

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 6

CRD 16

Original Language Only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE

Eighth Session

Virtual

GUIDELINES ON INTEGRATED MONITORING AND SURVEILLANCE OF FOODBORNE ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE (For comments at Step 3)

(Prepared by the by Chair and co-chairs of the EWG (the Netherlands, Canada, Chile, China and New Zealand) based on the comments received in reply to CL 2021/59-AMR)

The chair and co-chairs have proposed revised text in section 10 based on the comments received with the aim of facilitating the discussions at TFAMR8 and finding a consensus.

10. Integrated analysis and reporting of results

10.1. Management of data

98. To facilitate the management of data, database(s) should be structured, and where feasible, centralized to allow for the appropriate and easy extraction of data when required and to accommodate expansion as the integrated monitoring and surveillance program(s) improves.

Co-chairs proposal:

Retain original text. Where feasible implies flexibility. The term coordination may create confusion. Editorial change improve/evolve for accuracy.

99. A confidentiality and data management policy should be put in place. Data should be collected and stored to maintain data integrity and to protect the confidentiality of personal and proprietary information.

100. To facilitate the management of data, ongoing or regular validation of the data ~~should~~ ~~may~~ be performed.

Co-chairs proposal:

Validation is essential even if the dataset is small, to check data quality. For example, checking for a nonsensical entry of text into numeric fields.

101. A description of the sampling design(s) and sampling plan(s), including any stratification and randomization procedures, the per-food producing animals-populations, and plants/crops, food production environment or food categories, should be recorded to link ~~the~~ data within and across monitoring and surveillance components.

Co-chairs proposal:

Additions for technical accuracy and clarity and editorial improvements.

10.2. Analysis of results

102. The data from the integrated monitoring and surveillance program(s) may be analyzed as described in CXG 77-2011 for risk assessment purposes and to ~~then~~ inform the development and implementation of risk management options and policies to drive responsible and prudent use of antimicrobials to address foodborne AMR.

Co-chairs proposal:

Editorial improvements.

103. Analysis of data from the integrated monitoring and surveillance ~~of AMR and AMU~~ program(s) may include the assessment within or between sectors across the One Health spectrum, to evaluate temporal or geographical trends

over time, across host species, across bacterial species or antimicrobial classes. When available, other contextual information such as epidemiological data may be considered.

Co-chairs proposal:

AMR and AMU has been amended by programs, as in other parts of the document to facilitate consensus. Other proposals for new text have not been incorporated as they modifies the intention of the paragraph. This paragraph was discussed at PWG.

The intention of this paragraph is to describe how to integrate data collected within the monitoring and surveillance program(s) and then other information if appropriate can be considered. Asking countries to conduct monitoring and surveillance and collect unspecified contextual information is too prescriptive and resource intensive.

104. The detailed methodology and the epidemiological context of the monitoring and surveillance program(s) should be considered for the analysis. Where data are available, exposure pathways among people, food producing animals, plants/crops and their shared environment connecting resident bacterial populations may be incorporated into the analysis.

Co-chairs proposal:

Retain original as flexibility is provided already by “where data are available” and “may be incorporated”.

The “or” implies you only have to do plants/crops or their shared environment which changes the intent of the paragraph which is about integration.

105. Data may originate from different monitoring and surveillance program(s), so comparability is an important consideration. The choice of analytical approaches should allow the investigation of ~~any~~ relationships between AMU and AMR within or across ~~the~~ food producing animals, plants/crops and human populations, provided that AMR and AMU data are representative of the target population. Integrated monitoring and surveillance of foodborne AMR should be harmonized across these sectors to assist in the understanding, ~~and the investigation~~ of relationships between and AMU, including other factors that may influence the emergence and spread of AMR.

Co-chair proposal:

Some amendments for clarity.

One member proposed rearrangement and rephrasing of the text in the paragraph.

When the text in the paragraph was re-arranged, it introduced technically prescriptive elements that were not present in the original paragraph. The addition of “antimicrobials intended for use” is adding prescriptive constraints on what you can do the analysis on. The rephrasing of the choice of analytic approaches changes the meaning of the sentence and was not incorporated.

“and/or” was not included since any of the combinations, including associations between animals and plants is applicable and changes the main intent of the sentence is to integrate and evaluate associations with public health.

106. AMR data from relevant human isolates may be considered for inclusion in the analysis and reporting based on information from significant foodborne pathogens according to national epidemiological information and, whenever possible, ~~commensal~~ indicator flora.

Co-chairs proposal:

“Commensal” was changed to “indicator” for consistency.

107. Integration of data from surveillance of human clinical isolates should facilitate the ability to identify trends in resistance to specific antimicrobials important for use in human medicine, as well as to identify trends in the occurrence of resistance ~~between~~ in humans, food producing animals, plants/crops and ~~animals~~ food.

Co-chairs proposal:

Editorial changes for consistency and to add “food” which was missing. ---

108. Statistical analysis should be used to ensure proper interpretation of results.

10.3. Reporting of results

~~109. Transparent and open communication for the reporting of the results between the competent authorities and the different stakeholders under the One Health approach should be encouraged.~~

Co-chairs proposal:

Paragraph 109 is moved after 111 as 111bis for logical flow of the information. The public was added as the public are not always considered stakeholders.

110. Results of integrated monitoring and surveillance program(s) should be reported regularly, where resources allow.

Co-chairs proposal:

Retain original text. No changes were made to the paragraph, flexibility is provided by “where resources allow” and “Regularly” can be defined by the country.

111. When ~~ever possible available, summary~~ reports on the integrated monitoring and surveillance program(s) data across humans, animals, plants/crops, food and the food production environment ~~may should~~ be made publicly available.

Co-chairs proposal:

“or” was not included since it does not provide clear guidance and flexibility is already included in the sentence as “where possible”. Should have been added as flexibility is provided by “Where possible”.
Summary has been deleted to allow more flexibility.

111 bis. Transparent and open communication for the reporting of the results between the competent authorities and the different stakeholders ~~including the public under the One Health approach~~ should be ~~encouraged~~ considered.