

# 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](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

Agenda Item 18

CX/CF 22/15/17

April 2022

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
CODEX COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS**

15<sup>th</sup> Session

Virtual

9-13 and 24 May 2022

**REVIEW OF CODEX STANDARDS FOR CONTAMINANTS**

**Comments in reply to CL 2021/90-CF**

*Comments from Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, European Union,  
Japan, Kenya, Peru, Republic of Korea, Uganda, USA*

**Background**

1. This document compiles comments received through the Codex Online Commenting System (OCS) in response to CL 2021/90-CF<sup>1</sup> issued in December 2021. Under the OCS, comments are compiled in the following order: general comments are listed first, followed by comments on specific sections.

**Explanatory notes on the appendix**

2. The comments submitted through the OCS are attached in the **Annex** and are presented in table format.

---

<sup>1</sup> Codex circular letter, including CL 2021/90-CF, are available on the Codex webpage/Circular Letters: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/> or on the dedicated Codex webpage/CCCF/Circular Letters: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-circular-letters/en/?committee=CCCF>

**Annex****GENERAL COMMENTS**

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>MEMBER / OBERVER</b>
Cuba considera en principio que puede apoyar el orden de prioridad de revisión para el Codex seguimiento de las normas y textos afines propuestos de acuerdo al orden previsto en el documento.	<b>Cuba</b>
<p>Egypt agrees with the proposed list (A.1 , A.2 &amp; B) according to the criteria of prioritization for identifying Codex Standards for review as following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Established or reviewed <math>\geq 25</math> years ago</li> <li>2- Established or reviewed <math>\geq 15</math> &amp; <math>&lt; 25</math> years ago</li> <li>3- Codex contaminant standards recommended for re-evaluation</li> </ol>	<b>Egypt</b>
De acuerdo a las listas de seguimiento de las normas y textos afines del Codex para contaminantes, el Perú se acoge a la orden de prioridad propuesta por la Secretaría.	<b>Peru</b>
Saudi Arabia support the progression of (prioritization) on the review of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed.	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>
<p>At this time, the United States has the following comments on the prioritization of the items referenced in CL 2021/90-CF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We encourage progress on or completion of current agenda items before undertaking new work.</li> <li>• From the items on the tracking lists, we suggest prioritizing review of the Code of Practice Concerning Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals, CAC/RCP 49-2001. We are willing to chair this work.</li> <li>• A second priority from the items on the tracking list would be to review the 50 <math>\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}</math> patulin in juice ML, either for extension to apple products other than apple juice (no JECFA evaluation needed), or for the review of the juice ML, (JECFA evaluation may be required).</li> </ul>	<b>USA</b>

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

**1. Please prioritize contaminants listed in Lists A and B and include the rationale for such prioritization based on the information presented in the lists below and the criteria provided in Annex II of CL 2021/90-CF**

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>Canada supports the use of the prioritization criteria in Annex II of CL 2021/90-CF.</p> <p>Canada has also identified some additional prioritization criteria through the exercise to prioritize the standards in the tracking lists (Lists A &amp;B, Annex I of CL 2021/90-CF), as well as the review of associated materials from past CCCF and CAC meetings and information in the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual (27th edition).</p> <p>Although comments on the prioritization criteria are not specifically requested as part of this circular letter, given that the process agreed to by CCCF14 (2021) for prioritizing existing Codex standards for review is undergoing a 3-year trial period, Canada felt it relevant to provide input at this time.</p> <p>As such, Canada’s suggested edits to the prioritization criteria are included in response to this circular letter as follows:</p> <p>Under the section for Criteria for Maximum levels, Guideline Levels and Codes of Practice:</p> <p>1) Edits for the row on Recommended for re-evaluation to read: CCCF, CAC or a member country recommended the standard for re evaluation within a certain period of time or at an unspecified future date.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Editorial: Edits to this text make it consistent with the way the other prioritization criteria are written.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">****</p> <p>2) Add new row following "Recommended for re-evaluation":</p> <p>Criteria for identifying Codex standards for review - "Staple food: The food commodity that the standard applies to is a staple food."</p> <p>Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern - "Moderate to high"</p> <p>Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF - "1"</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Substantive: Canada recommends adding the prioritization criteria: ‘Staple food: The food commodity that the standard applies to is a staple food.’ This criteria would help address the potentially significant contaminant contribution that can come from staple foods.</p> <p>If it would be useful to reference an agreed-upon list of staple foods, Canada notes that this list may be fully or partially developed as presented at CCCF14 (2021) in the document titled: Review of staple food-contaminant combinations for future work (CX/CF 21/14/17).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>3) Add new row under "Staple food" proposed above:</p> <p>Criteria for identifying Codex standards for review - "Developing countries: Standards relevant to the needs of developing countries."</p> <p>Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern - "Moderate to high"</p> <p>Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF - "1"</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Substantive: Canada recommends adding the prioritization criteria: ‘Developing countries: Standards relevant to the needs of developing countries’. This criteria aligns with the recommendation in the Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Section IV Risk Analysis: Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCCF, that “The needs and situations of developing countries should be specifically identified and taken into account by the responsible bodies in the different stages of the risk analysis.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p>	<p><b>Canada</b></p>

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
<p>4) Edits for the row on "A new or updated health risk assessment is available:" so that the text reads:            "Either JECFA or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF published a health risk assessment and the conclusions are significantly different than the previous evaluation."  <u>Comment:</u> Editorial: Edits to this text make it consistent with the way the other prioritization criteria are written.            ***</p> <p>5) Add new row under "A new or updated health risk assessment is available:"            Criteria for identifying Codex standards for review - "Efficiencies with other work: Standard review involving the same or similar commodity or the same contaminant was recently completed, is underway or commencing in the near future."            Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern - "n/a"            Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF - "2"  <u>Comment:</u> Substantive: Canada recommends adding the prioritization criteria: 'Efficiencies with other work: Standard review involving the same or similar commodity or the same contaminant was recently completed, is underway or commencing in the near future.'            This criteria aligns with the goal of the CCCF to strategically consider and implement its forward work plan, particularly that relating to new work.            ***</p> <p>6) Add new row under "Efficiencies with other work;" proposed above:            Criteria for identifying Codex standards for review - "Member country volunteer: A Codex member country volunteers to take on the work to draft a discussion paper outlining any proposed changes to the Codex standard."            Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern - "n/a"            Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF - "2"  <u>Comment:</u> Substantive: Canada recommends adding the prioritization criteria: 'Member country volunteer: A Codex member country volunteers to take on the work to draft a discussion paper outlining any proposed changes to the Codex standard.'            ***</p> <p>7) Under the section Additional Criteria for Maximum Levels:            In the row "Trade disruptions" Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF - "2" and to delete the following "(1 – when involving a trade disruption of a staple food)"  <u>Comment:</u> Substantive: Canada proposed that a specific prioritization criteria on staple foods be included in this list, which would make the information on staple foods in the 'trade disruption' criterion redundant.</p>	

**1 (i). LIST A.1: Priority for review for contaminants established or reviewed ≥25 years ago (1996 and earlier)**

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>Canada suggests that the standards in List A.1 could be prioritized in the following decreasing order of priority:</p> <p>1: <b>Tin in meats MLs (x5)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1 (Priority 1); in revised List B (accidental omission from CL-90) (Priority 2) as only temporarily endorsed pending future review; possible efficiencies with other work – i) CoP for tin in canned foods packaged in tinplate containers (CXC 60-2005) in List A.2; ii) MLs for tin in canned foods (250 mg/kg) and canned beverages (150 mg/kg) in tinplate containers will be in List A.2 in 2023.</p> <p>2: <b>Salt, MLs for arsenic, cadmium and mercury</b> (accidental omission, in revised List A.1)  <u>Rationale:</u> 3 MLs for salt are in List A.1 (Priority 1); salt is widely consumed and traded; possible efficiencies gained by assessing the three trace elements concurrently.</p> <p>3: <b>Arsenic ML in edible fats and oils</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1. (Priority 1); ML does not appear have been established based on scientific principals (i.e. appears to have been transferred from the relevant Codex Commodity standard) and CCCF should consider if there is a health or trade-based need to update and retain this ML; possible efficiencies with other work – i) ML for arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads will be in List A.2 in 2023; ii) assessment of non-cancer effects of organic and inorganic arsenic which is currently on the JECFA priority list.</p> <p>4: <b>Acrylonitrile &amp; vinyl chloride</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1 (Priority 1). As part of a discussion of possible future topics for forward work planning, CCCF briefly discussed future food packaging and food contact materials, noting that these compounds are covered by the scope of the definition of a contaminant (CX/CF 19/13/18, Appendix D).</p>	Canada
Colombia considera que la prioridad propuesta está acorde con lo revisado en las listas anexas, por lo cual apoya el orden propuesto en este listado.	Colombia
No standards prioritized for review.	European Union

1 (ii). LIST A.2: Priority for review for contaminants established or reviewed  $\geq 15$  and  $< 25$  years ago (between 1997 and 2006)

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
<p>Canada suggests that the highest priority items in List A.2 should be those that relate to other existing Codex standards that are in List A.1 or List B, or ongoing or recent work by CCCF, as there would be possible efficiencies in working on similar standards concurrently. Canada suggests that the standards in List A.1 could be prioritized in the following order of decreasing priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>ML for aflatoxins in peanuts intended for further processing</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In revised List A.2 (accidental omission from CL-90) (Priority 2); aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and should be ALARA in foods; possible efficiencies with other work – i) Aflatoxins in Peanuts CoP (CXC 55-2004) in List A.2 (Priority 2); ii) CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts.</li> <li>2. <b>Aflatoxins in Peanuts CoP (CXC 55-2004)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> See #1 above for the ML aflatoxins in peanuts for further processing.</li> <li>3. <b>ML for Aflatoxin M1 in Milks</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2 (Priority 2); in revised List B (accidental omission) (Priority 2); aflatoxin M1 is a genotoxic carcinogen and should be ALARA in foods; possible efficiencies with other work – i) CoP for Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997) in List A.2; ii) CoP for mycotoxins in cereals (CXC 51-2003) established in 2003 and since updated.</li> <li>4. <b>CoP for Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> See above for the ML for Aflatoxin M1 in milks.</li> <li>5. <b>Patulin in apple juice ML</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2 (Priority 2); in revised List B (accidental omission from CL-90) (Priority 2); dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995) in 2007 as ML was established and not high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127); possible efficiencies with other work – i) patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2.</li> <li>6. <b>Patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> See above for patulin in apple juice ML.</li> <li>7. <b>Tin in canned foods [in tinplate cans] CoP (CXC 60-2005)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2 (Priority 2); possible efficiencies with other work - i) the two MLs for tin in foods and beverages packaged in tinplate packaging will be in List A.2 in 2023; there are 5 MLs for tin meats not packaged in tinplate cans in List A.1.</li> <li>8. <b>Cadmium MLs (x13)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2. JECFA 2022 HRA only identified potential health concerns in certain Chinese age groups.</li> <li>9. <b>CoP for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Foods with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)</b>  <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2 (Priority 2).</li> </ol>	Canada
Colombia considera que la prioridad propuesta está acorde con lo revisado en las listas anexas, por lo cual apoya el orden propuesto en este listado.	Colombia
The following standards are to be prioritized for review:	European Union

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Aflatoxin M1 in milk:</b> Potential safety concern is moderate to high (priority level 1). In connection with the review of the ML, it might be appropriate to simultaneously discuss the need to update of the Code of Practice “Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)” – new occurrence data available, technological advances and developments to reduce presence of aflatoxin M1 in milk.</li> <li>• <b>Cadmium in listed food commodities</b> (certain cereal grains, legume vegetables, pulses, Brassica vegetables, bulb vegetables, fruiting vegetables, certain leafy vegetables, certain root and tuber vegetables, certain stalk and stem vegetables, wheat, cephalopods, marine bivalve molluscs, rice, polished): potential safety concern is moderate to high (priority level 1) – new occurrence data available, new dietary exposure data available, new health-based guidance value (HBGV), updated health risk assessment available from JECFA.                       As new maximum levels should reflect concentrations in crops, which were produced taking into account good practices for the mitigation of cadmium, it could be considered to first draft a general code of practice for the mitigation of cadmium in agricultural crops, followed by a data collection on products to which these good practices were applied. Those data could then be used at a later stage for a possible review of the MLs.</li> </ul>	

**1 (i-ii). LIST A: Codex Contaminant Standards Established or Reviewed ≥25 and ≥15 and >25 Years Ago**

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p>• <b>Table A.1:</b> Add a new Contaminant: "Mercury"; Food(s): "Salt, food grade"; Type of standard: "ML"; Year: "1987"; Corresponding standard: "n/a"  <u>Comment:</u> The ML for mercury in food grade salt should be included in List A.1 as it was established in 1987, which is ≥25 years ago.</p> </li> <li> <p>• <b>Table A.1:</b> In section Contaminant for "Tin, total" add "*" as a footnote after each named foods; add footnote to read "*MLs apply to products in containers other than tinplate containers".  <u>Comment:</u> Adding text to indicate that the application of the MLs to meats that are not packaged in tinplate containers adds clarity to List A.1.</p> </li> <li> <p>• <b>Arsenic, total:</b> Delete the row for "Fat spread and blended spread", including "ML" and "2007" from the table.  <u>Comment:</u> As the ML for arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads was established in 2007, at this time it does not meet the criteria for inclusion in List A.1 or A.2. However, next year (2023) it will be eligible for inclusion in List A.2.                      The arsenic ML for fat spreads and blended spreads was not scientifically justified when entered into the GSCTFF in 2007, it was put in place with the understanding that a specific ML for arsenic in these types of foods would be established in the future, as outlined below:                      “The products covered by the provisions of this Standard [the Draft Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads] shall comply with maximum limits being established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission but in the meantime the following limits will apply: Maximum permissible concentration: Lead (Pb) 0.1 mg/kg; Arsenic (As) 0.1 mg/kg.” (Report of the 20th Session of CCFO, Appendix II, Draft Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads (ALINORM 07/30/17)).                      Based on the above rationale, Canada suggests that the ML for arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads requires review and that a possible efficiency may be gained in reviewing that ML at the same time as the ML for arsenic in edible fats and oils, which is in List A.1.</p> </li> <li> <p>• <b>Acrylonitrile:</b> The standard for acrylonitrile in food is a GL not an ML.</p> </li> <li> <p>• <b>Add a new row to Table A.2:</b> Contaminant: "Aflatoxin, total"; Food(s): "Peanuts intended for further processing"; Type of standard "ML"; Year established: "1999"; Corresponding standard: "CoP: CXC 59-2005"  <u>Comment:</u> The ML for aflatoxins (total) in peanuts intended for further processing should be in List A.2 as it was established in 1999, which is ≥15 and &lt;25 years ago.</p> </li> <li> <p>• <b>A.2 Established or Reviewed ≥15 and &lt;25 years ago (between 1997 and 2006)</b>                      Table A.2: For the contaminant; "Tin, inorganic", Food: "Canned Foods" add a footnote "*"; footnote to add: "*The CoP relates to thermally processed canned human foods (including fruit and vegetable juices) which are packed into plain tinplate cans"  <u>Comment:</u> Adding text to indicate the application of the CoP to thermally processed foods packaged in plain tinplate cans adds clarity to List A.2.</p> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Canada</b></p>

**1 (iii). LIST B: Priority for review for contaminants recommended for re-evaluation**

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canada suggests that the highest priority items in List B should be those that relate to other existing Codex standards that are in List A.1 or List A.2 or ongoing or recent work by CCCF, as there would be possible efficiencies in working on similar standards concurrently. The 4 highest priority items in List B would therefore be, in decreasing order of priority (more detailed rationales are provided above for Lists A.1 and A.2, and in the 'Rationale for Re-Evaluation' column of List B):             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Methylmercury in tuna ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> Efficiencies with other work - CCCF still has an active EWG that is elaborating MLs for methylmercury in fish and developing a sampling plan.</li> <li>2. <b>Aflatoxin M1 in milks ML</b> (accidental omission from List B) <u>Rationale:</u> Also in List A.2.</li> <li>3. <b>Patulin in apple juice ML</b> (accidental omission from List B) <u>Rationale:</u> Also in List A.2 as there was a view to establish a lower ML after the implementation of the Code of Practice.</li> <li>4. <b>Tin in meats</b> [not packaged in tinplate containers] [not in MLs (x5)] (accidental omission from List B) <u>Rationale:</u> Only temporarily endorsed pending future review.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• In order for the MLs in List B to be reviewed, additional occurrence data would be required in most if not all cases. Once CCCF decides that a standard is ready to be prioritized for review and a member country has agreed to take on the work, a call for data could be issued. Canada has additional occurrence data to contribute for lead in most of the commodities listed, the acetylated DON derivatives in cereals and cereal-based products, fumonisins in maize flour and maize meal, and methylmercury in tuna.</li> <li>• <b>Adding a new row for Contaminant:</b> "Tin, Total"; add five new rows for Food(s): "Cooked cured chopped meat*", "Cooked cured ham*", "Cooked cured pork shoulder*", "Corned beef*", "Luncheon meat*" ; Type of Standard (to be added for each of the five foods): "ML" ; Year Established (to be added for each of the five foods): "1981" ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation (to be added for each of the five foods): "Not Specified" <u>Rationale for Re-Evaluation:</u> "However, the 23rd Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had only temporarily endorsed the contaminant provisions for lead and tin, as they were felt to be excessively high. Several delegations reiterated their reservations on the high levels established for contaminants derived from the packaging material in this and the other Draft Standards before the Commission." (ALINORM 91/40, para. 321) "The Commission adopted the Draft Revised Standard for [canned meat X] at Step 8, as contained in Appendix [#] of ALINORM 91/16, with the understanding that the contaminant provisions for lead and tin would remain as temporarily endorsed, pending a review by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants and the Secretariat in the future." (ALINORM 91/40, paras. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330)" The table would read as follows: Food - Cooked cured ham* ; Type of Standard - ML ; Year Established - 1981 ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation - Not Specified; Food - Cooked cured Pork shoulder* ; Type of Standard - ML ; Year Established - 1981 ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation - Not Specified; Food - Corned beef* ; Type of Standard - ML ; Year Established - 1981 ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation - Not Specified; Food - Luncheon meat* ; Type of Standard - ML ; Year Established - 1981 ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation - Not Specified;</li> </ul>	Canada

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>Added footnote: *ML applies to products in containers other than tinsplate containers</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The MLs for tin in each cooked cured chopped meat, cooked cured ham, cooked cured pork shoulder, corned beef and luncheon meat were accidentally omitted from the original List B. These MLs should be included in List B, however, because in 1991 they were temporarily endorsed pending review by CCFAC, and this review has not been initiated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Adding a new row for Contaminant:</b> "Patulin"; Food: "Apple Juice Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration"; Type of Standard: "ML" ; Year Established: "2003" ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation: "2007"</p> <p><u>Rationale for Re-Evaluation:</u> "The Commission noted that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had discussed the development of the proposed maximum level of 50 µg/kg of patulin with a view to establishing a lower level of 25 µg/kg in the future based on the application of the Code of Practice which was aimed at achieving lower patulin levels. The Commission supported the decision of the Committee to continue to collect data on the levels of patulin in apple juice and apple juice ingredients for other beverages with the aim of reconsidering a possible reduction of the maximum level once the code of practice had been implemented (after four years)." (ALINORM 03/41, para. 43) (CAC26 (2003))"</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The ML for patulin in apple juice was accidentally omitted from the original List B. This ML should be included in List B, however, because in 2003 it was suggested for review with the view to possibly lower the ML after the CoP was in place for four years.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Adding a new row for Contaminant:</b> "Aflatoxin M1"; Food: "Milks" ; Type of Standard: "ML" ; Year Established: "2001" ; Year of Recommended Re-Evaluation: "Not Specified"</p> <p><u>Rationale for Re-Evaluation:</u> "The delegation of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Community, objected to the level of 0.5 µg/kg because in the case of genotoxic carcinogens, exposure at any level might pose a health risk to consumers, in particular children, and that the level should therefore be as low as reasonably achievable. Other delegations supported the level of 0.5 µg/kg as proposed, especially in view of the determination of the JECFA that with worst-case assumptions, the additional risks for liver cancer predicted with the use of the proposed maximum levels of aflatoxin M1 of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg were very small. The Delegation of Bolivia stated that if the lower level would be fixed, it would create unjustified barriers to trade without affecting the risks to consumers' health. The Commission could not reach a consensus on this issue.</p> <p>In view of the importance of establishing a level for the health protection of consumers, and in consideration that the higher level provided an adequate level of protection as determined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants, the Commission adopted the maximum level of 0.5 µg/kg in milk. It was agreed that data supporting the lower level, if and when available, could be examined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants at a future meeting if necessary. The member states of the EU, as well as the delegations of Cyprus, Estonia, Ghana, Hungary, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Swaziland and Switzerland expressed their reservations on this decision. The Representative of Consumers International also expressed the concern of that organization at the decision taken." (ALINORM 01/41, paras. 127-129)"</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The ML for aflatoxin M1 in milks was accidentally omitted from the original List B. This ML should be included in List B, however, because in 2001 it was suggested for future review if and when more data became available supporting a lower ML value.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Methylmercury:</b> Add the following text to the beginning of the Rationale:</p> <p>"The EU expressed the view that it could not agree for the time being with any of the MLs proposed as the levels were higher than those currently in force in the EU and would result in higher exposure to mercury which was a public health concern. This view was supported by Switzerland and Norway." (REP18/CF, para 72)</p> </li> </ul>	

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>“ML for tuna: CCCF first considered the ML based on P95 (1.1 mg/kg) and noted that while there was some support for this ML because it would be more protective for health, that many delegations believed the rejection rate of 5% was too high, and that the ML of 1.2 mg/kg or other higher MLs such as 1.7 mg/kg should be considered which would result in lower rejection rates. Views were also expressed that the ML for tuna should be set based on the species of tuna with high mercury content, such as Bigeye or Bluefin tuna. The ML of 1.2 mg/kg was proposed as a compromise as this was based on the data of all tuna species but with a next lower rejection rate than 5%.” (REP18/CF, para. 74)</p> <p>“CCCF agreed on an ML of 1.2 mg/kg. EU, Switzerland and Norway expressed their reservation to this decision for the reasons given in paragraph 72.” (REP18/CF, paras. 75-76)</p> <p>“The EU, supported by Norway and Switzerland, expressed its reservation regarding all the MLs for the reasons contained in CX/CAC 18/41/4.” (REP18/CAC, para. 34).</p> <p>“The European Union reiterates its reservation on the adoption at step 5/8 of the MLs for all tuna, alfonsino, marlin and shark. All these MLs have been increased from the current Codex Guideline Level (GL) of 1 mg/kg. ...the EU cannot agree with any of the MLs proposed as the levels are higher than those currently in force in the EU and would result in higher exposure to mercury which is a serious public health concern.” (CX/CAC 18/41/4).</p> <p>“Colombia and Cuba also reserved their position on the final adoption of all the MLs, supporting instead adoption at Step 5 and further consideration in CCCF. Cuba further noted that, according to their national regulation, the proposed MLs would not sufficiently protect the health of the Cuban population.” (REP18/CAC, para. 35)</p> <p>“Ecuador expressed a reservation on the setting of one single ML for methylmercury for all tuna species on the grounds that data used in establishing the ML did not take into account certain eastern Pacific tuna species with higher methylmercury concentrations. ... If adopted, the ML should be revised after three years based on available data with a view to establishing a more globally representative ML.” (REP18/CAC, para. 37).</p> <p>“The Commission adopted the proposed MLs [for methylmercury in tuna, alfonsino, marlin and shark], noting the reservations expressed by Cuba, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, Norway, Senegal and Switzerland, and agreed that CCCF could consider revising the ML for tuna in the light of additional data after three years.” (REP18/CAC, para. 39)</p> <p>"Note that Sengal did not express reservation to the tuna ML, but the methylmercury MLs for other species."</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Adding additional details about the discussions had and concerns raised at the CCCF and CAC meeting when the methylmercury in tuna ML was being developed provides additional context that will be useful when considering how to prioritize this standard for possible review and/or future calls for data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Fumonisin:</b> Add to the Rationale the following text:</p> <p>“Maize grain unprocessed: African delegations indicated that the establishment of MLs for maize was long overdue and necessary to protect consumer health, especially since maize was a staple food in most parts of the continent. These delegations however could not support the proposed “ML of 5 000 µg/kg as this would not be health protective.” (REP14/CF, para. 64) “Maize flour/meal: There was wide support for the proposed ML of 2 000 µg/kg for maize flour and maize meal. African delegations, however, proposed an ML of 1 000 µg/kg for similar reasons as indicated in the discussion on the raw maize grains, and in addition these delegations questioned whether data from Africa had been considered. Further questions were raised on the cluster diets, noting that it wasn’t necessarily reflective of actual dietary intake in many countries.</p> </li> </ul>	

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>The JECFA Secretariat clarified that JECFA had undertaken an impact assessment of the different proposed MLs and that the different estimated exposures between the MLs of 2 000 and 1 000 µg/kg would be very low, however the rejection rate was very different. So aspects of food security and food safety had to be carefully considered and balanced. Moreover, in JECFA's analyses the highest daily average consumption applied from one of the GEMS/Food cluster diets was about 300 g of maize per person per day, and overall 11% of the samples considered were from African countries (over 12 000 samples).</p> <p>In noting the need for the ML and progress on this work, and in the spirit of compromise, African delegations, while having a preference for 1 000 µg/kg, agreed to the ML of 2 000 µg/kg." (REP14/CF, paras. 67-69)</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Technical - Adding additional details about the discussions had and concerns raised at the CCCF meeting when the fumonisin MLs in maize flour and maize meal were being developed provides additional context that will be useful when considering how to prioritize these standards for possible review.</p> <p>"...the Committee agreed that the ML of 4 000 µg/kg for raw [maize] cereal grains and 2 000 µg/kg for "maize" flour and maize meal were ready for adoption by the Commission. In relation to the ML for maize flour and maize meal, the Committee agreed that these would be advanced for adoption with the understanding that exposure and impact assessment should be undertaken by JECFA within three years for reconsideration of the levels." (REP14/CF, para. 71)</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Editorial - The addition of the word '[maize]' to this sentence clarifies the food that the previous discussion pertained to. The sentence would read: "...ML of 4 000 µg/kg for raw [maize] cereal grains..."</p> <p>"The Committee [JECFA "83 (2016)"] reviewed the studies that have become available since the previous evaluation in 2011, and concluded that they would not change the overall toxicological assessment performed previously by the Committee. Thus, the previously established group PMTDI of 2 µg/kg bw for FB1, FB2 and FB3, alone or in combination, was retained by the current Committee. The Committee noted that the international exposure estimates for FB1 and total fumonisins were lower than those estimated by the Committee at its seventy-fourth meeting in 2011. In the current assessment, a larger part of the occurrence data was from countries belonging to the WHO European Region compared with 2011, resulting in lower overall fumonisin levels in maize.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Editorial - The addition of the JECFA meeting number and year clarifies which JECFA meeting is being referred to. The sentence would read: "The Committee [JECFA 83 (2016)]..."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Arsenic</b> <u>Comment:</u> If the studies noted have become available, Canada would support a future update of the Code of practice for arsenic in rice (CoP: CXC 77-2017). A possible efficiency could be gained pursuing this work at the same time as any updates to the ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice, which is also in List B.</li> <li>• <b>Fumonisin:</b> Add next to Contaminant Fumonisin (B1 + B2). <u>Comment:</u> The addition of 'B1 + B2' clarifies the specific fumonisin compounds that the ML pertains to.</li> </ul>	
Colombia considera que la prioridad propuesta está acorde con lo revisado en las listas anexas, por lo cual apoya el orden propuesto en este listado.	Colombia

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives in cereals and cereal-based products:</b> Potential safety concern is moderate to high: new occurrence data available.</li> <li>• <b>Inorganic arsenic in husked rice:</b> Potential safety concern is moderate to high - new occurrence data available.</li> <li>• <b>Methylmercury in tuna:</b> Potential safety concern is moderate to high - new occurrence data available.</li> </ul>	<b>European Union</b>
<p>We recommend to review contaminants by an order for food consumption. The priority for review would beö</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) cereals &amp; cereal-based products (acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives),</li> <li>2) cereal grains (lead),</li> <li>3) rice (arsenic),</li> <li>4) maize flour &amp; maize meal (fumonisins).</li> </ol> <p>The rest of the list needs to be prioritized by food consumption order.</p>	<b>Republic of Korea</b>

**1 (iv). Priority for review for contaminants in food and feed:** Based on the prioritization proposed under points i to iii, above, please provide a single list of prioritized contaminants for review by CCCF.

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>Canada suggests that the following 13 items are the highest priority Codex standards for review from Lists A.1, A.2 and B, in decreasing priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Aflatoxins in peanuts intended for further processing ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In revised List A.2; aligns with ongoing CCCF work to elaborate an ML in RTE peanuts.</li> <li>2. <b>Aflatoxins in Peanuts CoP (CXC 55-2004)</b> <u>Rationale:</u> Aligns with ongoing CCCF work to elaborate an ML in RTE peanuts &amp; ML for aflatoxins in peanuts for further processing in List A.2.</li> <li>3. <b>Methylmercury in tuna ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> Aligns with ongoing CCCF work to elaborate MLs for methylmercury in fish and developing a sampling plan.</li> <li>4. <b>Aflatoxin M1 in Milks ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2; in revised List B; related CoP in List A.2; genotoxic carcinogen; CoP for mycotoxins in cereal grains has been developed since the ML was established.</li> <li>5. <b>Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk-Producing Animals CoP (CXC 45-1997)</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2; related ML in List A.2; genotoxic carcinogen; CoP for mycotoxins in cereal grains was developed after this CoP.</li> <li>6. <b>Patulin in apple juice ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2; in revised List B; dated JECFA evaluation (1995); patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2.</li> <li>7. <b>Patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003)</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2; in revised List B; dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995); related ML in List A.2.</li> <li>8. <b>Tin in meats MLs [not packaged in tinfoil containers] (x5)</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1; in revised List B; CoP for tin in canned foods packaged in tinfoil containers (CXC 60-2005) in List A.2; ii) MLs for tin in canned foods and beverages in tinfoil containers will be in List A.2 in 2023.</li> <li>10. <b>Tin in canned foods [packaged in plain tinfoil containers] CoP (CXC 60-2005)</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.2; 5 MLs for tin in meats not packaged in tinfoil cans in List A.1; two MLs for tin in foods and beverages packaged in tinfoil containers will be in List A.2 in 2023</li> <li>11. <b>Salt MLs for arsenic, cadmium and mercury</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1; salt is widely consumed and traded; possible efficiencies could be gained by assessing the three trace elements concurrently.</li> <li>12. <b>Arsenic in edible fats and oils ML</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1; ML does not appear have been established based on scientific principals; ML for arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads which will be in List A.2 in 2023; inorganic and organic arsenic on JECFA priority list.</li> <li>13. <b>Acrylonitrile &amp; vinyl chloride</b> <u>Rationale:</u> In List A.1. Appear to be well managed and not detected in foods.</li> </ol>	Canada

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>Luego de revisados los criterios expuestos en el anexo II de la carta circular y contrastados con los contaminantes enumerados en las listas A y B en anexo I de la CL, Chile considera que, se deben respetar el orden expuesto en las listas expuestas y priorizar la lista A1 en primer lugar, dado que los datos con los cuales fueron establecidos los niveles máximos en su momento para estos contaminantes fueron obtenidos en su mayoría con métodos analíticos con un límite de cuantificación de mayor valor que los que la tecnología actual permite, y por tanto, realizar un nuevo levantamiento de datos con métodos de ensayo contemporáneos de seguro permitirá aspirar a niveles máximos de menor concentración, al disponer de límites de cuantificación menores y por tanto asegurar de mejor forma a la población respecto de prevenir la ingesta de estos contaminantes.</p>	Chile
<p>Colombia revisara los listados de contaminantes en alimentos y piensos, de acuerdo a los trabajos que se realicen en el próximo comité codex, para definir una lista única en concordancia con las listas del anexo.</p>	Colombia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aflatoxin M1 in milk and update related Code of Practice CXC 45-1997</li> <li>• Methylmercury in tuna</li> <li>• Inorganic arsenic in husked rice</li> <li>• Acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives in cereals and cereal products</li> <li>• <u>Cadmium in food</u>: The development of a code of practice for the mitigation of cadmium in agricultural crops. After the application of such code of practice and a new data collection. Priority could be given for a review of the MLs for legume vegetables, pulses, wheat, cephalopods, marine bivalve molluscs and rice, polished</li> </ul>	European Union
<p>Japan agrees to trial of the systematic review of Codex Standards and related texts for contaminant in food and feed.</p> <p><u>Comments on list A</u></p> <p>While new occurrence data and new dietary exposure data for some of the contaminants on List A are available from GEMS/Food database and JECFA evaluations, the current Maximum Levels (MLs) and Codes of Practice (COPs) on list A seem to remain effective for protecting consumers' health and ensuring fair practices in the food trade considering the current risk assessments by JECFA for those contaminants.</p> <p>The priority of the work on the review of the Standards on List A should be considered in the light of the current overall workload of the CCCF, and it would not be so high at this stage.</p> <p><u>Comments on list B</u></p> <p>Japan believes that a review of MLs or COPs for contaminants in List B based on CCCF or CAC recommendations should be given higher priority than that of List A, if the relevant data for review are available.</p> <p>Japan can submit new occurrence data on deoxynivalenol and their derivatives in cereals, inorganic arsenic in husked rice and methylmercury in tuna species, and new information on prevention measures of arsenic contamination in rice.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there are no new occurrence data for lead and fumonisins in selected foods that can be submitted by Japan.</p> <p>For prioritization of review on the MLs and COP on List B, it would be needed to evaluate the overall information and data availability from Codex Members.</p> <p>Since arsenic is included in the current priority list for evaluation by JECFA, Japan proposes that at least a review of the ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice should await the completion of the JECFA evaluation to be conducted in the near future.</p>	Japan

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER
<p>1 <b>Vinyl chloride monomer and Acrylonitrile</b> The compounds are raw materials for the manufacture of plastic packaging which is commonly used in Kenya for water piping, primary packaging of most foods and drinking water.</p> <p>2 <b>Aflatoxin B1 -Raw Materials and Supplemental Feeding stuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)</b> The basic raw materials for dairy animal feed stuffs are cereal in nature and due to the climatic conditions (tropical humid) of Kenya they are prone to aflatoxin contamination. Under unsuitable storage conditions, the levels of aflatoxin may increase significantly.</p> <p>3 <b>Aflatoxin M1 in Milks</b> The basic raw materials for dairy animal feed stuffs are cereal in nature and due to the climatic conditions (tropical humid) of Kenya they are prone to aflatoxin contamination. Therefore there is a risk of aflatoxin M1 as a metabolite of B1.</p> <p>4 <b>Aflatoxin in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004)</b> Peanuts are susceptible to Aspergillus spp and therefore are naturally prone to aflatoxin contamination.</p> <p>5 <b>Fumonisin in Maize flour &amp; maize meal</b> Maize are susceptible Fusarium moniliforme and Fusarium verticillioides and therefore are naturally prone to fumonisin contamination. Maize flour and maize meal is a staple food in Kenya.</p> <p>6 <b>Patulin in apple Juice and apple Juice Ingredients in Other Beverages (CXC 50-2003)</b> Apples are prone to infection by penicillium, aspergillus and byssoschlamys spp that may contaminate apple and apple products. Kenya imports a lot of apple products.</p> <p>7 <b>Sodium metabisulfite also called sodium pyrosulfite ( Na<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) in meat and meat products</b> It is covered in the JECFA list Codex Stan 192, but not covering meat and poultry. The current MRLs covers only fish (shrimps, prawns and lobsters ). Its widely used in Kenya as a food preservative but without MRLs in meat. Kenyan National legislation, Cap 254 of Kenya allows its use in sausage, and in the Kenya Meat Control act it allows its use in other processed meat products but Codex has not offered guidance on safe limits of its use.</p>	Kenya
<p>We recommend to review the list A.1 by chronological order first. If another item is affordable to review, we hope that list B can be reviewed at the same time. Therefore, our priority list for review is A+B or as follows.</p> <p>Priority is follows:</p> <p>1) <b>Arsenic, total</b> - Edible fats and oils -ML- &lt;1980, List A.1.</p> <p>2) <b>Acetyl deoxynivalenol derivatives</b> - Cereals &amp; cereal-based products-ML-2015, List B</p> <p>3) <b>Tin, total</b> - Cooked meats and ham, etc -ML - 1981 -List A.1</p> <p>4) <b>Lead</b> - Cereal grains - ML - 2001(reviewed in 2013) - List B</p> <p>5) <b>Arsenic, total &amp; Cadmium</b> - Salt, food grade - ML - 1987 - List A.1</p> <p>6) <b>Arsenic</b> - Rice - COP - 2017 - List B</p>	Republic of Korea

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBERVER																								
<p>Uganda proposes to have priority lists in line of high priority as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A.2 Established or Reviewed <math>\geq 15</math> and <math>&lt; 25</math> years ago (between 1997 and 2006)</li> <li>2) List B: Codex Contaminant Standards Recommended for Re-Evaluation</li> <li>3) A.1 Established or Reviewed <math>\geq 25</math> years ago (1996 and earlier)</li> </ol> <p>and consideration of items as below:</p> <p>A.2 Established or Reviewed <math>\geq 15</math> and <math>&lt; 25</math> years ago (between 1997 and 2006):</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>SN</th> <th>Contaminat</th> <th>Food category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>Root and tuber vegetables</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>Fruiting vegetables</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>Leafy vegetables</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>Bulb vegetables</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>Rice, polished</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Patulin</td> <td>Apple juice</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>List B: Codex Contaminant Standards Recommended for Re-Evaluation</p> <table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Arsenic</td> <td>Rice</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	SN	Contaminat	Food category	1	Cadmium	Root and tuber vegetables	2	Cadmium	Fruiting vegetables	3	Cadmium	Leafy vegetables	4	Cadmium	Bulb vegetables	6	Cadmium	Rice, polished	7	Patulin	Apple juice	8	Arsenic	Rice	<p><b>Uganda</b></p>
SN	Contaminat	Food category																							
1	Cadmium	Root and tuber vegetables																							
2	Cadmium	Fruiting vegetables																							
3	Cadmium	Leafy vegetables																							
4	Cadmium	Bulb vegetables																							
6	Cadmium	Rice, polished																							
7	Patulin	Apple juice																							
8	Arsenic	Rice																							

**2. Please indicate whether your country is willing to lead or co-lead some of the items identified as priority (if appropriate)**

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>MEMBER / OBERVER</b>
Canada is willing to continue to chair the working group on this agenda item.	<b>Canada</b>
Colombia no identificó dentro de los listados anexos un tema prioritario, por lo tanto, no se presenta para presidir o copresidir algún tema, se esperará a la comisión próxima del comité de contaminantes para tomar decisiones referentes a las listas ajustadas.	<b>Colombia</b>
While we cannot make firm commitments at this stage because the schedule and workload of each task is unclear, Japan would like to continue to contribute as a chair or co-chair when the review of the Code of Practice for the Prevention of Arsenic Contamination in Rice is conducted depending on our resources to do so.	<b>Japan</b>