

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



World Health  
Organization

E

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)

CL 2022/85-CF

January 2023

**TO:** Codex Contact Points  
Contact Points of international organizations having observer status with Codex

**FROM:** Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission,  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme

**SUBJECT:** Request for comments on the prioritization for re-evaluation of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants

**DEADLINE:** 28 February 2023

## BACKGROUND

1. For background information on the systematic review of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed to determine the need for their re-evaluation, please refer to the discussion held and decisions made as outlined in the report of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Sessions of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF14<sup>1</sup>, 2021 and CCCF15<sup>2</sup>, 2022 respectively) and the associated conference room documents (CRDs<sup>3</sup>) submitted at CCCF15.

## REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

2. Codex members and observers are invited to:
  - i. Recommend standards and related texts from Lists A and B, as provided in Annex I, for inclusion in the *Overall Highest Priority List for Re-Evaluation of Codex Standards and Related Texts for Contaminants in Food and Feed* in Annex II.
    - a. Detailed rationale for such prioritization must be provided using the prioritization criteria in Annex III and/or other clear, reasonable rationale (in this case please indicate whether such a rationale should be included in the prioritization criteria by providing comments in Annex IV).
    - b. Details provided in support of any prioritization criteria cited should include but are not limited to: dates occurrence data were collected and approximate number of samples, supporting information about trade challenges, relevance as a staple food or relevance to developing countries, etc.
  - ii. Indicate whether your country is willing to lead or co-lead any items presently listed, or recommended for inclusion in, the Overall Highest Priority List.
  - iii. Provide editorial or any other feedback on Lists A and B, the prioritization criteria or the process<sup>4</sup> by which the trial period is proceeding, as these are all open to adjustments during the 3-year trial period (2022-2024) (see Annex IV).
3. As agreed to at CCCF15<sup>5</sup>, the working group (WG) Chair led by Canada will provide a verification function, where possible, of rationales provided by Members recommending standards and related texts for inclusion in the Overall Highest Priority List, including the standards and related texts included in this list in Annex II.

<sup>1</sup> REP21/CF14, paras. 211-218

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCCF&session=14>

<sup>2</sup> REP22/CF15, paras. 215-218

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCCF&session=15>

<sup>3</sup> CF15/CRD02 and CF15/CRD06. These documents are available by clicking on the link provided in footnote 2.

<sup>4</sup> The process, as agreed to by CCCF14, is described in CX/CF 21/14/16, paras. 9-13 and further improved by decisions taken by CCCF15 in REP22/CF15, para. 218. These documents are available by clicking on the links provided in footnotes 1 and 2.

<sup>5</sup> REP22/CF15, para. 218 point i) (e)

4. In providing comments to help prioritize Codex standards and/or related texts for contaminants for re-evaluation by JECFA, Codex members and observers are invited to also take into account the discussions held and decisions made at CCCF15 on the priority list of contaminants for evaluation and/or re-evaluation by JECFA<sup>6</sup> (see also CL 2022/84-CF) and on the follow-up to the outcomes of JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert meetings<sup>7</sup>. Comments that also consider the above items will assist CCCF16 (2023) in better assessing its future work, vis-à-vis ongoing work, and to more strategically address new work on Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed.
5. Comments submitted in reply to this Circular Letter<sup>8</sup> will be considered by the WG on the “Prioritization for re-evaluation of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed” that will meet prior to CCCF16 (2023) to prepare recommendations for consideration by CCCF16.

#### **GUIDANCE ON THE PROVISION OF COMMENTS**

6. Comments should be submitted through the Codex Contact Points of Codex members and observers using the OCS.
7. Contact Points of Codex members and observers may log into the OCS and access the document open for comments by selecting “Enter” in the “My reviews” page, available after login to the system.
8. Other OCS resources, including [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQs\)](#)-as well as the user manual and short guide, can be found at the following link: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/>.
9. For questions on the OCS, please contact [Codex-OCS@fao.org](mailto:Codex-OCS@fao.org).

---

<sup>6</sup> REP22/CF15, paras. 225-228, Appendix IX

<sup>7</sup> REP22/CF15, paras. 219-224

<sup>8</sup> [Codex webpage/Circular Letters](#):

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/>

[Codex webpage/CCCF/Circular Letters](#):

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-circular-letters/en/?committee=CCCF>

## Annex I

TRACKING LISTS OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS<sup>9</sup> FOR CONTAMINANTS PRIORITIZATION FOR POSSIBLE RE-EVALUATION

(For comments based on the guidance provided in CL 2022/85-CF paragraph 2 and Annex III)

List A: Codex Contaminant Standards Established or Reviewed  $\geq 25$  and  $\geq 15$  and  $> 25$  Years Ago (the standards within the lists are not presented in order of priority)

Contaminant	Food(s) <sup>a</sup>	Type of standard <sup>b</sup>	Year established <sup>c</sup>	Corresponding standard <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>A.1 Established or reviewed <math>\geq 25</math> years ago (1997 and earlier)</b>						
<b>Vinyl chloride monomer and acrylonitrile</b>						
Vinyl chloride monomer	Food	GL	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	In discussion of possible future topics for forward work planning CCCF discussed 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) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
Acrylonitrile	Food	GL	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	
<b>Aflatoxin B1</b>						
Aflatoxin B1	Raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)	CoP	1997	ML	List A.2 (priority 2)	See entry for Aflatoxin M1 ML in milks.
<b>Arsenic, total</b>						
Arsenic, total	Edible fats and oils	ML	<1980	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	ML appears to have been transferred from the commodity standards and not scientifically justified. 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 on JECFA priority list . (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
	Salt, food grade	ML	1987		List A.1 (priority 1)	Salt is widely consumed and traded. Possible efficiencies gained by assessing the three trace element MLs in salt concurrently. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)

<sup>9</sup> All Codex standards and related texts for contaminants are available on the Codex webpages:

Codex webpage/Codex texts:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/codex-texts/en/>

Codex webpage/CCCF/Related standards:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-standards/en/?committee=CCCF>

Contaminant	Food(s) <sup>a</sup>	Type of standard <sup>b</sup>	Year established <sup>c</sup>	Corresponding standard <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Cadmium</b>						
Cadmium	Salt, food grade	ML	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	See Canada's comment for arsenic in salt.
<b>Mercury</b>						
Mercury	Salt, food grade	ML	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	See Canada's comment for arsenic in salt.
<b>Tin, total</b>						
Tin, total	Cooked cured chopped meat	ML	1981	CoP (CXC 60-2005)	List A.1 (priority 1) List B (priority 2) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Possible efficiencies with other work: i) CoP for tin in canned foods packaged in tinfoil 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 tinfoil containers will be in List A.2 in 2023 . (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
	Cooked cured ham	ML	1981			
	Cooked cured pork shoulder	ML	1981			
	Corned beef	ML	1981			
	Luncheon meat	ML	1981			
<b>A.2 Established or reviewed ≥15 and &lt;25 years ago (between 1998 and 2007)</b>						
<b>Aflatoxins, total</b>						
Aflatoxins, total	Peanuts intended for further processing	ML	1999	CoP (CXC 59-2005)	List A.2 (priority 2) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and should be ALARA in foods. Possible efficiencies with other work: i) CoP for aflatoxins in peanuts (CXC 55-2004) in List A.2 (Priority 2); ii) CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
<b>Aflatoxin M1</b>						
Aflatoxin M1	Milks	ML	2001	CoP (CXC 45-1997)	List A.2 (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. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)

Contaminant	Food(s) <sup>a</sup>	Type of standard <sup>b</sup>	Year established <sup>c</sup>	Corresponding standard <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Cadmium</b>						
Cadmium	Cereal grains	ML	2001	n/a	List A.2 (priority 2)	JECFA91 2021 HRA only identified potential health concerns in certain Chinese age groups. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
	Legume vegetables	ML	2001			
	Pulses	ML	2001			
	Brassica vegetables	ML	2005			
	Bulb vegetables	ML	2005			
	Fruiting vegetables	ML	2005			
	Leafy vegetables	ML	2005			
	Root and tuber vegetables	ML	2005			
	Stalk and stem vegetables	ML	2005			
	Wheat	ML	2005			
	Cephalopods	ML	2006			
	Marine bivalve molluscs	ML	2006			
	Rice, polished	ML	2006			
<b>Patulin</b>						
Patulin	Apple juice	ML	2003	CoP (CXC 50-2003)	List A.2 (priority 2)	Dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995). CCCF01 removed it from the JECFA priority list in 2007 as an ML was established and no longer considered as a high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127) (CCCF01, 2007) Possible efficiencies with other work: i) CoP for patulin in apple juice (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
Patulin	Apple juice and apple Juice ingredients in other beverages (CXC 50-2003)	CoP	2003	ML	List A.2 (priority 2)	See Canada's comment for Patulin ML for apple juice.

Contaminant	Food(s) <sup>a</sup>	Type of standard <sup>b</sup>	Year established <sup>c</sup>	Corresponding standard <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Contamination (general)</b>						
Contamination (general)	Concerning source directed measures to reduce contamination of foods with chemicals (CXC 49-2001)	CoP	2001	n/a	List A.2 (priority 2)	See Canada's comment for Aflatoxin ML in peanuts for further processing.
Tin, inorganic	Canned foods (CXC 60-2005)	CoP	2005	MLs	List A.2 (priority 2)	Possible efficiencies with other work: i) the two MLs for tin in foods and beverages packaged in tinfoil packaging will be in List A.2 in 2023; there are 5 MLs for tin meats not packaged in tinfoil cans in List A.1. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)

n/a – not applicable

a - Refer to GSCFF for specific exclusions and other details.

b - Standards referred to include: Maximum Level (ML); Guideline Level (GL); Code of Practice (CoP); relevant Codex commodity standards are not included.

c - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), its description is edited for clarity, etc.

**List B: Codex Contaminant Standards Recommended for Re-Evaluation** (the standards within the lists are not presented in order of priority)

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Lead</b>							
Lead	Milk	ML	2001 (reviewed in 2013)	Not specified	<p>“The Committee agreed to retain the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg (milks) and 0.2 mg/kg (cereals).”</p> <p>“The Committee noted that the ML for milk might be reviewed in future when new data became available and might be revised in light of the review of the MLs for secondary milk products. The Committee also noted that if different MLs would be considered for cereal grains in future, stricter MLs could be applied to certain cereal grains in light of available data.”</p> <p>(REP13/CF07, paras. 28-29)</p>	New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	
	Cereal grains	ML	2001 (reviewed in 2013)	Not specified		New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	
	Table olives	ML	2016	Not specified	<p>“The Committee agreed to lower the ML from 1 mg/kg to 0.4 mg/kg; to re-evaluate table olives in future when more data became available, and to revoke the previous ML.”</p> <p>(REP16/CF10, para. 77)</p>		
	Jams, jellies, marmalades	ML	2017	Not specified	<p>“The Committee thus agreed to lower the ML to 0.4 mg/kg and to re-evaluate jams, jellies and marmalades in the future when more data became available.”</p> <p>(REP17/CF11, para. 61)</p>		
<b>Acetylated Deoxynivalenol Derivatives</b>							
Acetylated Deoxynivalenol Derivatives	Cereals & cereal-based products	ML	2015	Not specified	<p>“The Committee, [...], agreed that it was premature to continue with work on the extension of the MLs for DON in cereals and cereal products to its acetylated derivatives. The Committee encouraged members to continue collecting and submitting data on occurrence of acetylated DON to GEMS/Food and noted the need for development of an internationally validated method for analysis of acetylated DON.”</p> <p>“The Committee agreed that [...] when further information became available, it could be considered as part of the discussion on the MLs for DON in cereals and cereal-based products.” (REP14/CF08, paras. 61-62)</p>	New occurrence data available (priority 1) (European Union (EU), CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Fumonisin (B1 + B2)</b>							
Fumonisin (B1 + B2)	Maize flour & meal	ML	2014	2017	<p>“<u>Maize grain unprocessed</u>: 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/CF08, para. 64)</p> <p>“<u>Maize flour/meal</u>: 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> <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/CF08, paras. 67-69)</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.</p>	New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	



Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					<p>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/CF08, para. 71)</p> <p>“The Committee (JECFA) 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. In the current assessment, no information on fumonisin levels in maize was available from countries belonging to the African, Eastern Mediterranean or South-East Asia regions, where higher fumonisin concentrations are typically detected.” (JECFA/83/SC) (2016)</p> <p>“The Committee agreed to [...] call upon countries belonging to the African, Eastern Mediterranean or South-East Asia regions to provide to GEMS/Food contaminants database information on fumonisin levels in maize and to record this in the report of the meeting.” (REP17/CF11 para. 151)</p>		

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Arsenic</b>							
Inorganic Arsenic	Husked rice	ML	2016	2020	“The Committee agreed to advance the ML of 0.35 mg/kg for husked rice for adoption by CAC39 on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed three years after the implementation of the CoP for the prevention and reduction of arsenic in rice (CXC 77-2017), and would take into account all available data to clearly lower the ML of 0.35 mg/kg.” (REP16/CF10, para. 44)	New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Arsenic	Rice	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	2017	2019	“A delegation stated that they did not have any objections to the adoption of the CoP. However, as the results of several ongoing studies would be available in 2019, the additional information gained from these studies might need to be added to this CoP in order to make it more understandable and more practical. Thus, the delegation noted that there would be a need to revise the CoP in 2019 when the outcome from ongoing studies became available.”(REP17/CF11, para. 102)	New information on prevention measures of arsenic contamination in rice (priority 2) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Methylmercury</b>							
Methylmercury	Tuna	ML	2018	2021	“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/CF12, para 72) “ <u>ML for tuna</u> : 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/CF12, para. 74)	New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					<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/CF12, 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/CAC41, para. 34).</p> <p>“The EU 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 GL of 1 mg/kg. [...] 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, para 34).</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/CAC41, 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/CAC41, 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/CAC41, para. 39)</p>		

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					Note that Senegal didn't express reservation for the tuna ML, but for other species.		
<b>Aflatoxin M1</b>							
Aflatoxin M1	Milks	ML	2001	Not specified	<p>“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 MLs of aflatoxin M1 of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg were very small. Bolivia stated that if the lower level would be fixed, it would create unjustified barriers to trade without affecting the risks to consumers' health.”</p> <p>“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 ML 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 Cyprus, Estonia, Ghana, Hungary, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Swaziland and Switzerland expressed their reservations on this decision. Consumers International also expressed the concern of that organization at the decision taken.”</p> <p>(ALINORM 01/41, paras. 127-129) (CAC24, 2001)</p>	List B (priority 2) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	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. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
<b>Patulin</b>							
Patulin	Apple juice Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration	ML	2003	2007	“The Commission noted that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had discussed the development of the proposed ML 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 CoP 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 ML once the CoP had been implemented (after four years).” (ALINORM 03/41, para. 43) (CAC26, 2003)	List B (priority 2) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995) removed from JECFA priority list in 2007 as ML was established and not high priority. (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127) (CCCF01, 2007) Possible efficiencies with other work: i) CoP for patulin in apple juice (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2 (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)
<b>Tin, total</b>							
Tin, total *ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers	Cooked cured chopped meat*	ML	1981	Not specified	“[...] However, the 23 <sup>rd</sup> 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) (CAC19, 1991)	List B (priority 2) (revised) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	
	Cooked cured ham*						
	Cooked cured pork shoulder*						
	Corned beef*						

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
	Luncheon meat*				<p>“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.”</p> <p>(ALINORM 91/40, paras. 322, 324, 326, 328, 330) (CAC19, 1991)</p>		
<b>Aflatoxins, total</b>							
Aflatoxins, total	Maize grain, destined for further processing	ML	2022 (pending approval by CAC45, 2022)	2027 (CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)	<p>“Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 116)</p> <p>“The Chair, noting the diverse views, proposed to consider an ML of 15 µg/kg as a compromise and noted that CCCF could review the ML within 5 years’ time to see if it could be adjusted. She further noted that Members should continue to implement the CoP for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXG 51 – 2003) and to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food for the later review of the ML. The other option was to discontinue work on this ML.”</p> <p>“The JECFA Secretariat urged delegates to take into consideration that most health benefit would be achieved already by setting an ML of 20 µg/kg. While a comparatively lower ML of 15 or 10 µg/kg, respectively, would realize further incremental gains in its protective value for public health, the magnitude of those increments was considerably lower than and paled in comparison to the public health benefits that is realized by setting the ML at the higher end of the proposed values, compared to setting no ML [...]”</p> <p>“The Representative of WHO expressed the view that while WHO would like to see an ML as low as possible for a potent genotoxic carcinogen such as aflatoxin he also noted the differences in views of which ML to establish.</p>		

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					Therefore, in order to best protect public health under these circumstances, WHO informed CCCF that from a WHO perspective an ML for aflatoxins was better than no ML." (REP22/CF15, paras. 121-123) "CCCF [...] noted the reservations of Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda for the reasons expressed in paragraph 124." (REP22/CF15, paras. 129-133) (see REP22/CF15 paras. 116-128 for the full discussion and member country comments)		
	Flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize				"Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML." (REP22/CF15, para. 116) "Those not in favor of the ML, reiterated their views that MLs should be set as low as reasonably achievable. It was further noted that there was a large year-to-year variation in all regions of the world. Proposals were made for lower MLs of 2.5 µg/kg or 4 to 5 µg/kg. It was noted that an ML of 2.5 µg/kg, for example, would result in a significant reduction for human exposure to aflatoxins, with an acceptable rejection rate of 4%." "The Chair reiterated that data could be reviewed again within 5 years' time similar for the maize grain, to see if the ML could be adjusted and that Members were encouraged to continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food." (REP22/CF15, paras. 131-132) "CCCF [...] noted the reservations of Egypt, EU and Kazakhstan for the reasons expressed in paragraph 131." (REP22/CF15, para. 133)		
	Husked rice				"Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML." (REP22/CF15, para. 134) "Those in favor of the ML noted that it was already a compromise proposal and lower than the 25 µg/kg initially proposed by the EWG, with an appropriate rejection rate of 2.7%."		

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					<p>“Those not in favor of the ML, expressed the view that: The ML should be set as low as reasonably achievable; high consumption of husked rice in their countries, particularly because of its promotion as part of a healthier diet coupled with such a high ML may pose a greater risk to their consumers; lower MLs were already implemented at country or regional level; it was difficult to distinguish rice destined for further processing from rice for direct consumption.”</p> <p>“The Chair reminded CCCF that the ML under consideration was already a lower ML than the originally proposed ML of 25 µg/kg and that the ML could be reviewed in 5 years’ time and that Members were encouraged to continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 135-136, 138)</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noting the reservations of Egypt, EU, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Singapore and Sudan for the reasons expressed in paragraph 136.” (REP22/CF15, para. 139)</p>		
	Sorghum grain, destined for further processing				<p>“CCCF supported the ML, while noting that the data used to derive the ML was mainly from one country and ideally, MLs should be based on more representative data. A proposal was made to set the ML at 15 µg/kg at this time and that the ML should be reviewed in 5 years’ time with more data from different regions, especially those with high consumption of sorghum.” (REP22/CF15, para. 141)</p>		
	Cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs)				<p>“Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 143)</p> <p>“Those opposed to the ML, expressed the views that: ML for aflatoxin should be set as low as reasonably achievable, in particular for foods destined for infants and young children; [...] these foods played an important role in the complementary feeding period for infants and other than milk, exclusive feeding of the products, made infants even more vulnerable to the dietary risk of contaminated cereals; a lower ML was achievable by sourcing cleaner ingredients.”</p>		



Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Year of recommended re-Evaluation	Rationale for recommended re-Evaluation	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or rationale
					<p>“Those in favor of the ML expressed the following views: while they could not support the initial EWG proposal of 10 µg/kg, the current proposal was more acceptable and that it was better to have at least an ML rather than none; by already lowering the ML from 10 µg/kg to 5 µg/kg, there would be a significant protection of the health of infants and young children and could be reasonably achieved; the ML could be reviewed at a later stage to see if it could be adjusted.” (REP22/CF15, para. 144-145)</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noting the reservations of the Egypt, EU, Iran, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Singapore, Uganda and the United Kingdom for the reasons expressed in paragraph 144.” (REP22/CF15, para. 150)</p> <p><i>(see REP22/CF15 paras. 143-150 for the full discussion and food aid program comments)</i></p>		
	Cereal-based foods for older infants and young children for food aid programs				<p>(See above for Cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs)).</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noting the reservations of the Egypt and EU consistent with their reservations on cereals-based foods for infants and young children.” (REP22/CF15, para. 150)</p>		

a - ML: Maximum Level; GL: Guideline Level; CoP: Code of Practice; b - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A ‘review’ involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.; c - Prioritization criteria most recently agreed to for the prioritization of existing Codex standards for possible review.

## ANNEX II

## Overall Highest Priority List for Re-Evaluation of Codex Standards and Related Texts for Contaminants in Food and Feed

(the standards within the lists are not presented in order of priority)

(Last Updated 23-June-2022)

(For revision based on comments provided on Lists A and B in Annex I)

*Note: This priority list is solely for the purpose of the prioritizing standards and related texts for re-evaluation based on established prioritization criteria and does not reflect the validity of existing standards or related texts*

*Codex Secretariat Note: Codex members are expected to provide their overall highest priority list for re-evaluation of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in the format provided below based on comments submitted to Annex I in accordance with the prioritization criteria provided in Annex III*

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
<b>Acetylated Deoxynivalenol Derivatives</b>								
Acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives	Cereals & cereal-based products	ML (ML not extended AcDON)	2015	CoP (CXC 51-2003)	List B (priority 2) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)		EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Acrylonitrile</b>								
Acrylonitrile	Food	GL (0.02 mg/kg)	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	Raw materials in manufacture of plastic packaging which is commonly used in Kenya for water piping, primary packaging of most foods and drinking water. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Appear to be well managed and not detected in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
<b>Aflatoxin M1</b>								
Aflatoxin M1	Milks	ML (0.5 µg/kg)	2001	CoP (CXC 45-1997)	List A.2 (priority 2) List B (priority 2) (revised) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Consider simultaneous update of the CoP for raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)" (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) 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. Under unsuitable storage conditions, the levels of aflatoxin may increase significantly. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) 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. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Aflatoxin B1</b>								
Aflatoxin B1	Raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)	CoP	1997	ML - Aflatoxin M1 in milks (List A.2 & List B)	List A.2 (priority 2)	See entry for Aflatoxin M1 ML in milks.	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
<b>Aflatoxins (total)</b>								
Aflatoxins (total)	Peanuts intended for further processing	ML (15 µg/kg)	1999	CoP (CXC 59-2005)	List A.2 (priority 2) (revised)	Aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and should be ALARA in foods. Possible efficiencies with other work: i) Cop for aflatoxins in peanuts (CXC 55-2004) in List A.2 (Priority 2); ii) CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Aflatoxins (total)</b>								
Aflatoxins (total)	Peanuts (CXC 55-2004)	CoP	2004	ML - Aflatoxins in peanuts intended for further processing (List A.2)	List A.2 (priority 2)	Peanuts are susceptible to <i>Aspergillus</i> spp and therefore are naturally prone to aflatoxin contamination. See Canada's comment for Aflatoxins in Peanuts for further processing ML.	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Arsenic</b>								
Arsenic	Edible fats and oils	ML (0.08 mg/kg)	<1980	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	ML appears to have been transferred from the commodity standards & not scientifically justified. 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 on JECFA priority list. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Arsenic	Husked Rice	ML (0.35 mg/kg)	2016 (recommended for review in 2020)	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	List B (priority 2) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	ML review should await the completion of the JECFA evaluation. (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
Arsenic	Rice	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	2017	MLs – Arsenic in polished and husked rice	List B (priority 2) New information on prevention measures (priority 2) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)		Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Arsenic	Salt	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) (revised)	Salt is widely consumed and traded. Possible efficiencies gained by assessing cadmium, mercury and arsenic in salt concurrently. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Cadmium</b>								
Cadmium	Salt	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	See Canada's entry for Arsenic in Salt ML.	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Cadmium	Legume Vegetables	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001		List A.2 (priority 2) New occurrence data, dietary exposure, HBGV, updated JECFA HRA available (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Consider first drafting a CoP for the mitigation of cadmium in crops, followed by a data collection on products and possible review of the MLs after the application the CoP. (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17)	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Cadmium	Pulses	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001					
Cadmium	Wheat	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2005					
Cadmium	Cephalopods	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006					
Cadmium	Marine bivalve molluscs	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006					
Cadmium	Rice, polished	ML (0.4 mg/kg)	2006					

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
<b>Contamination (general)</b>								
Contamination (general)	Concerning source directed measures to reduce Contamination of Foods with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)	CoP	2001	n/a	List A.2 (priority 2)		USA (CX/CF 22/15/17)	USA
<b>Fumonisin (B1 + B2)</b>								
Fumonisin (B1 + B2)	Maize flour & maize meal	ML (2000 µg/kg)	2014 (recommended for re-evaluation in 2017)	CoP (CXC 51-2003)	List B (priority 2) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Maize are susceptible to <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> and <i>Fusarium verticillioides</i> and therefore are naturally prone to fumonisin contamination. Maize flour and maize meal is a staple food in Kenya.	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Lead</b>								
Lead	Cereal grains	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2001 (reviewed In 2013)	n/a	List B (priority 2)		Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Mercury</b>								
Mercury	Salt	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) (revised)	See Canada's entry for Arsenic in Salt ML.	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Methylmercury</b>								
Methylmercury	Tuna	ML	2018 (recommended for re-evaluation in 2021)	n/a	List B (priority 2) New occurrence data available (priority 1)	Aligns with ongoing CCCF work to elaborate MLs for methylmercury in fish and developing a sampling plan. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) EU (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
					(EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)			
<b>Patulin</b>								
Patulin	Apple juice	ML (50 µg/kg)	2003	CoP (CXC 50-2003) (List A.2)	List A.2 (priority 2) List B (revised)	Either extension to apple products other than apple juice (no JECFA evaluation needed) or review of juice ML (JECFA evaluation may be required). (USA, CX/CF 22/15/17) Dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995) removed from JECFA priority list in 2007 as ML was established and not high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127) (CCCF01, 2007). Possible efficiencies with other work: i) Patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	USA (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Patulin	Apple juice and apple juice ingredients in other beverages (CXC 50-2003)	CoP	2003	ML – Patulin in apple juice	List A.2 (priority 2)	Apples are prone to infection by penicillium, aspergillus and byssosclamyces spp that may contaminate apple and apple products. Kenya imports a lot of apple products (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17). See Canada's comment for Patulin ML for apple juice.	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Tin</b>								
Tin, total	Cooked cured chopped meat	ML (50 mg/kg)	1981	CoP (CXC 60-2005)	List A.2 (priority 1) List B (priority 2) (revised)	Possible efficiencies with other work: i) CoP for tin in canned foods packaged in tinfoil 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 tinfoil containers will be in List A.2 in 2023. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
	Cooked cured ham							
	Cooked cured pork shoulder							
	Corned beef							
	Luncheon meat							

Contaminant	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value or CoP) <sup>a</sup>	Year established <sup>b</sup>	Corresponding standard (List) <sup>a</sup>	Prioritization criteria <sup>c</sup> cited	Other comments or information	Recommended by (document ref.)	Volunteer
Tin, inorganic	Canned Foods (CXC 60-2005)	CoP	2003	MLs	List A.2 (priority 2)	Possible efficiencies with other work: i) The two MLs for tin in foods and beverages packaged in tinfoil packaging will be in List A.2 in 2023; there are 5 MLs for tin meats not packaged in tinfoil cans in List A.1. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<b>Vinyl chloride</b>								
Vinyl chloride	Food	GL (0.01 mg/kg)	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1)	Raw materials in manufacture of plastic packaging which is commonly used in Kenya for water piping, primary packaging of most foods and drinking water. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Appear to be well managed and not detected in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

a - ML: Maximum Level; GL: Guideline Level; CoP: Code of Practice

b - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.

c - Prioritization criteria most recently agreed to for the prioritization of existing Codex standards for possible review.



**ANNEX III**

(For information to support comments on Lists A and B in Annex I)

**PRIORITIZATION OF CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS FOR CONTAMINANTS FOR RE-EVALUATION**

Criteria <sup>a</sup> for identifying standards and related texts for contaminants for review	Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern <sup>b</sup>	Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF <sup>d</sup> 1 – highest priority 2 – medium priority 3 – lowest priority
<b>Criteria for Maximum levels, Guideline Levels and Codes of Practice</b>		
<b>Established or Reviewed <math>\geq 15</math> and <math>&lt; 25</math> years ago<sup>c</sup></b>	Low to moderate	2
<b>Established or Reviewed <math>\geq 25</math> years ago<sup>c</sup></b>	Moderate to high	1
<b>Recommended for re-evaluation:</b> CCCF, CAC or a member country recommended the standard for re-evaluation within a certain period of time or at an unspecified future date.	Low to Moderate	2
<b>Staple food:</b> The food commodity that the standard applies to is a staple food.	Moderate to high	1
<b>Developing countries:</b> Standards relevant to the needs of developing countries.	Moderate to high	1
<b>New occurrence data are available:</b> Occurrence data identified by CCCF or its member countries and/or submitted to the GEMS/Food database are significantly different <sup>e</sup> across two or more regions or markets than those used to establish the existing ML or GL.	Moderate to high	1
<b>New dietary exposure data are available:</b> CCCF, JECFA, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF developed new dietary exposure estimates or revised existing estimates that are significantly different <sup>e</sup> than the previous estimates that were used to establish the existing ML or GL.	Moderate to high	1
<b>A new health-based guidance value (HBGV) is available:</b> Either JECFA, upon request by CCCF, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF developed a new HBGV, revised an existing HBGV that is significantly different <sup>e</sup> than the previous HBGV that was used to establish the existing ML or GL, or withdrew an existing HBGV.	Moderate to high	1
<b>A new or updated health risk assessment is available:</b> Either JECFA or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF published a health risk assessment and the conclusions are significantly different <sup>e</sup> than the previous evaluation.	Moderate to high	1
<b>Efficiencies with other work:</b> Standard review involving the same or similar commodity or the same contaminant is underway or commencing.	n/a	2
<b>Member country volunteer:</b> A Codex member country volunteers to take on the work to draft a discussion paper outlining any proposed changes to the Codex standard.	n/a	2

Criteria <sup>a</sup> for identifying standards and related texts for contaminants for review	Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern <sup>b</sup>	Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF <sup>d</sup> 1 – highest priority 2 – medium priority 3 – lowest priority
<b>Additional Criteria for Maximum Levels</b>		
<b>Codex commodity standards:</b> Significant <sup>e</sup> revisions have been made to the commodity standards for relevant foods or food groups for which MLs are established.	n/a	3
<b>Codex Classification of Food and Feed (CXM 4-1989):</b> Significant <sup>e</sup> revisions have been made to this document for relevant foods or food groups for which MLs are established.	n/a	3
<b>Trade disruptions:</b> An existing ML for a certain food and contaminant combination is responsible for disruptions in international trade.	n/a	2
<b>Additional Criteria for Codes of Practice</b>		
<b>Technological advances and developments:</b> Significant <sup>e</sup> new information is available on contamination sources or processes, and/or agricultural, production and manufacturing practices related to food or feed contaminant management and control.	n/a	2
<b>Expanded scope:</b> CoP could include other contaminants or toxins, or food or feed, with comparable contamination sources or processes, and/or agricultural, production and manufacturing practices.	n/a	3
<b>Comparable CoP updated:</b> Updates to a CoP for a similar food or feed and contaminant combination may be transferable to another CoP or make an existing CoP redundant.	n/a	3

n/a – not applicable

a - Certain criteria may overlap, particularly those relating to the various elements of a health risk assessment.

b - Potential safety concern would be determined once any new data and scientific information are assessed.

c - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.

d - Priority rankings are intended as a guide, not to generate a precise numeric ranking.

e - The significance would be determined on a case-by-case basis by CCCF.

**ANNEX IV****(For comments)****ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR THE REVISION OF STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS FOR CONTAMINANTS****I. Prioritization Criteria**

Based on the guidance provided in CL 2022/85-CF, paragraph 2(i, iii) please indicate any additional criteria, as appropriate/necessary, to those indicated in Annex III that should be included in the prioritization criteria and specify if they relate to:

- (i) General criteria or**
- (ii) Specific criteria related to**
  - a. ML**
  - b. CoP**
  - c. Other(s) (as appropriate)**

**II. Prioritization Process**

Based on the guidance provided in CL 2022/85-CF, paragraph 2(iii) please indicate any improvements, as appropriate/necessary, that could be made to the current prioritization process followed for the re-evaluation of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed (See CL 2022/85-CF, footnote 4, to download relevant documents to inform comments in this regard).