

CODEx ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

CF/18 INF/1

June 2025

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

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

Eighteenth Session

23-27 June 2025

Bangkok, Thailand

WORKING DOCUMENT FOR INFORMATION AND USE IN DISCUSSIONS RELATED TO CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN THE GSCTFF

(Prepared by Japan and The Netherlands)

Background

1. This document has been prepared by Japan and the Netherlands in accordance with the recommendation endorsed by CCFAC38¹ and on the basis of the document CX/CF 07/1/6 published for the first Session of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF1) held in 2007. It incorporates all the decisions made at CCCF17² and subsequently adopted by CAC47³.
2. As CCCF3 agreed to discontinue work on the food categorization system to be used for the purpose of the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF)⁴, the following changes are made in the list of MLs:
 - Where an ML was adopted at Step 8 or 5/8 by the Commission with the Codex Code for the commodity, the Codex Code was retained in the List; and
 - Where an ML was adopted at Step 8 or 5/8 by the Commission without the Codex Code for the commodity, the Codex Code was not included.

Some texts were added in the Explanatory Notes to indicate whether and where commodity descriptions are found.

3. In order to assist consideration of maximum levels in various steps, issues arising from previous Codex discussions of maximum levels for a contaminant/toxin and JECFA recommendations to CCCF are surrounded by broken lines while information on the nature and toxicity is surrounded by solid lines in the list.

The list of maximum levels for contaminants and toxins in foods is attached to this document (starting from page 2). Schedule I (renamed "Schedule" in 2014) is no longer included in this Information Document as agreed by CCCF8 but is available in the GSCTFF (CXS 193-1995)⁵.

4. At CCCF17, the development of an inventory list of previous JECFA evaluations or FAO/WHO expert consultations for which no or no complete follow-up had been undertaken was discussed. CCCF17 agreed to separate the inventory of the follow-up to JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations into recent and older evaluations. It was further agreed that the list of more recent evaluations would be included in the report of the Working Group on the priority list/follow-up to JECFA evaluations, and that the list of older evaluations would be included as an Annex to this working document, which is updated yearly.

¹ ALINORM 06/29/12, para. 116

² REP24/CF17

³ REP24/CAC47

⁴ ALINORM 09/31/41, para. 37

⁵ REP14/CF, Appendix VII

Working Document for Information and Use in Discussions on the GSCTFF

This working document presents contaminants and toxins that are or have been dealt with in the CCFAC and CCCF. It does not only encompass the contaminants and toxins for which Codex standards exist or are being developed, but also those for which further information is sought or about which a Codex decision has been taken.

The Working Document has the purpose of providing an overview of the situation regarding Codex decisions about this subject and guidance about further actions required. Therefore, also relevant information and references are added to the list.

The list of maximum levels / guideline levels is thus active, which needs regular update.

The situation regarding contaminants and toxins is very complex and many substances are or have been the subject of scientific research and discussion regarding their occurrence in foods and their significance for human and animal health. On a national level, there are many activities, sometimes implying legal measures which may affect international trade in foods and feeds. It is obviously important for CCCF to take note of the developments in this field and to consider the necessity of actions. In order to obtain an overview of the situation, CCCF shall develop and maintain a working document in which more comprehensive information regarding contaminants and toxins in foods is presented in a summary form.

The Working Document has two main parts, followed by an inventory annex at the end. **Part 1** containing maximum and guideline levels developed by CCFAC/CCCF and contaminant provisions included in commodity standards; and **Part 2** containing maximum levels developed for copper, iron and zinc which are regarded as quality factors as opposed to safety factors, The **annex** containing an inventory of earlier JECFA evaluations or FAO/WHO expert consultations for which no or no complete follow-up has been undertaken by CCCF. **Part 1** also contains those levels still at various steps of the Codex elaboration procedure for the facilitation of consideration of proposed maximum levels by CCCF.

INDEX OF CONTAMINANTS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

NAME	PART	Page
Acrylamide	1	208
Acrylonitrile	1	212
Aflatoxins, Total	1	79
Aflatoxin M ₁	1	134
Aluminium	1	6
Arsenic	1	8
Azaspiracid group	1	185
Benzene	1	211
Brevetoxin group	1	183
Cadmium	1	15
Chloropropanols	1	210
Ciguatoxins	1	185
Copper	2	247
Deoxynivalenol	1	136
Diacetoxyscirpenol	1	145
1,3-Dichloro-2-propanol (1,3-DCP)	1	212
Domoic acid group	1	181
Dioxins	1	218
Ergot alkaloids	1	150
Ethyl carbamate	1	221
Fumonisin (B ₁ +B ₂)	1	153
Furan	1	223
Glycidyl ester	1	224
Halogenated solvents	1	226
HT-2 toxin	1	172
Hydrocyanic acid	1	192
Iron	2	253

NAME	PART	Page
Lead	1	28
Melamine	1	228
Mercury	1	56
Methylmercury	1	57
3-Monochloropropane-1,2-diol (3-MCPD)	1	212
3-MCPD ester	1	216
Non-dioxin-like Polychlorinated biphenyls	1	233
Ochratoxin A	1	162
Okadaic acid group	1	179
Patulin	1	169
Perchlorate	1	230
Polybrominated diphenyl ethers	1	231
Polychlorinated biphenyls	1	233
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons	1	238
Pyrrolizidine alkaloids	1	197
Radionuclides	1	241
Saxitoxin group	1	177
Scopoletin	1	201
Sterigmatocystin	1	170
T-2 toxin	1	172
Tin	1	75
Tropane alkaloids	1	203
Vinyl chloride monomer	1	240
Zearalenone	1	176
Zinc	2	257

Background of the Working Document

The Working Document was established in its current form when the CCFAC36 agreed to integrate the Annotated List of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (Annex IV then to the Preamble of the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods [GSCTF], Part 1 and Part 2) into a separate document “Working document for information and use in discussions on the GSCTF”⁶. Annex IV had the purpose of providing an overview of the situation regarding Codex decisions about contaminants and toxins and guidance about further actions required. It was originally included in the GSCTF as an introduction text without the lists of contaminants and toxins⁷. All is now included in the Working Document.

It was agreed that the Working Document (ANNEX IV at the time) would:

contain information not only for contaminants and toxins for which Codex standards exist or are being developed, but also those for which further information is sought or about which a Codex decision has been taken, and that relevant information and references are added in order to give guidance about further actions required⁸;

- include references to validated methods of analysis as well as references to information on toxicological guidance, if available⁹;
- exclude references to revoked standards¹⁰; and
- include maximum levels for quality-related parameters such as copper, zinc, iron, etc. as a record of the complete range of contaminants in the Codex system¹¹.

The format of the Working Document is that of Schedule I. This results from the agreement of the CCFAC32 to create a new Schedule I to the GSCTF, for which a working document was created in its format, and under the name of Schedule I. It was noted that Schedule I would not be added to the GSCTF until the relevant levels were adopted by the Commission¹².

At the following Sessions of the Committee, it was agreed that this Schedule I:

- should include all current maximum and guideline levels for contaminants in food and those under elaboration by the Committee, as well as current maximum and guideline levels contained in Codex commodity standards, with an indication of their step status¹³;
- would contain two lists, i.e., List 1 with MLs for contaminants and toxins already adopted as final texts and List 2 with MLs for contaminants and toxins under discussion at different steps of the Codex procedure; and
- would be used as a working document during the Working Group and the plenary sessions¹⁴.

In this Schedule I as prepared for the CCFAC36, it was identified that List 2 was in fact ANNEX IV, and was renamed accordingly to distinguish it clearly from Schedule I, the list of adopted Standards¹⁵. The Committee endorsed the recommendation to include Schedule I (List 1) in the GSCTF. The Committee noted that ANNEX IV was useful in providing an overview of the situation regarding Codex decisions about contaminants and toxins, and to give guidance about further actions required by CCFAC. The Committee agreed with the recommendation that such information should be part of a working document to be updated yearly and presented at each session of the Committee, and requested the Netherlands and Japan to perform this task¹⁶.

During the work of the editorial amendments to GSCTFF, which was adopted at CAC37, CCCF8 agreed to delete (i) short information notes on the substance at the end of the provisions on contaminants in Schedule I, (ii) scientific references and (iii) operating characteristic curves (OC curves) in the sampling plans from Schedule I in the GSCTFF. The Committee agreed that all information that is deleted would be transferred to this Working Document (INF 1)¹⁷. Therefore, this document is keeping such information which is not included in the current GSCTFF.

⁶ ALINORM 04/27/12, para. 119

⁷ ALINORM 97/12, para. 68

⁸ ALINORM 04/27/12, para. 116 and Appendix XIII

⁹ ALINORM 95/12A, para. 99

¹⁰ ALINORM 04/27/12, para. 116

¹¹ ALINORM 04/27/12, para. 120

¹² ALINORM 01/12, para. 79

¹³ ALINORM 01/12, para. 118

¹⁴ ALINORM 03/12, para. 104

¹⁵ CX/FAC 04/36/16

¹⁶ ALINORM 04/27/12, paras. 117-119

¹⁷ REP14/CF, paras. 87-89

At CCCF17, the development of an inventory list of previous JECFA evaluations or FAO/WHO expert consultations for which no or no complete follow-up had been undertaken was discussed. CCCF17 agreed to separate the inventory of the follow-up to JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations into recent and older evaluations. It was further agreed that the list of more recent evaluations would be included in the report of the Working Group on the priority list/follow-up to JECFA evaluations, and that the list of older evaluations would be included as an Annex to this working document, which is updated yearly.

The current Working Document is the subsequent result.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Reference to JECFA:	References to the JECFA meeting in which the contaminant was evaluated and the year of that meeting.
Toxicological guidance value:	Toxicological advice about the tolerable intake level of the contaminant for humans, expressed in milligrams (mg) per kg body weight (bw). The year of recommendations and additional explanation are included.
Contaminant definition:	Definition of the contaminant in the form of which the ML or GL applies or which may or should be analyzed in commodities/products.
Synonyms:	Symbols, synonyms abbreviations, scientific descriptions and identification codes used to define the contaminant.
Related code of practice:	Name of any code(s) of practice related to the contaminant and its (their) reference number(s).
Commodity/product name:	The commodities or products, to which the ML or GL applies, other than the terms feed or food, are those that are intended for human consumption, unless otherwise specified. The ML or GL contained in Codex commodity standards apply to the commodities within the scope of the Codex commodity standard. Reference to the Codex Standard is provided and the definition of the commodity/product is the definition as provided in the Codex commodity standard. When the ML or GL applies only to the commodity within the scope of the Codex commodity standard then the reference is mentioned as "Relevant Codex commodity standard(s) is (are) ...". In case the reference to Codex commodity standards is provided as example for commodities to which the ML or GL applies then the reference is mentioned as "Relevant Codex Commodity standards include ..." For the other commodities or products not contained in Codex commodity standards the definition of the commodity or product is provided in the Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds (CXM 4-1989), unless otherwise specified. In case a ML or GL applies to a product group (e.g. legume vegetables), the ML or GL applies to all individual products belonging to the group as defined in CXM 4-1989. For any other commodities or products other than those described above, where necessary, the definition of the commodity/product is provided in "Notes/Remarks".
Step:	Step of the Codex Elaboration Procedure at which each maximum level is (at the time of the publication of this paper). See the Codex Procedural Manual. The term "Adopted" is used for an adopted MLs and Codex Standards.
Reference or adoption year:	Reference number of the Codex commodity standard in which the ML is established or the year of adoption of the ML following the recommendation of the CCFAC (up to 2006) and the CCCF (after 2007), or the year of adoption of the Codex commodity standard in which the ML is included following the endorsement of the CCFAC and CCCF.
Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the maximum level (ML) or guideline level (GL) applies:	The portion of the feed or food to which the ML or GL applies, is the portion defined in the Codex commodity standard or CXM 4 or defined at the establishment of the ML or GL, unless otherwise specified.

Definitions of some toxicological terms

PMTDI:	<i>(Provisional Maximum Tolerable Daily Intake).</i> The use of the term “provisional” expresses the tentative nature of the evaluation, in view of the paucity of reliable data on the consequences of human exposure at levels approaching those with which JECFA is concerned. The endpoint used for contaminants with no cumulative properties. Its value represents permissible human exposure as a result of the natural occurrence of the substance in food and in drinking-water. In the case of trace elements that are both essential nutrients and unavoidable constituents of food, a range is expressed, the lower value representing the level of essentiality and the upper value the PMTDI.
PTWI:	<i>(Provisional Tolerable Weekly Intake)</i> For contaminants that may accumulate within the body over a period of time, JECFA has used the PTWI and PTMI. On any particular day, consumption of food containing above-average levels of the contaminant may exceed the proportionate share of its weekly or monthly tolerable intake (TI). JECFA’s assessment takes into account such daily variations, its real concern being prolonged exposure to the contaminant, because of its ability to accumulate within the body over a period of time. An endpoint used for food contaminants such as heavy metals with cumulative properties. Its value represents permissible human weekly exposure to those contaminants unavoidably associated with the consumption of otherwise wholesome and nutritious foods.
PTMI:	<i>(Provisional Tolerable Monthly Intake)</i> An endpoint used for a food contaminant with cumulative properties that has a very long half-life in the human body. Its value represents permissible human monthly exposure to a contaminant unavoidably associated with otherwise wholesome and nutritious foods.
ADI:	<i>(Acceptable Daily Intake)</i> The estimate of the amount of a chemical in food or drinking-water, expressed on a body weight basis, that can be ingested daily over a lifetime without appreciable health risk to the consumer. It is derived on the basis of all the known facts at the time of the evaluation. The ADI is expressed in milligrams of the chemical per kilogram of body weight (a standard adult person weighs 60 kg). It is applied to food additives, residues of pesticides and residues of veterinary drugs in food.
ARfD	<i>(Acute Reference Dose)</i> The estimate of the amount of a substance in food or drinking-water, expressed on a body weight basis, that can be ingested in a period of 24 h or less without appreciable health risk to the consumer. It is derived on the basis of all the known facts at the time of evaluation. The ARfD is expressed in milligrams of the chemical per kilogram of body weight.
BMDL:	<i>(Benchmark Dose Lower Limit)</i> The lower one-sided confidence limit of the benchmark dose (BMD) for a predetermined level of response, called the benchmark response (BMR), such as a 5 or 10% incidence of an effect. It is determined by dose-response modeling of toxicological data.
MOE	<i>(Margin of Exposure)</i> The ratio between the BMDL and the estimated intake in humans. It can be used to prioritize different contaminants, providing that a consistent approach has been adopted. Its acceptability depends on its magnitude and is ultimately a risk management decision.

A full list of toxicological terms and explanations can be found in Environmental Health Criteria 240: Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food.

[Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food \(who.int\)](http://www.who.int/publications/i/item/principles-and-methods-for-the-risk-assessment-of-chemicals-in-food)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Aluminium**

Reference to JECFA: 67 (2006), 74 (2011)

Toxicological guidance value: PTWI 2 mg/kg bw (2011, for all aluminium compounds in food, including additives)

Synonyms: Al

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity/Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

The WHO Representative clarified that exposure through food contact utensils and containers had been considered during the evaluation by JECFA and that it was concluded that they were not main contributors for human exposure to aluminium (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 31).

JECFA67 (2006) established a PTWI for Al of 1 mg/kg bw for all aluminium compounds in food, including additives; previously established ADIs and PTWI for aluminium compounds were withdrawn. The Committee concluded that aluminium compounds have the potential to affect the reproductive system and developing nervous system at doses lower than those used in establishing the previous PTWI.

The evaluation of the PTWI was based on the combined evidence from several studies: the studies conducted with dietary administration of aluminium compounds were considered most appropriate. The lowest LOELs for Al of different studies in mice, rats and dogs were in the range of 50-75 mg/kg bw per day. An uncertainty factor of 100 was applied (to 50 mg/kg bw per day) to allow for inter- and intraspecies differences. An additional uncertainty factor of 3 was applied to cover deficiencies in the database (absence of NOELs in majority of studies and absence of long-term studies on relevant toxicological endpoints). Also, deficiencies are counterbalanced by the probable lower bioavailability of the less soluble aluminium compounds present in food. Because of the potential for bioaccumulation JECFA confirmed that the resulting health-based guidance value should be expressed as a PTWI.

The Committee noted that the PTWI is likely to be exceeded to a large extent by some population groups, particularly children, who regularly consume foods that include aluminium-containing additives. JECFA also noted that dietary exposure to Al is expected to be very high for infants fed on soya-based formula.

The Committee recommended: Further data on the bioavailability of different aluminium-containing food additives are required; There is a need for an appropriate study of developmental toxicity and a multigeneration study incorporating neurobehavioral end-points, to be conducted on a relevant aluminium compound(s); Studies to identify the forms of aluminium present in soya formulae, and their bioavailability, are needed before an evaluation of the potential risk for infants fed on soya formulae can be considered.

At JECFA74 (2011) evaluated aluminium-containing food additives (including new food additives potassium aluminium silicate and potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments). New data was submitted including studies of bioavailability and reproductive, developmental and neurobehavioral effects. The absorption of aluminium compounds is found to be generally in the region of 0.01-0.3% with soluble compounds appearing to be more bioavailable. It was not possible though to draw conclusions on quantitative differences in the overall toxicokinetics of different aluminium-containing food additives or between experimental animals and humans. Recent evidence did not show effects of aluminium on reproductive outcomes. The Committee concluded that there continues to be a lack of consistency regarding the reported neurodevelopmental effects in animals and most studies involved administration of aluminium compounds in drinking-water rather than in the diet.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Aluminium**

The Committee noted that a study, in which aluminium citrate was administered in drinking-water, provided a NOAEL of 30 mg/kg bw per day. Based on the higher solubility of aluminium citrate compared to many other aluminium compounds and the fact that it is likely to be more bioavailable from drinking-water than from food, The Committee concluded that the NOAEL of 30 mg/kg bw per day was an appropriate basis for establishing a PTWI for aluminium compounds. Because long-term studies on the relevant toxicological endpoints had become available since the 67th meeting, an additional uncertainty factor for deficiencies in the database was considered to be no longer necessary. A PTWI of 2 mg/kg bw was established by applying an uncertainty factor of 100 for interspecies and intraspecies differences.

The PTWI applies to all aluminium compounds in food, including food additives. The Committee noted that dietary exposure of children to aluminium-containing food additives, including high-level dietary exposure, can exceed the PTWI by up to 2-fold. For potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments at the maximum proposed use levels and using conservative estimates, JECFA noted that dietary exposure at the highest range of estimates is 200 times higher than the PTWI.

The Committee recommended: Provisions for food additives containing aluminium included in the GFSA should be compatible with the revised PTWI for aluminium compounds of 2 mg/kg bw as aluminium from all sources. Furthermore, there is a need for convincing data to demonstrate that Al is not bioavailable from potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments. Studies to identify the forms of Al present in soya-based formula and their bioavailability are still required.

Aluminium occurs in the environment in the form of silicates, oxides and hydroxides, combined with other elements, such as sodium and fluorine, and as complexes with organic matter. Aluminium is a major component of the earth's crust. It is released to the environment both by natural processes and from anthropogenic sources, whereby natural processes far outweigh the contribution of anthropogenic sources. Mobilization of aluminium through human actions is mostly indirect and occurs as a result of emission of acidifying substances to the atmosphere. Aluminium is highly concentrated in soil-derived dusts from natural processes, coal combustion, and activities as mining and agriculture. In addition, aluminium finds use in a wide variety of applications including structural materials in construction, automobiles and aircraft, packaging materials, various containers and kitchen utensils and pharmaceuticals (Environmental health criteria for aluminium; International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); 1997).

Non-occupational human exposure to aluminium is primarily through ingestion of food and water. Food being the principal contributor, as aluminium is naturally present in varying amounts in most foodstuffs consumed. The intake of aluminium can be increased greatly through the use of aluminium-containing pharmaceutical products (especially antacids) (Environmental health criteria for aluminium; International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); 1997).

Aluminium and its compounds appear to be poorly absorbed in humans; the mechanism of gastrointestinal absorption has not yet been fully elucidated. Variability results from the chemical properties of the element and the formation of various chemical species, which is dependent upon the pH, ionic strength, presence of competing elements and complexing agents within the gastrointestinal tract. The urine is the most important route of aluminium excretion. Aluminium has a long half-life (Environmental health criteria for aluminium; International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); 1997).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

Reference to JECFA: 5 (1960), 10 (1967), 27 (1983), 33 (1988), 72 (2010)

Toxicological guidance value: BMDL_{0.5}: 3.0 µg/kg bw per day (2.0-7.0 µg/kg bw per day based on the range of estimated total dietary exposure) (2010, for inorganic arsenic)

Contaminant definition: Arsenic: total (As-tot) when not otherwise mentioned; inorganic arsenic (As-in); or other specification

Synonyms: As

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)
Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Arsenic Contamination in Rice (CXC 77-2017)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Edible fats and oils	0.1	Adopted	CXS 19-1981 CXS 33-1981 CXS 210-1999 CXS 211-1999 2017	FO FO FO FO CF	Whole commodity	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 19-1981, CXS 33-1981, CXS 210-1999, CXS 211-1999 and CXS 329-2017. For fish oils covered by CXS 329-2017, the ML is for (As-in). Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for As-in in fish oils by analyzing total arsenic (As-tot) in fish oils. If the As-tot concentration is below the ML for As-in, no further testing is required, and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the As-tot concentration is above the ML for As-in, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the As-in concentration is above the ML.	Fish oils were included in 2017.
Fat spreads and blended spreads	0.1	Adopted	CXS 256-2007	FO		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 256-2007.	1)
Natural mineral waters	0.01	Adopted	CXS 108-1981, 2001	NMW FAC		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 108-1981. Calculated as total As in mg/l.	2), 3)
Rice, husked	0.35	Adopted	2016	CF	Whole commodity	The ML is for inorganic arsenic (As-in). Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for As-in in rice by analyzing total arsenic (As-tot) in rice. If the As-tot concentration is below or equal to the ML for As-in, no further testing is required ¹ . and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the As-tot concentration is above the ML for As-in, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the As-in concentration is above the ML. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 198-1995]	4), 5)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Rice, polished	0.2	Adopted	2014	CF	Whole commodity	The ML is for inorganic arsenic (As-in). Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for As-in in rice by analyzing total arsenic (As-tot) in rice. If the As-tot concentration is below or equal to the ML for As-in, no further testing is required, and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the As-tot concentration is above the ML for As-in, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the As-in concentration is above the ML. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 198-1995]	5)
Salt, food grade	0.5	Adopted	CXS 150-1985, (1987)	FAC		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 150-1985.	6)

- 1) The Standard for fat spreads and blended spreads contain the following wording for the mentioned contaminant MLs: “The products covered by the provisions of this Standard shall comply with MLs being established by CAC but in the meantime the following limits will apply”. (only applying to Pb and As)
- 2) CCFAC33 (2001) endorsed the levels of health-related substances in the Standard for Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981), noting that the CCNMW had brought them in conformity with the levels included in the WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality. (ALINORM 01/12A, para. 110) The health-related limit for arsenic was amended from 0.05 mg/l to 0.01 mg/l.
- 3) The Standard for Natural Mineral Waters contains the level in the Section 3.2 “Health-related limits for certain substances”. The CCCF2 (2008) temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4 (2010), CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 89-90)
- 4) CAC39 (2016) adopted the ML on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed three years after the implementation of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of arsenic contamination in rice taking into account all available data from all regions (REP16/CAC, para. 65).
- 5) CCCF12 (2018) agreed to similarly amend the note on screening for arsenic in rice with mercury in fish (REP18/CF, para. 84).
- 6) CAC16 (1985) adopted the Standard for food grade salt at Step 8, with the proviso that provisions on contaminants be include later into the Standard, when finalized by CCFAC. CAC17 (1987) adopted the levels of contaminants in food grade salt. (ALONORM 85/47, paras 220-223 and ALINORM 87/39, paras. 215-218)

A position document CX/FAC 99/22 on arsenic discussed in CCFAC31 (1999) noted that several countries have established MLs for arsenic in food commodities and some of these were stringent regarding seafoods, so trade problems might occur. The present range of Codex MLs for arsenic in some commodities do not cover all national MLs. The document

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

concluded however that in general there are no indications that specific Codex MLs for arsenic in food commodities would be necessary. Also, at present there is no sufficient basis to decide about the establishment of Codex MLs for arsenic, due to the uncertainties mentioned about the levels of naturally occurring arsenic species in foods, about their toxicity and about the availability of suitable analytical methods. It was acknowledged that at present especially the ML for arsenic in drinking water and in mineral water is relevant. The Committee agreed that a finalized position paper would form the basis for future work until such time as routine methodology became available to determine toxic arsenic compounds in food (ALINORM 99/12A, para. 137).

JECFA72 (2010) derived an inorganic arsenic BMDL for a 0.5% increased incidence of lung cancer (BMDL_{0.5}) by using a range of assumptions to estimate exposure from drinking-water and food, with differing concentrations of inorganic arsenic. The BMDL_{0.5} was computed to be 3.0 µg/kg bw per day (2–7 µg/kg bw per day based on the range of estimated total dietary exposure). The uncertainties in this BMDL relate to the assumptions regarding total exposure and to extrapolation of the BMDL_{0.5} to other populations due to the influence of nutritional status, such as low protein intake, and other lifestyle factors on the effects observed in the studied population. The Committee noted that the PTWI of 15 µg/kg bw (2.1 µg/kg bw per day) is in the region of the BMDL_{0.5} and therefore was no longer appropriate, and the Committee withdrew the previous PTWI.

Reported mean dietary exposure to inorganic arsenic in the United States of America (USA) and various European and Asian countries ranged from 0.1 to 3.0 µg/kg bw per day. The Committee noted that drinking-water was a major contributor to total inorganic arsenic dietary exposures and, depending on the concentration, can also be an important source of arsenic in food through food preparation and possibly irrigation of crops, particularly rice. For certain regions of the world where concentrations of inorganic arsenic in drinking-water are elevated (e.g. above the WHO guideline value of 10 µg/L), the Committee noted that there is a possibility that adverse effects could occur as a result of exposure to inorganic arsenic from water and food.

The Committee also noted that more accurate information on the inorganic arsenic content of foods as they are consumed is needed to improve assessments of dietary exposures of inorganic arsenic species. Analytical constraints to achieving this goal include the lack of validated methods for selective determination of inorganic arsenic species in food matrices and the lack of certified reference materials for inorganic arsenic in foods. The proportion of inorganic arsenic in some foods was found to vary widely, indicating that dietary exposures to inorganic arsenic should be based on actual data rather than using generalized conversion factors from total arsenic measurements.

CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to initiate new work on maximum levels for arsenic in rice subject to approval by CAC34 and also agreed to re-convene the EWG, led by China, would prepare a working paper considering MLs for arsenic in rice based on the considerations made at plenary for deliberation at the next session of the Committee.

CAC34 (2011) approved the new work (REP11/CAC, para.142).

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed that an EWG chaired by China and co-chaired by Japan would prepare a discussion paper on the possibility to develop a COP. In addition, China would prepare proposals for maximum levels for inorganic arsenic in rice (raw and processed) for consideration by CCCC8 based on additional data provided by that time to GEMS Food. The committee also agreed to retain at Step 4 the proposed draft maximum levels for inorganic or total arsenic in rice (raw) at 0.3 mg/kg and inorganic arsenic in rice (polished) at 0.2 mg/kg until the Committee resumed the consideration of this matter at its 8th Session based on the outcome of proposals to be prepared by China and to inform the Executive Committee accordingly (REP12/CF, paras. 63-65).

CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to re-establish the EWG led by China and co-chaired by Japan to further develop the discussion paper, and to look into management practices to determine which risk management measures were readily available to the extent that could provide the basis for the preliminary development of a COP and, if so, to attach a proposed draft COP for consideration by CCCC8 (REP13/CF, para. 107).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

CCCF7 also agreed that the above-mentioned EWG would also prepare a discussion paper on proposals for maximum levels for inorganic arsenic in rice and rice products for consideration at the 8th session. The Committee encouraged members to submit relevant data to the EWG, especially those from rice-producing countries, and data on indica rice, to reflect them into the discussion paper (REP13/CF, para. 110).

CCCF8 (2014) noted extensive support for an ML of 0.2 mg/kg of inorganic arsenic for polished rice and analysis for total arsenic as screening method. However, divergent views were expressed as to what the ML for husked rice should be in terms of protection of human health while not having a negative impact on international trade, in particular as rice was a major staple-food in Asian countries and the ML established may affect availability of rice. Possible levels discussed were 0.25 mg/kg, 0.3 mg/kg and the proposed ML of 0.4 mg/kg.

The Committee could not reach agreement on an ML for husked rice. However, in view of the relevance of this matter for many Codex members, the Committee encouraged countries, especially rice-producing countries to submit data to GEMS/Food. Data submitted could then be considered in the EWG in order to facilitate the discussion of this matter at CCCF9 before taking a final decision on the feasibility to establish an ML for this product. In view of this, the remaining recommendations on the development of a "polishing procedure" and the establishment of a worldwide "conversion factor" were not considered (REP14/CF, paras. 37, 42-43).

The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft ML of 0.2 mg/kg for inorganic arsenic in polished rice to Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) for adoption by CAC37 (REP14/CF, para. 46 and Appendix III).

The Committee agreed to return the proposed draft ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice to Step 2/3 for further elaboration in the EWG, circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next session of the Committee and further agreed to re-establish the EWG led by China and co-chaired by Japan to prepare a proposed draft ML for husked rice (REP14/CF, para. 45 and 47).

The Committee noted wide support for the development of a Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of arsenic contamination in rice as supportive for the implementation of the MLs. A proposal however was made that current available management practices for containing arsenic contamination in rice mainly relate to source directed measures and whether it would be more appropriate to revise the Code of practice for source directed measures (CXC 49-2001) to address measures to reduce arsenic contamination rather than proceeding with the development of a separate COP at this point in time. In this regard, it was noted that although most of the management measures readily available at present mainly refer to source directed measures, other management measures were also available and relevant and should be included in the COP (REP14/CF, para. 94).

The Committee agreed to initiate new work on a Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of arsenic contamination in Rice for approval by CAC37 (Appendix VIII). The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by Japan and co-chaired by China to develop the COP for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next session of the Committee (REP14/CF, paras. 95-96, Appendix VIII).

CAC37 adopted the proposed draft ML of 0.2 mg/kg for inorganic arsenic in polished rice at Step 5/8. Egypt and Sri Lanka expressed reservation about the ML (REP14/CAC, paras. 79-82, Appendix III).

CCCF9 (2015) noted general support for the establishment of an ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice and proceeded with the discussion of the possible levels. However controversial discussion was made on the proposed ML between 0.25, 0.3, 0.35 and 0.4 mg/kg. As a compromise solution, the Committee agreed on an ML for husked rice at 0.35 mg/kg and to send this proposal to the Commission for adoption at Step 5. EU, Japan and Norway expressed their reservation to this decision. The Committee agreed that the ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice should be accompanied by a note on analysis of total arsenic as a screening method. However, in view of the opinions expressed in relation to the need for more geographically representative data, the Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Japan and co-chaired by China, to further consider

Metals**Arsenic**

new/additional data provided by countries especially main rice-producing countries and countries where husked rice was a major staple food. The Committee should then consider the outcome of the analysis performed by the EWG based on the current and new/additional data to confirm or change the ML of 0.35 mg/kg at its next session. The Committee encouraged countries concerned to submit data to GEMS/Food so that the ML could be finalised at the next session of CCCF (REP15/CF, paras. 56-69).

The Committee agreed to return the COP for the prevention and reduction of arsenic contamination in rice to Step 2/3 for further development, comments and consideration by CCCF10. The Committee also agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by Japan and co-chaired by China to further develop the COP in light of comments submitted and decisions taken at this session (REP15/CF, paras. 73-74).

The Committee discussed the report of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for evaluation by JECFA and agreed to include inorganic arsenic for evaluation of non-cancer effects (neurodevelopmental, immunological and cardiovascular) (REP15/CF, para. 147).

CAC38 (2015) adopted the proposed draft ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice at Step 5 as proposed by the Committee and advanced the draft ML to Step 6 for comments.

CCCF10 (2016) discussed whether to retain the draft ML of 0.35 mg/kg. There was support for the draft ML of 0.35 mg/kg, but also support for the proposal for an ML of 0.25 mg/kg. Noting the lack of consensus, the Committee considered a proposal by the Chair to discontinue the work on the ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice. There was limited support to discontinue the work as views were expressed that an ML would assist in reducing exposure to inorganic arsenic and that there was a possibility that countries would apply the ML for polished rice to husked rice or that there would be different MLs applied by countries, which could impact negatively on the trade of husked rice. As a compromise, and noting the ongoing work on the COP for the prevention and reduction of arsenic in rice, the Chair proposed that the level of 0.35 mg/kg be accepted on the understanding that following the implementation of the COP (of which one of the aims is to assist in the meeting of the ML for polished rice and husked rice) the Committee would consider all available data with the intention to lower the ML.

As the result of the discussion, the Committee agreed to advance the ML of 0.35 mg/kg for husked rice for adoption at Step 8 by CAC39 on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed three years after the implementation of the COP for prevention and reduction of arsenic in rice, and would take into account all available data to clearly lower the ML of 0.35 mg/kg. The Committee noted the reservations of EU and Norway, and India. The Observer of Consumers International reiterated its concern with this decision. (REP16/CF, paras. 30-45)

CAC39 (2016) adopted the proposed ML of 0.35 mg/kg for inorganic arsenic in husked rice on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed three years after the implementation of the COP, as agreed by CCCF, and would take into account all available data from all regions. Reservations to this decision were expressed by Egypt, EU and Norway, India, Philippines and Sri Lanka. Consumers International and the National Health Federation expressed their strong concern on this decision (REP16/CAC, paras. 58-66).

The Committee discussed that the work on COP for the prevention and reduction of arsenic in rice either be postponed (pending the results of the studies being undertaken) or that work should continue on finalizing the COP (with the currently available information) on the understanding that the COP could be revised when information from such studies became available. There was general agreement on the need for work to continue on the COP, but varying views on how to proceed.

As the result, the Committee agreed to continue work on the finalisation of the COP through an EWG to be chaired by Japan and co-chaired by Spain, taking into account all decisions previously taken by the Committee, the adequacy of all current and new information submitted in response to the aforementioned CL as well as written comments submitted at this session, for consideration by the next Session of the Committee with the understanding that the COP could be reviewed in future when more information and data became available. (REP16/CF, paras. 91-100).

The Committee listed inorganic arsenic in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxins for evaluation by JECFA (REP 16/CF, appendix VI).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

CCCF11 (2017) noted the request of CCFO25 (2017) to establish ML for arsenic, in particular inorganic arsenic, and ML for lead in fish oil (REP17/FO, paras. 22, 23 and 28) and noted that in seafood, arsenic is mainly found in its less toxic organic form. Similarly, while oils derived from fish can contain elevated levels of total arsenic, the majority is in the form of arsenosugars and arsenolipids. The Committee therefore agreed that the ML for arsenic in fish oils can be the same as the current ML for arsenic in edible fats and oils. However, the Committee considered it appropriate to indicate the ML for fish oils to be specific to inorganic arsenic and to apply a note that total arsenic could be used for screening purposes (REP17/CF paras. 17 and 18 and Appendix II).

The Committee revised the COP based on the revised version and agreed on several amendments to improve the clarity and accuracy of the text. The Committee agreed that complementary information for further consideration of measures would be better placed in the report as a guide for the further development of the COP when new data and information on mitigation measures become available as follows:

The results of ongoing or planned research studies on the effectiveness of measures to prevent and reduce arsenic concentration in rice should be considered in future revisions to this COP. Research on the following topics may help in further developing this COP:

- Effects of soil amendments and fertilizers (e.g. silicates, phosphates and organic materials) on arsenic concentrations in rice including considering the effects of applying different amounts of the materials or applying the materials with different timing and frequency (e.g. one-off or repeated use in each season);
- Indirect effects (e.g. change of yield, cadmium concentration in rice) of implementing measures to reduce arsenic concentrations in rice;
- Effects of varying the timing and duration of flooded/aerobic conditions during the rice growth period;
- Understanding factors affecting arsenic concentrations in rice, including from the arsenic concentrations in soil and/or other factors (e.g. iron, silicates, phosphates concentrations etc.) before cultivation; and
- Efficiency and cost of removing arsenic in soil using agricultural crops that absorb and accumulate arsenic from the soil or using chemical compounds that adsorb arsenic and are easily separated from the soil.

The Committee agreed to send the proposed draft COP to CAC40 for adoption at Step 5/8 (REP17/CF, paras. 100-103).

CAC40 (2017) adopted the proposed draft COP at Step 5/8 (REP17/CAC Appendix III).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed to similarly amend the note on screening for arsenic in rice with that of methylmercury in fish (REP 18/CF, para. 84).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the amendment to the note for the ML on inorganic arsenic in rice (REP 18/CAC, Appendix VIII).

CCCF13 (2019) revised the priority list based on comments provided by Codex members for accuracy. The Committee agreed to the prioritization exercise performed by the in-session WG, which identified ergot alkaloids, arsenic (inorganic and organic) and dioxin and dioxin-like PCBs as top priorities for future JECFA evaluations (REP 19/CF, para. 167-168, Appendix X).

CCCF14 (2021), CCCF15 (2022), CCCF16 (2023) and CCCF17(2024) agreed to endorse the priority list (REP 22/CF15, APPENDIX IX, REP 21/CF, APPENDIX VIII, REP23/CF, Appendix VII and REP24/CF17, Appendix X)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Arsenic**

Arsenic is a metalloid element which is normally occurring in mineral bound form in the earth's crust and which can become more easily available by natural sources such as volcanic activity and weathering of minerals, and by anthropogenic activity causing emissions in the environment, such as ore smelting, burning of coal and specific uses, such as arsenic-based wood preservatives, pesticides or veterinary or human medicinal drugs. As a result of naturally occurring metabolic processes in the biosphere arsenic occurs as a large number of organic or inorganic chemical forms in food (species). Especially in the marine environment arsenic is often found in high concentrations of organic forms, up to 50 mg/kg of arsenic on a wet weight basis in some seafood including seaweed, fish, shellfish and crustaceans. In fresh water and in the terrestrial environments arsenic is normally found in much lower levels (typically 0-20 µg/kg) in crop plants and in livestock. Higher levels may be found in rice, mushrooms and sometimes in poultry which is fed fish meal containing arsenic. Levels of arsenic in drinking water are of concern in many countries; levels exceeding 200 mg/l have been reported, which can adversely affect the health of consumers.

The most toxic forms of arsenic are the inorganic arsenic (III) and (V) compounds; the inorganic arsenic trioxide is well known as a rat poison, which was also sometimes used for homicide. Methylated forms of arsenic have a low acute toxicity; arsenobetaine which is the principal arsenic form in fish and crustaceans is considered non-toxic. In shellfish, molluscs and seaweed dimethylarsinylriboside derivatives occur ("arsenosugars"), the possible toxicity of which is not known in detail. Only a few percent of the total arsenic in fish is present in inorganic form, which is the only form about which a PTWI has been developed by JECFA.

The human epidemiological data used for this risk assessment is based on exposure to inorganic arsenic in drinking water. IARC has classified inorganic arsenic as a human carcinogen, and the estimated lifetime risk for arsenic-induced skin cancer which may be caused by drinking water at or in excess of the WHO guideline for arsenic in drinking water is estimated at 6×10^{-4} .

The analysis of total arsenic in food has up to date suffered from difficulties with respect to accuracy and precision. Furthermore, specified data for arsenic are strongly needed because of the large differences in toxicity to humans of the various forms of arsenic.

The intake of total arsenic in the human diet is usually dominated by organic arsenic derived from seafood. The available data about the possible human exposure to inorganic arsenic (often using the assumption that non-seafood commodities contain only inorganic arsenic) suggest that the PTWI will normally not be exceeded, unless there is a large contribution from drinking water. Further research is needed about the fate of organic arsenicals and the possibility that they might be converted to more toxic inorganic forms of arsenic, whether by processing or by metabolism in animals or humans.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

Reference to JECFA: 16 (1972), 33 (1988), 41 (1993), 55 (2000), 61 (2003), 64 (2005), 73 (2010), 77 (2013), 91(2021)
 Toxicological guidance value: PTMI 25 µg/kg bw (2010)
 Contaminant definition: Cadmium, total
 Synonyms: Cd
 Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)
 Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Cadmium Contamination in Cocoa Beans (CXC 81-2022)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Brassica vegetables	0.05	Adopted	2005	FAC	Head cabbages and kohlrabi: whole commodity as marketed, after removal of obviously decomposed or withered leaves. Cauliflower and broccoli: flower heads (immature inflorescence only). Brussels sprouts: "buttons" only.	The ML does not apply to Brassica leafy vegetables.	VB 0040
Bulb vegetables	0.05	Adopted	2005	FAC	Bulb/dry onions and garlic: whole commodity after removal of roots and adhering soil and whatever parchment skin is easily detached.	[Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 337-2020 and CXS 348-2022]	VA 0035
Fruiting vegetables	0.05	Adopted	2005	FAC	Whole commodity after removal of stems. Sweet corn and fresh corn: kernels plus cob without husk.	The ML does not apply to tomatoes and edible fungi. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS293-2008, CXS 303-2011, CXS 318-2014 and CXS 330-2018]	VC 0045 VO 0050
Leafy vegetables	0.2	Adopted	2005	FAC	Whole commodity as usually marketed, after removal of obviously decomposed or withered leaves.	The ML also applies to Brassica leafy vegetables.	VL 0053
Legume vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity as consumed. The succulent forms may be consumed as whole pods or as the shelled product.		VP 0060
Pulses	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	The ML does not apply to soya bean (dry). [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 171-1989]	VD 0070

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Root and tuber vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2005	FAC	Whole commodity after removing tops. Remove adhering soil (e.g. by rinsing in running water or by gentle brushing of the dry commodity). Potato: peeled potato.	The ML does not apply to celeriac. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 218-1999, CXS 224-2001, CXS 238-2003, CXS 339-2022 and CXS 340-2020]	VR 0075 VR 0589
Stalk and stem vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2005	FAC	Whole commodity as marketed after removal of obviously decomposed or withered leaves. Rhubarb: leaf stems only. Globe artichoke: flower head only. Celery and asparagus: remove adhering soil.	[Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 185-1993 and CXS 225-2001]	VS 0078
Cereal grains	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	The ML does not apply to buckwheat, cañihua, quinoa, wheat and rice. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 153-1985, CXS 169-1989, CXS 172-1989 and CXS 201-1995]	GC 0081
Rice, polished	0.4	Adopted	2006	FAC	Whole commodity	[Relevant Codex commodity standards is CXS 198-1995]	CM 1205
Wheat	0.2	Adopted	2005	FAC	Whole commodity	The ML applies to common wheat, durum wheat, spelt and emmer. [Relevant Codex commodity standards is CXS 199-1995]	GC 0654
Cephalopods	2	Adopted	2006	FAC	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to cuttlefishes, octopuses and squids without viscera.	IM 0152
Marine bivalve molluscs	2	Adopted	2006	FAC	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to clams, cockles and mussels but not to oysters and scallops. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 292-2008]	IM 0151
Natural mineral waters	0.003	Adopted	CXS 108-1981	NMW, CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 108-1981. The ML is expressed in mg/l.	1)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCC
Salt, food grade	0.5	Adopted	CXS 150-1985 (1987)	FAC		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 150-1985.	2)
Chocolate containing or declaring < 30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	0.3	adopted	2021	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution	Including milk chocolate, family milk chocolate, milk chocolate couverture, Gianduja milk chocolate, table chocolate, milk chocolate Vermicelli/milk chocolate flakes [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 87-1981]	
Chocolate containing or declaring ≥ 30% to < 50% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	0.7	adopted	2021	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution	Including sweet chocolate, Gianduja chocolate, semi – bitter table chocolate, Vermicelli chocolate / chocolate flakes, bitter table chocolate, couverture chocolate. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 87-1981]	
Chocolate containing or declaring ≥ 50% to < 70% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	0.8	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution	Including sweet chocolate, Gianduja chocolate, semi – bitter table chocolate, Vermicelli chocolate / chocolate flakes, and bitter table chocolate. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 87-1981]	
Chocolate containing or declaring ≥ 70% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	0.9	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution	Including sweet chocolate, Gianduja chocolate, semi – bitter table chocolate, Vermicelli chocolate / chocolate flakes, and bitter table chocolate. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 87-1981]	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) ready for consumption	2.0	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution	The ML applies to 100% cocoa powder. The ML applies also to cocoa powder when used as an ingredient in other foods. The ML does not apply to cocoa powder-based drink mixes that contain other ingredients, such as milk powder and sugar. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 105-1981]	
Quinoa	0.15	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole commodity	The relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 333-2019	

- 1) The Standard for Natural Mineral Waters contains the level in the Section 3.2 “Health-related limits for certain substances”. CCCF2 (2008) endorsed the section and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 27). CCCF5 (2011) decided that the Committee took no further action on the integration of the safety parameters in sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.16 into the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 90).
- 2) CAC16 (1985) adopted the Standard for food grade salt at Step 8, with the proviso that provisions on contaminants be include later into the Standard, when finalized by CCFAC. CAC17 (1987) adopted the levels of contaminants in food grade salt. (ALONORM 85/47, paras 220-223 and ALINORM 87/39, paras. 215-218)

MLs

At JECFA61 (2003) it was estimated that the total intake of cadmium ranged from 2.8 to 4.2 µg/kg bw per week. This was calculated from available data on concentrations and food consumption taken from the GEMS/Food regional diets and corresponds to approximately 40-60% of the current PTWI of 7 µg/kg bw/week. Regarding major dietary sources of cadmium, the following foods contributed 10% or more to PTWI in at least one of the GEMS/Food regions: rice, wheat, starchy roots/tubers, and molluscs. Vegetable (excluding leafy vegetables) contribute >5% to the PTWI in two regions.

CCFAC36 (2004) decided to discontinue the work on developing MLs for cadmium in fruits, meat of cattle, pigs, sheep and poultry; horse meat; herbs, fresh; fungi (edible); celeriac; soya beans (dry); and peanuts as no levels were necessary because these foods were no major contributors to cadmium intake (ALINORM 04/27/12, para. 176).

JECFA64 (2005) conducted intake and impact assessment requested by CCFAC36 for the seven commodity groups; rice, wheat, potatoes, stem and root vegetables, leafy vegetables, other vegetables and molluscs taking into account different MLs. The Committee concluded that the effect of different MLs on the overall intake of cadmium would be very small.

JECFA73 (2010) re-evaluated cadmium as there had been a number of new epidemiological studies that had reported cadmium-related biomarkers in urine following environmental exposure. Urinary β2-microglobulin level was chosen as the most suitable biomarker for cadmium toxicity because it was widely recognized as a marker for renal pathology and consequently had the largest number of available data. Because of the long half-life of cadmium in human kidneys (15 years), it was concluded that determination of a critical concentration of cadmium in the urine was most reliable using data from individuals of 50 years of age and older. Using the dose-response relationship of β2-

Metals**Cadmium**

microglobulin excretion in urine to cadmium excretion in urine for this population group, a critical concentration of 5.24 (confidence interval 4.94–5.57) µg of cadmium per gram creatinine was estimated. Using a one-compartment toxicokinetic model, a corresponding dietary cadmium exposure of 0.8 µg/kg body weight per day or 25 µg/kg body weight per month was estimated based on the lower bound of the 5th percentile dietary cadmium exposure (on a population level). Considering the exceptionally long half-life of cadmium and the fact that daily or weekly daily ingestion in food would have a small or even negligible effect on overall exposure, the Committee decided to express the tolerable intake as a monthly value in the form of a provisional tolerable monthly intake (PTMI). The Committee withdrew the PTWI of 7 µg/kg body weight and established a PTMI of 25 µg/kg body weight.

CCCCF5 (2011) agreed that no follow-up was necessary since the estimates of exposure to cadmium through the diet for all age groups, including consumers with high exposure and subgroups with special dietary habits (e.g. vegetarians), examined by JECFA72 were below this PTMI.

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to include the proposal of an exposure assessment of cadmium from cocoa and cocoa product in the priority list and noted that relevant data would be needed to undertake the assessment (REP12/CF, para 161).

JECFA77 (2013) conducted an assessment of exposure from cocoa and cocoa products at the request of CCCC6 (2012). The estimates of mean population dietary exposure to cadmium from products containing cocoa and its derivatives for the 17 new GEMS/Food Cluster Diets ranged from 0.005 to 0.39 µg/kg bw per month, which equated to 0.02–1.6% of the PTMI of 25 µg/kg bw. The potential dietary exposures to cadmium for high consumers of products containing cocoa and its derivatives in addition to cadmium derived from other foods were estimated to be 30–69% of the PTMI for adults and 96% of the PTMI for children 0.5–12 years of age. The Committee noted that this total cadmium dietary exposure for high consumers of cocoa and cocoa products was likely to be overestimated and did not consider it to be of concern.

CCCCF8 (2014) agreed to initiate new work on MLs for cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products for approval by CAC37. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by Ecuador, co-chaired by Ghana and Brazil to prepare proposals for MLs for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next session of the Committee, subject to approval by CAC. (REP14/CF, paras. 141-142, Appendix XI)

CAC37 (2014) approved the new work (REP14/CAC, para. 96, Appendix VI).

CCCCF9 (2015) agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Ecuador and co-chaired by Brazil and Ghana to reconsider the proposed draft MLs taking into account the comments submitted to this session. The Committee noted the EWG should clearly identify the products for which the MLs were being established and provide the rationale for the MLs. The Committee agreed to return the proposed draft MLs to Step 2/3 for further consideration by the EWG, circulation for comments and further consideration by the next session of CCCC (REP15/CF, paras. 52-55).

CCCCF10 (2016) agreed to establish an in-session WG chaired by Ecuador and co-chaired by Brazil and Ghana to discuss an agreement on the food categories to work on for the establishment of MLs for cadmium due to the difficulty to agree on the food categories to which the MLs should apply. The Committee considered the recommendations of the in-session WG and agreed on the recommended food categories on which MLs for cadmium would be set.

The Committee agreed to return the work on MLs for chocolate and cocoa-derived products to Step 2/3 for further elaboration, comments and consideration by CCCC11, and to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Ecuador and co-chaired by Brazil and Ghana to continue work on the development of MLs for cadmium in the intermediate products (i.e. cocoa liquor and cocoa powder) and finished products based on total cocoa solids content (%) (i.e. chocolate and cocoa powder ready for consumption) (REP16/CF, paras. 101-119).

CCCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish an in-session WG to propose recommendations for the categorization of chocolates and cocoa derived products and dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars. The Committee agreed:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

- to endorse the proposed categories for “chocolates” and for “cocoa powder and dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars”;
- to establish an EWG, chaired by Ecuador and co-chaired by Brazil and Ghana to prepare proposals for MLs for the identified categories for “chocolates” and “cocoa-powder and dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars” sold for final consumption;
- to discontinue work on intermediate products. Future new work could be proposed on these products in future;
- that the Codex Secretariat would issue a request for data through a CL;
- to revise the deadline for completion by two years to 2019 and to inform the CCEXEC accordingly (REP17, paras. 90-99 and Appendix XIII).

In the Committee, Peru introduced a new work on COP for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa and explained that the proposed COP aimed to guide Member States and the cocoa production industry in preventing and reducing cadmium contamination in cocoa beans during the production and processing phases. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by Peru to prepare a discussion paper and project document for discussion on the opportunity to develop such COP and the risk mitigation measures available to that would support the development of a COP (REP17/CF, paras. 154-155).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed:

- to advance the ML of 0.8 mg/kg for adoption at Step 5/8 by CAC41 for chocolate containing or declaring $\geq 50\%$ to $< 70\%$ total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis;
- to advance the ML of 0.9 mg/kg for adoption at Step 5/8 by CAC41 for chocolate containing or declaring $\geq 70\%$ total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis;
- to continue work on the category of chocolate and chocolate products containing or declaring (1) $< 30\%$ and (2) $\geq 30\%$ to $< 50\%$ total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis and to assess if it is feasible to merge these two categories to derive one ML for chocolate containing or declaring $< 50\%$ total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis;
- to discontinue work on dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars sold for final consumption; and
- to continue work on cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) taking into consideration MLs established for other product categories.

The CCCF further agreed to re-establish an EWG chaired by Ecuador, co-chaired by Brazil and Ghana reporting to CCCF13, to work on points above iii) and v) (REP18/CF, paras. 67-68).

The Committee noted the request from CAC40 that CCCF consider including quinoa in the MLs for lead and cadmium in cereals in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CX/CF 18/12/02, para. 7). The Committee agreed to discuss the MLs for lead and cadmium in quinoa at CCCF13 based on the paper from the Codex and JECFA Secretariats (REP 18/CF, para. 14).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the proposed MLs, noting the reservation expressed by Peru and that they applied to the final product (chocolate) as opposed to the raw material (cocoa beans) since the name of the product was “chocolate” and the relevant note stated that the MLs applied to the whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution (REP 18/CAC, para. 32).

CCCF13 (2019) considered MLs for remaining categories of chocolates and cocoa-derived products based on four scenarios prepared by the chair of the EWG. In response to a request for a new evaluation by JECFA as one alternative to the establishment of MLs, the JECFA Secretariat clarified that he was not aware of sufficient new data regarding the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

toxicological effects to warrant a new risk assessment for cadmium. The results of such an assessment was unlikely to help CCCF in its decision-making progress any more than the existing JECFA risk assessment had helped CCCF to come to a consensus to date.

There was general agreement to consider the MLs on a proportional basis to the existing MLs (adopted at CAC41) while recognizing the need for some flexibility in the proportionality between the MLs for the different chocolate categories to avoid very high rejection rates. When considering MLs for the category of chocolate containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis, there was general support for the proposed ML of 0.3 mg/kg recognizing that there was a good proportional distribution of geographic data with a relatively low rejection rate on a worldwide basis (3.2%) although it was noted that this would result in higher rejection rates of 12% in particularly the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The Committee agreed

- i. to advance the ML of 0.3 mg/kg for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis for adoption at Step 5/8 by CAC42 and noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Ecuador to this decision;
- ii. to re-establish the EWG chaired by Ecuador and co-chaired by Ghana to continue work on MLs for the categories for chocolate and chocolate products containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis; and cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) for consideration by CCCF14, using a proportional approach;
- iii. to encourage continued data submission for use by the EWG in view of the need for balance between proportionality and rejection rates;
- iv. to not revise the existing MLs for chocolates that contain or declare ≥50% to <70%, and ≥70% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis; and
- v. if no consensus were reached at CCCF14, the work would be discontinued until the COP for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa was finalized and implemented. (REP 19/CF, paras. 45-56)

CAC42 (2019) considered the proposed draft ML of 0.3 mg/kg for cadmium for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis for adoption at Step 5/8. The Commission held extensive discussions on the proposed ML. As there was no consensus on the final adoption, the proposed ML was adopted at Step 5 which would allow for further discussion at CCCF and noted the reservations of EU, Norway and Switzerland as, based on the EFSA opinion, only a stricter ML of 0.1 mg/kg can ensure sufficient protection of all consumers, in particular of children. The Commission agreed that discussion would be limited to the ML of 0.3 mg/kg for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis. The concept of proportionality as agreed by CCCF with respect to the adopted MLs by CAC41 should be maintained. If new additional information provided does not justify a change to the ML, CCCF14 will recommend the adoption of the ML of 0.3 mg/kg by CAC at its next session.

CAC42 confirmed that upon such recommendation by CCCF14, CAC43 shall adopt the ML without further discussion. Benin, the EU, Nigeria, Norway, and Switzerland expressed their reservations to this decision. (REP19/CAC, paras. 52-67)

JECFA91 (2021) reassessed cadmium exposure to include the contribution of all food sources, particularly cocoa products. In addition to the previous calls for data on cadmium for CCCF, the JECFA Secretariat issued a call for data on cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products in 2019. The submitted data included a wider geographical range of occurrence data for cadmium in cocoa products than considered at the 77 meeting of the Committee. The occurrence data also showed a higher mean concentration for cadmium in cocoa products than previously noted by the Committee. As a result, the JECFA Secretariat considered it appropriate to revise the dietary exposure assessment of cadmium to include not only chocolate and cocoa products but the contribution from all food sources. Consistent with previous evaluations, the Committee concluded that major contributors to dietary cadmium exposure were cereals and cereal products, vegetables and seafood. The mean dietary exposure to cadmium from the whole diet ranged

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

from 0.6 µg/kg bw per month (2.4% of the PTMI) for adults in the Sikasso region of Mali up to 24 µg/kg bw per month (96% of the PTMI) in children aged 4–11 years in China. These children from China also had the highest high percentile estimate of dietary cadmium of 48.2 µg/kg bw per month (190% of the PTMI). High percentile estimates of adult dietary cadmium exposure were only occasionally above the PTMI and were typically 20–60% of the PTMI. The contribution of cocoa products to dietary cadmium exposure was minor in comparison (0.1–9.4% for national studies and estimates based on GEMS/Food cluster diets), even in countries in which the consumption of cocoa products is relatively high. Application of both established and proposed MLs for chocolate and cocoa powder may result in substantial rejection rates (up to 30%) for products from some regions, but has only a minor impact (mean decrease across clusters of 0.7%, range 0.0–2.4%) on total dietary cadmium exposure.

CCCCF14 (2021) agreed to advance the ML of 0.3 mg/kg for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids to Step 8 for adoption by CAC44, noting the reservations of the EU, Norway and Egypt to this decision. (REP21/CF, para. 26 and Appendix II)

The committee agreed to advance the ML of 0.7 mg/kg for chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solids to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC44, noting the reservations of the EU, Switzerland, Norway and Egypt. (REP21/CF, para. 39 and Appendix II)

When considering rename the category of cocoa powder, there was little support to rename the category and a general agreement that it was appropriate to incorporate all GEMS/Food data for cocoa powder into the analysis irrespective of whether or not the declared percent of total cocoa solids was given, or whether or not they were intermediate or final products. (REP21/CF, para. 44)

Delegates noted that the decision on the ML could await implementation of the COP so as to assess its impact on cadmium levels, and to allow further generation and submission of data to GEMS/Food. And there was limited data from the African region for the analysis and derivation of the proposed MLs which also support generation and submission of data to GEMS/Food in order to increase better representativeness of data at the global level. (REP21/CF, para. 46)

An observer highlighted the non-fat component was the key component that could contain cadmium and this should be used for the proportional calculation. Chocolate would typically have about 45% non-fat solids, which is where the cadmium could be present, whereas in 100% cocoa powder, typically there would be about 90% non-fat solids. This tended to be twice the amount of non-fat solids in 100% cocoa powder compared to chocolate. Therefore, it was necessary to double a proposed ML derived using the proportionality approach for 100% cocoa powder. The proportional approach calculated in Scenario 2 did not take this into account, so if the proportional calculation were done appropriately, it would align with the GEMS/Food data scenario. (REP21/CF, para. 50)

The JECFA Secretariat, noting that members alleged several times the importance of an ML to protect the children, clarified that the JECFA exposure assessment/evaluation had not revealed that such a need existed on a global level. He noted the EU pointed out correctly that a subcategory of European children may face a more significant contribution from exposure to cadmium through cocoa products, and if the EU intended to protect that particular sub-segment of its children, it was their prerogative. However, at a global level, there was no health benefit (i.e. a reduction in dietary exposure to cadmium) gained from putting up an ML on any cocoa containing products. (REP21/CF, para. 51)

The committee agreed:

i) to postpone discussion on the MLs by one year to allow for more data submission and proposals for MLs;

ii) to re-establish the EWG chaired by Ecuador, and co-chaired by Ghana to:

a. continue working on the ML for cocoa powder containing or declaring 100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis ready for consumption taking into consideration submitted written comments and comments made at this session; and to present the analysis in more detail at the next session and

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

b. collaborate closely with the EWG on data analysis (see Agenda Item 17 of CCCF14).

iii) to request JECFA to issue a call for data specific to cocoa powder containing or declaring 100% total cocoa solids ready for consumption;

iv) to encourage Members to submit data and actively participate in the EWG and

v) that if no new data were submitted, the current data set would be used to derive the ML. (REP21/CF, para. 52)

CAC44 (2021) adopted:

- the ML for cadmium in chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solid on a dry matter basis at Step 8, noting the reservations of the EU, Egypt, Norway, Switzerland and Ukraine, for the reasons expressed at CCCF14 and reiterated in CX/ CAC21/44/4 Add.1;
- the ML for cadmium in chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solid on a dry matter basis at Step 5/8 noting the reservations of the EU, Egypt, Norway, Switzerland and Ukraine, for the reasons expressed at CCCF14 and reiterated in CX/ CAC21/44/4 Add.1; (REP21/CAC, para. 44)

At CCCF15 (2022), the Codex Secretariat informed CCCF that the template to present MLs for adoption by CAC and inclusion in the GSCTFF required information on the “portion of the commodity to which the ML applies” and that this information was missing for the MLs for cadmium for the two categories finalized at CCCF14 and adopted by CAC44 (REP22/CF, para. 42).

The Codex Secretariat noted that the same description that applied to the other categories of chocolates adopted by CAC42 (2019) would also apply and would be presented to CAC for adoption as an editorial amendment to the MLs for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis and chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis (REP22/CF, para. 43).

CCCF15 agreed to forward the editorial amendment to the MLs for the aforesaid categories of chocolates for adoption by CAC (REP22/CF, para. 58 and Appendix II).

CCCF15 considered the ML proposals ranging between 2.0 and 3.0 mg/kg for cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) ready for consumption and noted the following comments (REP22/CF, para. 47):

A member organization indicated that cocoa products were an important contributor to the exposure to cadmium in their region and that many of their consumers exceeded their TWI and that cocoa products are important contributors to the cadmium exposure. It was therefore important to establish a stricter ML of 0.60 mg/kg for cocoa powder to ensure a high level of health protection for all consumer groups especially the more vulnerable young consumers. The member organization further noted that the ALARA Principle should be applied on data, which were obtained from crops on which good practices were applied and highlighted the importance of finalizing the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa beans to enable the implementation of good practices, which would lead to the reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa beans and their products and thus assist in achieving levels that ensure a sufficient level of health protection, in particular of children, a vulnerable group of the population. As an alternative, the member organization could agree not to set an ML for this category, as cocoa powder was a commodity of less significance for international trade (REP22/CF, para. 48).

Diverse MLs were proposed by other members: 0.60 mg/kg, 1.3 mg/kg, 1.3-1.5 mg/kg, 2.0 mg/kg, 2.0-3.0 mg/kg and 3.0 mg/kg (REP22/CF, para. 49-53).

Two observers supported the proposed ML range of 2.0 - 3.0 mg/kg as provided in their written comments (CX/CF 22/15/5-Add.1) (REP22/CF, para. 54).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

The FAO JECFA Secretariat noted that as many delegations pointed out, JECFA had performed an evaluation of the exposure to cadmium from all foods. It had been demonstrated in the reports of JECFA that the exposure to chocolate or cocoa products in general was rather minimal compared to other dietary sources of cadmium. Hence lower MLs would have no appreciable or very limited appreciable health benefits. The health concern expressed by some delegations in relation to the dietary exposure of children to cadmium in cocoa powder was not supported on a global level by JECFA's scientific conclusion (REP22/CF, para. 55).

CCCF15 agreed to advance an ML of 2.0 mg/kg for cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) to CAC for adoption at Step 5/8 and reservations to this decision were expressed from EU, Cameroon, Egypt, and Uganda. (REP22/CF, para. 59 and Appendix II).

CAC45 (2022) adopted the ML for cadmium in cocoa powder (100% cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) at Steps 5/8, noted the reservations of the EU and Cameroon as had been expressed at CCCF15, and of Norway, Switzerland, and the Russian Federation for the same reasons as expressed by the EU (REP22/CAC, para. 65 iia).

CAC45 adopted the editorial amendment to the MLs for cadmium in chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis and chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to ≤50% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis (REP22/CAC, para. 65 iii).

Code of practice

CCCF12 (2018) noted the recommendation of the EWG to administer a survey to gather information on validated practices throughout the food chain for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa prior to starting new work on the development of a COP. To gather this information, the Committee agreed that a circle letter would be prepared for the survey and distributed by the Codex Secretariat. The JECFA Secretariat requested CCCF to pay a particular attention to mitigation measures that would be feasible even for small-scale farmers to apply since they were the ones affected most by this issue (REP18/CF, para.141 and 143).

The Committee agreed to re-establish an EWG chaired by Peru, co-chaired by Ghana and Ecuador to further elaborate the discussion paper to:

- i. determine whether mitigation measures available at present would support the development of the COP; and
- ii. identify the scope of the COP (e.g. whether the COP will cover the whole production chain or only primary production) based on the replies provided to the survey.

If the conditions under i) and ii) above are met, then the EWG should provide a project document and a first draft of a COP (REP18/CF, paras. 144-146).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to:

- i. submit the project document to CAC42 for approval as new work; and
- ii. establish an EWG, chaired by Peru and co-chaired by Ghana and Ecuador to prepare, subject to the approval of CAC42, a draft COP based on the document provided in Appendix II to CX/CF 19/13/12, for comments and consideration at CCCF14. (REP19/CF, para. 112, Appendix VIII)

CAC42 (2019) approved the new work. (REP19/CAC, Appendix V)

CCCF14 (2021) noted general support for the development of the COP but that further work needed to be done in the EWG to bring the COP for finalization at the next session of the Committee. (REP21/CF, para. 55)

The committee agreed to:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

i) advance the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Cadmium Contamination in Cocoa Beans for adoption at Step 5 by CAC44, on the understanding that the COP will be further revised by the EWG as per the general comments provided by CCCF and the specific written comments submitted to this session and

ii) re-establish the EWG, chaired by Peru and co-chaired by Ecuador and Ghana to work further on the COP taking into account the general comments provided by the Committee and the specific written comments submitted to this session. (REP21/CF, para. 59 and Appendix III)

CAC44 (2021) adopted the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa beans at Step 5 and endorsed the extension of the timeline for completion of the work to CCCF16. (REP21/CAC, para. 45)

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to forward the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa beans to CAC for adoption at Step 8, noting that all issues had been resolved (REP22/CF, para. 68 and Appendix III).

CAC45 (2022) adopted the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Cadmium Contamination in Cocoa Beans at Step 8 (REP22/CAC, para. 65i).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed that the United States of America would prepare a discussion paper to consider the development a CoP to prevent or reduce cadmium contamination in foods (REP23/CF, para. 139).

CCCF17 (2024) noted the general support for the development of a CoP for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in foods, and the following points (REP24/CF, para.132):

- There was enough information to start work on the CoP.
- Considering the various factors affecting cadmium levels in seafood, regional or national specific mitigation measures, such as consumer advice or regional standards, may also be considered and appropriate.
- The development of annexes that could contain commodity-specific recommendations would depend on the information provided to the EWG, i.e. whether they were detailed or specific enough to warrant commodity-specific annexes.
- If commodity specific annexes were developed, foods that contribute significantly to cadmium exposure such as rice, cereals and cereal products, vegetables, fish, and seafood should be prioritized.

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 133):

(i) start new work on a code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in foods,

(ii) forward the project document to CAC47 for approval (Appendix IX); and

(iii) establish an EWG chaired by the United States of America, working in English, to develop a code of practice for the prevention of reduction of cadmium contamination in foods for comments and consideration by CCCF18; and to determine the need for development of annexes with commodity specific recommendations.

CAC47 (2024) approved the new work of code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in foods (REP24/CAC, Appendix II).

Quinoa

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

CAC40 (2017) requested that CCCF consider including quinoa in the MLs for lead and cadmium in cereal in GSCTFF (REP17/CAC, para. 81).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed to discuss the MLs for lead and cadmium in quinoa at CCCF13 based on the paper from the Codex and JECFA Secretariats (REP18/CF, para. 14).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed that JECFA would issue a call for data on occurrence data for cadmium and lead in quinoa through GEMS/Food; and based on the information collected, the JECFA secretariat, with the assistance of the Codex Secretariat, would finalize the paper for consideration by CCCF14 (REP19/CF, para.103).

At CCCF14 (2021), noting the diverse views expressed on whether or not to establish MLs, and if MLs were to be established, whether to extend the MLs for cadmium and lead in cereals to quinoa in CXS193 or whether to have separate MLs for quinoa, the limited data available, the need to consider the different cultivars and growing conditions, and ongoing work on data generation, the Chair proposed to postpone the discussion on MLs for cadmium and lead in quinoa for 3 years to allow data generation and submission to GEMS/Food. CCCF supported this proposal.

The Committee agreed:

- i) to request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data on cadmium and lead in quinoa and quinoa-based products, including foods for infants and young children, in two-years' time;
- ii) that the call for data should include a request for data on occurrence of lead and cadmium, and in addition consumption data, and country of origin should be indicated in the remarks field in order to help assess the geographic representativity of the data and
- iii) the JECFA Secretariat would prepare an analysis of the new data and prepare a paper for consideration by CCCF17. (REP21/CF, para. 180)

At CCCF16 (2023), the Codex Secretariat recalled the decision taken at CCCF14 on cadmium and lead in quinoa (REP23/CF, para. 118).

CCCF16 agreed that a call for data should be issued taking into account the points raised at CCCF14 and comments made at this Session (REP23/CF, para. 119).

CCCF16 request the JECFA Secretariat (REP23/CF, para. 133vii):

(a) to issue a call for data on cadmium and lead in quinoa and quinoa-based products, including foods for infants and young children;

1) that the call for data should include a request for data on occurrence of lead and cadmium for the last 10 years, consumption data, and country of origin (if known) should be indicated in the remarks field in order to help assess the geographic representativity of the data;

2) data collected with methods with a LOQ of 0.4 mg/kg or below, would be helpful but not required, given the current MLs in CXS193 for lead and cadmium in grains of up to 0.4 mg/kg.

(b) to prepare an analysis of the new data and prepare a paper for consideration by CCCF17.

At CCCF17 (2024), the Representative of the WHO introduced the item on behalf of the Joint FAO/WHO JECFA Secretariats and recalled the request from CCCF16. He explained that a call for data had been issued, the data points obtained for lead and cadmium in quinoa through the GEMS/Food database, the analysis undertaken and conclusions that an ML of 0.1 or 0.2 mg/kg for cadmium and lead in quinoa would have little impact on dietary exposure to cadmium and lead, respectively. He recommended that CCCF consider the recommendations as proposed in the paper (REP24/CF, para. 115).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Cadmium**

CCCF17 agreed to forward the ML of 0.15 mg/kg for cadmium and of 0.2 mg/kg for lead in quinoa for adoption by CAC47 (Appendix VII) (REP24/CF, para. 119).

CAC47 adopted (Appendix II) ii the MLs for cadmium and lead in quinoa (REP24/CAC, para. 63).

Cadmium is a relatively rare element, released to the air, land, and water by human activities. In general, the two major sources of contamination are the production and utilization of cadmium and the disposal of wastes containing cadmium. Increases in soil cadmium content will result in an increase in the uptake of cadmium by plants; the pathway of human exposure from agricultural crops is thus susceptible to increases in soil cadmium. The cadmium uptake by plants from soil is greater at low soil pH. Edible free-living food organisms such as shellfish, crustaceans, and fungi are natural accumulators of cadmium. Similar to humans, there are increased levels of cadmium in the liver and kidney of horses and some feral terrestrial animals. Regular consumption of these items can result in increased exposure. Tobacco is an important source of cadmium uptake in smokers (Environmental health criteria for cadmium; International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); 1992)

Data from experimental animals and humans show that pulmonary absorption is higher than gastrointestinal absorption. The gastrointestinal absorption of cadmium is influenced by the type of diet and nutritional status. Cadmium absorbed from the lungs or the gastrointestinal tract mainly accumulates in the liver and kidneys. Although cadmium accumulates in the placenta, transfer to the fetus is low. Excretion is normally slow, and the biological half-time is very long (decades). The binding of intracellular cadmium to metallothionein in tissues protects against the toxicity of cadmium. Excretion occurs mainly via urine (Environmental health criteria for cadmium; IPCS; 1992)

The kidney is considered the critical target organ for the general population as well as for occupationally exposed populations. The accumulation of cadmium in the kidney leads to renal dysfunction. Chronic obstructive airway disease is associated with long-term high-level occupational exposure by inhalation (Environmental health criteria for cadmium; IPCS; 1992).

The IARC classified cadmium and cadmium compounds in group 1, carcinogenic to humans (1993).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Reference to JECFA:	10 (1966), 16 (1972), 22 (1978), 30 (1986), 41 (1993), 53 (1999), 73 (2010)
Toxicological guidance value:	- (PTWI withdrawn in 2010)
Contaminant definition:	Lead, total
Synonyms:	Pb
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead Contamination in Foods (CXC 56-2004) Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Cranberry	0.2	Adopted	2015	CF	Whole commodity after removal of caps and stems.	[Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 349-2022]	
Currants	0.2	Adopted	2015	CF	Fruit with stem.	[Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 349-2022]	
Elderberry	0.2	Adopted	2015	CF	Whole commodity after removal of caps and stems.	[Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 349-2022]	
Fruits	0.1	Adopted	2001, 2016	FAC, CF	Whole commodity. Berries and other small fruits: whole commodity after removal of caps and stems. Pome fruits: whole commodity after removal of stems. Stone fruits, dates and olives: whole commodity after removal of stems and stones, but the level calculated and expressed on the whole commodity without stem. Pineapple: whole commodity after removal of crown. Avocado, mangos and similar fruit with hard seeds: whole commodity after removal of stone but calculated on whole fruit.	The ML does not apply to cranberry, current and elderberry. [Relevant Codex standards are CXS 143-1981, CXS 183-1999, CXS 184-1993, CXS 186-1993, CXS 187-1993, CXS 196-1995, CXS 197-1995, CXS 204-1997, CXS 205-1997, CXS 213-1999, CXS 214-1999, CXS 215-1999, CXS 217-1999, CXS 219-1999, CXS 220-1999, CXS 226-2001, CXS 237-2003, CXS 245-2004, CXS 246-2005, CXS 255-2007, CXS 299-2010, CXS 310-2013, CXS 316-2014, CXS 317-2014 and CXS 338-2020]	4) CCCF10 included berries and other small fruits (except cranberry, currants, elderberry) in this category (REP16/CF, para 83 and 84)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Brassica vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2015	CF	Head cabbages and kohlrabi: whole commodity as marketed, after removal of obviously decomposed or withered leaves. Cauliflower and broccoli: flower heads (immature inflorescence only). Brussels sprouts: "buttons" only.	The ML does not apply to kale and leafy Brassica vegetables.	
Bulb vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Bulb/dry onions and garlic: whole commodity after removal of roots and adhering soil and whatever parchment skin is easily detached.	[Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 337-2020 and CXS 348-2022]	VA 0035
Fruiting vegetables	0.05	Adopted	2015	CF	Whole commodity after removal of stems. Sweet corn and fresh corn: kernels plus cob without husk.	The ML does not apply to fungi and mushrooms. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 216-1999, CXS 293-2008, CXS 303-2011, CXS 318-2014 and CXS 330-2018]	
Leafy vegetables	0.3	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity as usually marketed, after removal of obviously decomposed or withered leaves.	The ML applies to leafy Brassica vegetables but does not apply to spinach.	VL 0053
Legume vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2015	CF	Whole commodity as consumed. The succulent forms may be consumed as whole pods or as the shelled product.		

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Fresh farmed mushrooms (common mushrooms (<i>Agaricus bisporous</i>), shiitake mushrooms (<i>Lentinula edodes</i>), and oyster mushrooms (<i>Pleurotus ostereatus</i>))	0.3	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 38-1981.	
Pulses	0.1	Adopted	2017	CF	Whole commodity	[Relevant Codex standard is CXS 171-1989]	VD 0070
Root and tuber vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity after removing tops. Remove adhering soil (e.g. by rinsing in running water or by gentle brushing of the dry commodity). Potato: peeled potato.	[Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 218-1999, CXS 224-2001, CXS 238-2003, CXS 339-2022 and CXS 340-2020]	VR 0075
Canned fruits	0.1	Adopted	2015 2016	CF	The ML applies to the products as consumed.	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 242-2003, CXS 254-2007, CXS 78-1981, CXS 159-1987, CXS 42-1981, CXS 99-1981, CXS 60-1981, CXS 62-1981, CXS 319-2015.	5), 6)
Jams, jellies and marmalades	0.4	Adopted	2017	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 296-2009	
Mango chutney	0.4	Adopted	2018	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 160-1987.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Canned vegetables	0.1	Adopted	2015 2016 2018	CF	The ML applies to the products as consumed.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 297-2009	CCCF9 noted that the ML also applied to canned mixed vegetables. (REP15/CF, para. 42)
Preserved tomatoes	0.05	Adopted	2017	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 13-1981.	
Table olives	0.4	Adopted	2016	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 66-1981.	CCCF10 agreed to re-evaluate in future when more data became available (REPCF/16, para. 77).
Pickled cucumbers (cucumber pickles)	0.1	Adopted	2016	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 115-1981.	
Canned chestnuts and canned chestnuts puree	0.05	Adopted	2017	CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 145-1985.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Fruit juices	0.03	Adopted	2015 2016 2021	CF	Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration, ready to drink. The ML applies also to nectars, ready to drink.	The ML does not apply to juices exclusively from berries and other small fruit. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 247-2005. The ML also applies to fruit juices for infants and young children.	CCCF10 included passion fruit juice in this category (REP16/CF, para. 56). CCCF14 included fruit juices for infants and young children in this category (REP21/CF, paras 98 and 101, Appendix IV)
Fruit juices exclusively from berries and other small fruits	0.05	Adopted	2015 2018	CF	Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration, ready to drink. The ML applies also to nectars, ready to drink.	The ML does not apply to grape juice. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 247-2005.	CCCF12 added the exception note for grape juice (REP18/CF, Appendix II)
Grape juice	0.04	Adopted	2018 2021	CF	Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration, ready to drink. The ML applies also to nectars, ready to drink.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 247-2005. The ML also applies to fruit juices for infants and young children.	CCCF14 included fruit juices for infants and young children in this category (REP21/CF, paras 98 and 101, Appendix IV)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Cereal grains	0.2	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	The ML does not apply to buckwheat cañihua and quinoa. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 153-1985, CXS 169-1989, CXS 172-1989, CXS 198-1995, CXS 199-1995 and CXS 201-1995]	GC 0081
Infant formula, Formula for special medical purposes intended for infants and Follow-up formula	0.01	Adopted	2014	CF	Whole commodity	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 72-1981 and CXS 156-1987. The ML applies to formula as consumed.	
Fish	0.3	Adopted	2006	FAC	Whole commodity (in general after removing the digestive tract)		
Meat of cattle, pigs and sheep	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity (without bones)	The ML also applies to the fat from meat.	MM 0097
Meat and fat of poultry	0.1	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity (without bones)		PM 0110 PF 0111
Cattle, Edible offal of	0.2	Adopted	2019	CF	Whole commodity.	The ML applies to the following edible offal: Brain, head, heart, kidney, liver, tongue and stomach	MO 0812
Pig, Edible offal of	0.15	Adopted	2019	CF	Whole commodity.	The ML applies to the following edible offal: Blood, heart, kidney, liver and tongue	MO 0818
Poultry, Edible offal of	0.1	Adopted	2019	CF	Whole commodity.	The ML applies to the following edible offal: Heart, kidney, liver, stomach and thymus	PO 0111
Edible fats and oils	0.08	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution.	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 19-1981, CXS 33-1981, CXS 210-1999, CXS 211-1999 and CXS 329-2017.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Fat spreads and blended spreads	0.04	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 256-2007.	1)
Milk	0.02	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	Milk is the normal mammary secretion of milking animals obtained from one or more milking without either addition to it or extraction from it, intended for consumption as liquid milk or for further processing. A concentration factor applies to partially or wholly dehydrated milks.	ML 0106 The previous footnote "For dairy products, an appropriate concentration factor should apply" was changed by CAC26.
Secondary milk products	0.02	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	The ML applies to the food as consumed. [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 207-1999, CXS 208-1999, CXS 221-2001, CXS 243-2003, CXS 250-2006, CXS 251-2006, CXS 252-2006, CXS 253-2006, CXS 262-2006, CXS 263-1966, CXS 264-1966, CXS 265-1966, CXS 266-1966, CXS 267-1966, CXS 268-1966, CXS 269-1967, CXS 270-1968, CXS 271-1968, CXS 272-1968, CXS 273-1968, CXS 274-1968, CXS 275-1973, CXS 276-1973, CXS 277-1973 , CXS 278-1978, CXS 279-1971, CXS 280-1973, CXS 281-1971, CXS 282-1971, CXS 283-1978, CXS 284-1971, CXS 288-1976, CXS 289-1995, CXS 290-1995, CXS 331-2017]	
Natural mineral waters	0.01	Adopted	CS 108-1981	NMW, CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 108-1981. The ML is expressed in mg/l.	2)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Salt, food grade	1	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 150-1985. Excluding salt from marshes.	
Wine	0.1	Adopted	2019	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to wine made from grapes harvested after the date of adoption (CAC42, July 2019)	
Fortified or liqueur wines	0.15	Adopted	2019	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to wine made from grapes harvested after the date of adoption (CAC42, July 2019)	
White and refined sugar, corn and maple syrops, honey	0.1	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 212-1999 (white and refined sugar) and CXS 12-1981 (honey).	
Soft brown, raw and non- centrifuged sugars	0.15	Adopted	2023	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to soft brown sugar, raw sugar and non-centrifuged sugar. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS-212-1999.	
Candies, sugar- based	0.1	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to all sugar-based candies.	
Cereal-based foods for infants and young children	0.02	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 74-1981. The ML applies to all cereal-based foods intended for infants (up to 12 months) and young children (12 to 36 months).	
Ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children	0.02	Adopted	2023	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to all ready-to-eat meals intended for infants (up to 12 months) and young children (12 to 36 months). Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 73-1981.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Dried Culinary herbs	2.5	5	2024	CF	Whole commodity	MLs for fresh culinary herbs may be derived based on the moisture content of the fresh herb in relation to the dry herb.	CX/CF 24/17/5 CX/CF 25/18/5
Dried Culinary herbs	2.0	7		CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	MLs for fresh culinary herbs may be derived based on the moisture content of the fresh herb in relation to the dry herb. Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 328-2017, CXS 342-2021, CXS 345-2021.	CX/CF 25/18/5
Spices, dried bark	2.5	5	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed		CX/CF 24/17/5 CX/CF 25/18/5
Spices, dried bark	3.0	7		CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed		CX/CF 25/18/5
Spices, dried floral parts	2.5	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 344-2021.	
Spices, dried fruits and berries	0.6	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	The ML does not apply to dried Sichuan pepper, star anise, dried paprika and sumac.	
Spices, dried paprika and sumac	0.8	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 353-2022.	
Spices, dried Sichuan pepper and Star anise	3.0	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed		
Spices, dried rhizomes, and roots	2.0	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 343-2021.	
Spices, dried seeds	0.9	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed	The ML does not apply to dried celery seeds. Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 327-2017 and CXS 352-2022.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Spices, dried celery seeds	1.5	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed		
Spices, dried aril	0.9	Adopted	2024	CF	Whole, ground, powder, crushed		Spice included data analysis was Mace
Quinoa	0.2	Adopted	2024	CF		The relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 333-2019.	

- 1) The Standard for fat spreads and blended spreads contain the following wording for the mentioned contaminant MLs: "The products covered by the provisions of this Standard shall comply with MLs being established by CAC but in the meantime the following limits will apply." (only applying to Pb and As).
- 2) The Standard for Natural Mineral Waters contains the level in the Section 3.2 "Health-related limits for certain substances". CCCF2 (2008) temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4, CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 89-90).
- 3) The category of "Berries and other small fruits" is still retained in the current version of the GSCTFF (amended in 2018) though CCCF10 agreed to combine the category of fruits with the category of berries and other small fruits (MLs = 0.1 mg/kg) and make the necessary adjustments to the ML for fruits so that it accommodate berries and other small fruits.
- 4) CCCF9 noted that the ML also applied to canned mixed fruits (REP15/CF, para. 39).
- 5) Canned berries and other small fruits were included by CCCF10 (REP16/CF, para. 58).

CAC32 (2001) requested reevaluation of the lead MLs in milk and milk fat (ALINORM 01/41, para. 121); see also ALINORM 03/12 paras. 135-137. CCFAC35 (2004) discussed the issue of the necessity of an ML for milk, as milk was not a major contributor to the intake of lead. However, in view of opinions that milk is a major contributor to the exposure of infants and young children, the ML for milk was maintained. The Committee decided to inform CAC that the current level for lead in milk fat (0.1 mg/kg) should be revoked (no documentation of such a decision is found in the CAC 2003 report however). CCFAC35 (2005) agreed to retain the current ML for milk.

In the informal ad hoc Working Group on priorities for evaluation by JECFA held at CCCF3 (2009), the USA proposed including lead in the priority list of JECFA evaluation, since new epidemiological data indicated that effects were seen below the practical threshold of blood lead levels of 10 µg/dl. The request was made to particularly evaluate the dose- response effects of lead below this 'threshold'. Since there was data readily available and because of possible public health implications, the WG decided to include lead in the priority list for evaluation by JECFA with high priority. The Committee endorsed the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for JECFA evaluation as proposed by the Working Group. (ALINORM 09/32/41, para 120 and CRD 2)

Metals**Lead**

CCCF4 (2010) noted that CCPFV had elaborated several general standards for groups of canned fruits and vegetables thereby replacing individual standards for canned fruits and vegetable which were revoked by the Commission on adoption of the general standards. It was further noted that the scope of these general standards had also been expanded to include other commodities for which individual standards had not previously existed. These general standards contained the general statement on contaminants from the Procedural Manual. At the same time, several MLs for lead for canned fruits and vegetables from the revoked standards were listed in the GSCTFF. The Committee therefore considered whether the levels for lead applied to the more general standards with particular regard to whether these levels could also be extended to those commodities now included in these general standards for which levels had not previously been established. The Committee agreed to not take action until JECFA73 (2010) had completed its evaluation (ALINORM 10/33/41, paras. 18-22).

JECFA73 (2010) re-evaluated lead and concluded that the effects on neurodevelopment and systolic blood pressure provided the appropriate bases for dose–response analyses. Based on the dose–response analyses, the Committee estimated that the previously established PTWI of 25 µg/kg bw was associated with a decrease of at least 3 IQ points in children and an increase in systolic blood pressure of approximately 3 mmHg (0.4 kPa) in adults, which were considered important effects when viewed on a population level. The Committee therefore withdrew the PTWI as it could no longer be considered health protective. Because the dose–response analyses did not provide any indication of a threshold for the key effects of lead, the Committee concluded that it was not possible to establish a new PTWI that would be considered to be health protective.

The Committee concluded that the conducted dose–response Analyses should be used to identify the magnitude of effect associated with identified levels of dietary lead exposure in different populations. The mean dietary exposure estimates for children aged about 1–4 years ranged from 0.03 to 9 µg/kg bw per day and for adults from 0.02 to 3 µg/kg bw per day. The higher end of the exposure range for children was deemed by the Committee to be a concern, as it was higher than the level of 1.9 µg/kg bw per day calculated by the Committee to be associated with a population decrease of 3 IQ points. For adults, the higher end of the exposure range, a population increase of approximately 2 mmHg (0.3 kPa) in systolic blood pressure would be expected to occur. An increase of this magnitude had been associated, in a large meta-analysis, with modest increases in the risks of ischemic heart disease and cerebrovascular stroke. The Committee considered the expected effects in children of more concern than the effects in adults.

The Committee stressed that other (than dietary) sources of exposure to lead needed also to be considered. Also, The Committee concluded that, in populations with prolonged dietary exposures to lead that are at the higher end of the ranges identified above, measures should be taken to identify major contributing sources and foods and, if appropriate, to identify methods of reducing dietary exposure that are commensurate with the level of risk reduction.

CCCF5 (2011) agreed to establish an EWG, led by USA, to: (i) reconsider the existing MLs with a focus on foods important for infants and children and also on the canned fruits and vegetables and (ii) reconsider if other existing maximum levels should be addressed.

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to start new work on the revision of the MLs for lead in fruit juices, milk and secondary milk products, infant formula, canned fruits and vegetables, fruits and cereal grains (except buckwheat, cañihua and quinoa). It was noted that where possible follow-up formula could be taken into account during this work because the data that was used for infant formula could also apply to this product. The Committee also agreed to establish an EWG lead by the United States of America to revise the MLs for lead for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 7th session (REP12/CF, paras. 126-127 and Appendix VIII). CAC35 (2012) approved the new work (REP12/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed to retain the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg for milks and 0.2 mg/kg for cereals. 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 milk products and 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 (REP13/CF, paras. 28-29)., The Committee agreed to retain the ML of 0.05 mg/kg for juices

Metals**Lead**

and nectars from berries and other small fruits, ready-to-drink, and noted that in future, there might be a need for different MLs for fruit juices depending on the outcome of discussions on the ML for lead in fruit (REP13/CF, paras. 31-32).

The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft ML of 0.03 mg/kg for fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink (excluding juices from berries and other small fruits); the proposed draft ML of 0.1 mg/kg for canned fruits, including canned mixed fruits (excluding canned berry and other small fruits); and the proposed draft ML of 0.1 mg/kg for canned vegetables, including canned mixed vegetables (excluding canned brassica vegetables, canned leafy vegetables and canned legume vegetables) to CAC36 for adoption at Step 5/8. Following this decision, the Committee agreed to request the Commission to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standards for canned fruits (i.e. canned fruit cocktail, canned tropical fruit salad, canned grapefruit, canned mandarin oranges, canned mangoes, canned pineapples, canned raspberries and canned strawberries) and to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standards for canned vegetables (i.e. canned asparagus, canned carrots, canned green beans and canned wax beans, canned green peas, canned mature processed peas, canned mushrooms, canned palmito (palm hearts), canned sweet corn, canned tomatoes and table olives) (REP13/CF, para.41-43 and APPENDIX II).

The Committee agreed to continue with the review of MLs for lead in fruits, vegetables, milk products and infant formula, follow-up formula and formula for special medical purposes for infants. The Committee therefore agreed to re-establish the EWG led by the USA to continue with the review of the MLs for lead for the above-mentioned commodities in the GSCTFF (REP13/CF, para. 39-40).

CAC36 (2013) agreed to adopt the MLs at Step 5 with the understanding that countries that had intervened commit to submit data to GEMS/Food database within a year, to allow CCCF to further consider the revision of the MLs in 2015 for submission to CAC38. Following this decision, the Commission did not revoke MLs for the individual standards for canned fruits and vegetables (REP13/CAC, para. 79 and 102).

CCCF8 (2014) noted wide support for the retention of the current MLs in the GSCTFF for “assorted (sub)tropical fruits, edible peel”, “assorted(sub)tropical fruits, inedible peel”, “citrus fruits”, “pome fruits”, “stone fruits”, “bulb vegetables”, “leafy vegetables”, “root and tuber vegetables” and “secondary milk products” and therefore no further action needed to be taken in regard to these MLs. The Committee noted that retention of these MLs implied that the relevant accompanying explanatory notes should be retained (REP14/CF, para. 21).

The Committee noted that for the commodity group “berries and other small fruits” the proposed lower ML may be acceptable when applied to the occurrence data of this group as a whole. However, when the data are split into the individual species or varieties of berries and small fruits, the proposed reduction may be problematic for some berries such as cranberries, currants, elderberries and strawberry tree. Therefore, it was advisable to postpone the discussion of this ML until CCCF9 to allow interested countries to submit new or additional data to GEMS/Food for analysis on the understanding that if no data were made available, the Committee would accept the proposed lower ML for adoption at its 9th session. The Committee recalled that this approach was similar to the one taken on infant formula at its 7th Session (REP14/CF, para. 22).

The Committee agreed to request the EWG to also undertake the review of the data submitted on lead contamination in fruit juices and nectars, canned fruits and canned vegetables in reply to CL 2013/23-CF, with a view to facilitating their discussion and finalization at CCCF9. The Committee further agreed that the EWG would be led by the USA (REP14/CF, paras. 26-27).

The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft ML of 0.01 mg/kg for lead in infant formula and formula for special medical purposes intended for infants and follow up formula (as consumed) to Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) for adoption by CAC37. EU and Norway expressed their reservation to this decision.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

In taking this decision, the Committee further agreed to request the Commission to revoke the current ML of 0.02 mg/kg for lead in infant formula in the GSCTFF and to request the Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses to remove this ML from the section on contaminants in the Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CXS 72-1981) and instead to make reference to the GSCTFF(CXS 193-1995, REP14/CF, paras. 32-34. Appendix II).

CAC37 (2014) adopted the revised ML of 0.01 mg/kg for lead in Infant Formula and Formula for Special Medical Purposes and for Follow-Up Formula as proposed by CCCF8. The EU, Egypt, Malaysia and Norway expressed their reservation (REP14/CAC, para. 74, Appendix III). The Commission agreed to revoke the Maximum Level for Lead in Infant Formula in the GSCTFF (REP14/CAC, para. 94, Appendix V).

CCCF9 (2015) agreed to reduce the ML for lead in fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink from 0.05 to 0.03 mg/kg. The Committee also agreed to retain the ML of 0.05 mg/kg for juices and nectars from berries and other small fruit at 0.05 mg/kg, and agreed that exclusion for juices from berries and other small fruits should be limited to juices that were “exclusively” prepared from berries and other small fruits. The Committee also agreed to exclude passion fruit juice from the ML for fruit juices and nectars and wait until CCCF10 to make a final decision on this matter based on the recommendation of the EWG (REP15/CF, paras. 36-38).

The Committee agreed to reduce the ML for canned fruits (excluding berries and other small fruits) from 1 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg. The Committee noted that the ML also applied to canned mixed fruits. Following this decision, the Committee agreed to make consequential amendments to the MLs for lead in the GSCTFF by revocation of MLs of corresponding fruits. The Committee agreed to retain the MLs for canned raspberries and canned strawberries at 1 mg/kg for consideration at CCCF10 based on the recommendation of the EWG (REP15/CF, paras. 39-40).

The Committee agreed to reduce the ML for berries and other small fruits from 0.2 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg and to exclude certain types of berries i.e. cranberry, currant, elderberry and to retain the existing ML of 0.2 mg/kg for these fruits (REP15/CF, para. 41).

The Committee agreed to reduce the ML for canned vegetables (excluding canned brassica, leafy and legume vegetables) from 1 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg. The Committee noted that the ML also applied to canned mixed vegetables. The Committee agreed to make consequential amendments to the MLs for lead in the GSCTFF by revocation of MLs of corresponding vegetables and noted that MLs for canned brassica vegetables, canned leafy vegetables and canned legume vegetables would be considered by the EWG (REP15/CF, paras. 42- 44).

The Committee agreed with the following: (i) reduce the ML for brassica vegetables from 0.3 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg; (ii) reduce the ML for legume vegetables from 0.2 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg; (iii) reduce the ML for fruiting vegetables, cucurbits from 0.1 mg/kg to 0.05 mg/kg; and (iv) reduce the ML for fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits from 0.1 mg/kg to 0.05 mg/kg (excluding fungi and mushrooms). The Committee noted a proposal to exclude sweet corn from the ML for fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits, however data in support of this reduction came mainly from one region while global GEMS/Food data supported inclusion of canned sweet corn under the ML for fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits. The Committee also noted that in view of the exclusion of fungi and mushrooms from the ML for fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits, MLs for these commodities would be considered by the EWG (REP15/CF, paras. 45-47).

Consequently, the Committee agreed to forward draft MLs for fruit juices and nectars (excluding juices exclusively from berries and other small fruits and passion fruit), ready-to-drink at 0.03 mg/kg, canned fruits (excluding berries and other small fruits) at 0.1 mg/kg and canned vegetables (excluding canned brassica, leafy and legume vegetables) at 0.1mg/kg to CAC38 for adoption at Step 8, and proposed draft MLs for berries and other small fruits (excluding cranberry, currant and elderberry) at 0.1 mg/kg; cranberries at 0.2 mg/kg; currant at 0.2 mg/kg; elderberry at 0.2 mg/kg; brassica vegetables at 0.1 mg/kg; legume vegetables at 0.1 mg/kg; fruiting vegetables, cucurbits at 0.05 mg/kg; and fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits at 0.05 mg/kg (excluding fungi and mushrooms) to CAC38 for adoption at Step 5/8.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

The Committee also agreed to recommend revocation of the following MLs by CAC38: canned grapefruit, canned mandarin oranges, canned mangoes, canned pineapples, canned fruit cocktail, canned tropical fruit salad, canned asparagus, canned carrots, canned mature processed peas, canned mushrooms, canned palmito (palm hearts) and canned sweet corn. (REP15/CF, paras. 49-51)

The Committee also agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by USA to continue to work on outstanding issues related to the review of MLs for lead in fruits and vegetables in the GSCTFF namely review of MLs for passion fruit juice; juices and nectars from berries and other small fruits; canned berries and other small fruits; jams (fruit preserves) and jellies; mango chutney; canned chestnuts and canned chestnuts puree; canned brassica vegetables; canned leafy vegetables; canned legume vegetables; pickled cucumbers (cucumber pickles); preserved tomatoes; processed tomato concentrates; table olives; fungi and mushrooms (REP15/CF, para. 48).

CAC38 (2015) adopted the draft and proposed draft MLs for lead at Step 8 and 5/8 (REP15/CAC, para. 13, Appendix III).

CCCF10 (2016) agreed to forward to CAC39 the proposed draft revised MLs for fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink (inclusion of passion fruit) (ML = 0.03 mg/kg); canned fruits (inclusion of canned berries and other small fruits) (ML = 0.1 mg/kg); canned vegetables (inclusion of canned leafy vegetables and canned legume vegetables) (ML = 0.1 mg/kg); jams, jellies and marmalades (revised ML = 0.1 mg/kg and inclusion of marmalades); pickled cucumbers (revised ML = 0.1 mg/kg); preserved tomatoes (revised ML = 0.05 mg/kg and deletion of the note on the adjustment of the ML to take into account the concentration of the product); table olives (revised ML = 0.4 mg/kg) for adoption at Step 5/8. The Committee also agreed to request CAC39 to revoke the MLs for lead in the GSCTFF for the following food categories: canned raspberries (ML = 1 mg/kg), canned strawberries (ML = 1 mg/kg), canned green beans and canned wax beans (ML = 1 mg/kg); canned green peas (ML = 1 mg/kg); jams (fruit preserves) and jellies (ML = 1 mg/kg); pickled cucumbers (1 mg/kg); preserved tomatoes (ML = 1 mg/kg); and table olives (ML = 1 mg/kg). The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG chaired by USA to continue work on the review of the MLs for lead on the following food categories: fruit juices and nectars that are obtained exclusively from berries and other small fruits; canned brassica vegetables; canned chestnuts and chestnut puree; fungi and mushrooms; mango chutney; processed tomato concentrates and to add two new food categories i.e. fish and pulses for consideration by CCCF11 (REP16/CF paras. 46-90).

CAC39 (2016) discussed MLs for lead. The Commission noted the concern of several delegations in relation to the adoption of MLs for preserved tomatoes and jams, jellies and marmalades. These delegations pointed out that there were not sufficient data available to be able to examine the proposed level for these products. These delegations requested more time to gather data to review the existing MLs in order to ensure both consumer health protection and fair trade practices and proposed to adopt these MLs at Step 5 only. The Chairperson therefore proposed to adopt the MLs as proposed by CCCF; to note the concerns of those Members in relation to the MLs for preserved tomatoes and jams, jellies and marmalades; to request CCCF to consider their revision in future should new/additional data become available; and to encourage Members to urgently work on the generation and submission of data so that the MLs could be revisited based on all the data and information available. The Commission agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson to adopt the MLs at Step 5/8 as proposed by CCCF with the exception of the MLs for preserved tomatoes and jams, jellies and marmalades which would be adopted at Step 5 only, on the understanding that countries concerned would submit relevant data in reply to a call for data to be issued shortly in order to finalize these MLs at CCCF11 (REP16/CAC, paras. 67- 74). The Commission did not revoke the MLs for lead in preserved tomatoes and in jams (fruit preserves) and jellies, for which revisions were only adopted at Step 5 (REP16/CAC, para. 94).

CCCF11 (2017) noted the request of CCFO25 (2017) to establish ML for arsenic, in particular inorganic arsenic, and ML for lead in fish oil (REP17/FO, paras. 22, 23 and 28) and noted that the ML for lead in fish oils can be the same as the current ML for lead in edible fats and oils. The Committee therefore agreed to add a reference to the Standard for Fish Oils to the remarks column of the ML for lead in edible fats and oils once the standard is adopted (REP17/CF para. 16 and Appendix II).

The Committee agreed to advance the MLs for preserved tomatoes (ML = 0.05 mg/kg), jams, jellies and marmalades (ML = 0.4 mg/kg), canned chestnuts (ML = 0.05 mg/kg) and pulses (ML = 0.1 mg/kg) to Steps 8 and 5/8. The Committee agreed to delete the note for preserved tomatoes in the GSCTFF on the adjustment of the ML to take into account

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

the concentration of the product, and to re-evaluate jams, jellies and marmalades in future when more data became available. India expressed its reservation to the decision on the jams, jellies and marmalades and Thailand expressed its reservation to the decision on the pulses.

The Committee agreed to advance the ML for processed tomato concentrate (ML = 0.05 mg/kg) and canned brassica vegetables (ML = 0.1 mg/kg) to Step 5. The Committee also agreed to delete the note for tomato concentrate in the GSCTFF (on the adjustment of the ML to take into account the concentration of the product. In addition, the Committee also encouraged countries and observer organizations to submit data to GEMS/Food and any additional information e.g. type of product (tomato paste, tomato puree), concentration factors etc. as remarks to the GEMS/Food database in order to better identify the product when deriving proposed lower MLs for this food category.

The Committee also agreed to propose that CAC revoke the existing MLs for the categories proposed for adoption at Steps 8 and 5/8, to establish an EWG chaired by the United States of America to work on the following food categories: grape juices (to determine if a lower ML could be established as part of the positive list to apply to juices obtained exclusively from berries and other small fruits); processed tomato concentrates; mango chutney; canned brassica vegetables; fungi and mushrooms; salt; wine; edible fats and oils, and, fats spreads and blended spreads. For the fats, oils and spread categories, the Committee agreed that a simplified approach should be preferable rather than having a detailed breakdown of these categories in order to facilitate the establishment of MLs and their enforcement.

The Committee agreed to retain the ML of 0.05 mg/kg for juices obtained exclusively from berries and small fruits and to work on a positive list of these fruits that could achieve lower levels (e.g. 0.03 or 0.04 mg/kg) as more data became available, and to retain the current ML of 1 mg/kg for mango chutney as a stand-alone category and to encourage member countries concerned to submit data to GEMS/Food in order to make a final decision at its next session. The Committee agreed to maintain the ML for fish at 0.3 mg/kg. The Committee agreed to further consider an ML for farmed fungi and mushrooms (i.e. common mushroom, shiitake and oyster) at its next session and encouraged member countries to submit data to GEMS/Food in order to finalize the ML(s) at its next session.

CAC40 adopted the MLs for lead in selected processed fruits and vegetables and noted the reservations of Uganda on the ML for preserved tomato and of Cuba on the ML for jams, jellies and marmalades (REP17/CAC, paras. 55-57).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed:

- to advance the MLs for grape juice (0.04 mg/kg) , mango chutney (0.4 mg/kg), canned brassica vegetables (include in the canned vegetable category with an ML of 0.1 mg/kg), fresh farmed mushrooms (0.3 mg/kg), salt (excluding salt from marshes) (1 mg/kg), fat spreads and blended spreads (0.04 mg/kg), edible fats and oils (0.08 mg/kg) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7);
- to propose that CAC41 revoke the existing MLs for the mango chutney, salt, fat spreads and blended spreads, edible fats and oils in view of the adoption of revised MLs, and the ML for processed tomato concentrates categories noting that the current ML for fruiting vegetables (which includes fresh tomatoes) of 0.05 mg/kg could be used to derive, with concentration factors, an ML for tomato concentrates, and that such an approach would be in line with the desire of CCCF to consolidate MLs where possible, and would provide for flexibility in the application of MLs for this food category (REP18/CF, paras. 45);
- to establish an EWG chaired by the United States of America, to continue work on MLs for wine made from grapes and for fortified wines, made from grapes harvested after the date of the established of the ML and on edible offals as previously agreed; and
- to communicate to CCEXEC that the work could be expected to be concluded at CCCF13 (REP18/CF, paras. 38, 46).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the MLs for lead in selected commodities and revoked corresponding MLs (REP18/CAC, Appendix III and V).

Metals**Lead**

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to:

- i. advance the revised MLs for wines (from grapes harvested after the adoption of the ML by CAC) at 0.1 mg/kg; fortified/liqueur wines (from grapes harvested after the adoption of the ML by CAC) at 0.15 mg/kg; edible offal (cattle, pig and poultry) at 0.2, 0.15 and 0.1 mg/kg respectively to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC42, specifying the tissues used for deriving the MLs.
- ii. propose that CAC42 revoke the existing MLs for lead in edible offals (cattle, pig and poultry).
- iii. forward a consequential amendment to the current ML of 0.2 mg/kg for lead for wine, including fortified / liqueur wine and to specify that this ML applies to wine made from grapes harvested before the adoption of the new MLs by CAC42 (REP19/CF, para.44 and Appendix II).

CAC42 (2019) adopted the for wines (from grapes harvested after the adoption of the ML by CAC) at 0.1 mg/kg; fortified/liqueur wines (from grapes harvested after the adoption of the ML by CAC at 0.15 mg/kg; edible offal (cattle, pig and poultry) at 0.2, 0.15 and 0.1 mg/kg, respectively. CAC42 noted the reservation of Cuba to this decision on the MLs for wine and edible offals for the reasons that the MLs should not be adopted at Step 5/8 to allow another year for submission of data as the data used to derive the MLs were not geographically representative. CAC 41 revoked the corresponding MLs for lead in selected commodities in the GSCTFF (REP19/CAC, paras. 50-51, 95, Appendix II and IV).

CCCF14 (2021) agreed to:

- i) clarify the MLs for fruit juices and grape juices in the GSCTFF also apply to infants and young children and to advance this ML to CAC44 for adoption noting the reservations of the EU and Norway;
- ii) discontinue work on an ML for herbal teas, yoghurt, cheese and milk-based products for infants and young children at this time;
- iii) re-establish the EWG, chaired by Brazil to:
 - a. continue working on MLs for lead in dried spices and culinary herbs, including dried bulbs, rhizomes and roots; fresh culinary herbs; eggs; sugars and sugar-based candies; cereal-based products for infants and young children and ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children taking into account the written comments submitted, comments and decisions made at the session and new data from GEMS/Food; and to describe in more detail the data analysis and present a broader range of MLs and rejections rates and
 - b. work in close collaboration with the EWG on data management (see Agenda Item 17 of CCCF14).
- iv) request JECFA to issue a call for data to get more (geographically representative) data available to the EWG, with the aim to finalize the MLs next year (REP21/CF, para. 101 and Appendix IV).

CAC44 (2021) adopted the amendment to extend the MLs for lead in fruit juices and grape juice in the GSCTFF to cover infants and young children, noting the reservations of the EU, Norway, Switzerland and Ukraine. CAC44 also noted the concerns of two Observers (REP21/CAC, para. 44).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to consider the revised proposed MLs as follows:

For cereal-based foods for infants and young children, CCCF15 agreed to forward an ML of 0.02 mg/kg to CAC for adoption at Step 5/8; and clarify that the ML applies to the product "as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption" (REP22/CF, para. 79).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

For ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children, a Member noted that there are certain foods that are very nutritious but may have slightly higher occurrence levels, e.g. certain root vegetables, which might require a separate treatment. It was suggested to advance the ML to Step 5 to allow additional time to review this category to identify if any foods need to have a separate ML, similar to the decision taken by CCCF on the separate MLs for lead in grape juices and berry/small fruit juices. This view was supported by an Observer who stressed the need to establish MLs that were globally achievable and that an ML of 0.02 mg/kg for certain food commodities such as root vegetables might be difficult to comply with and more time might be needed to review data for these food types (REP22/CF, para. 82).

CCCF15 agreed to forward an ML of 0.02 mg/kg for lead in ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children to CAC for adoption at Step 5 and further consideration in the EWG as per the possible exclusion of certain foods that may not be able to achieve this ML for consideration at CCCF16 (2023) (REP22/CF, para. 84).

For culinary herbs, the EWG Chair invited CCCF to consider the proposed MLs as follows and explained that no lower values could be proposed based on the available GEMS/Food dataset:

- 0.25 mg/kg for fresh culinary herbs (excluding rosemary)
- 0.5 mg/kg for rosemary (fresh)
- 2 mg/kg for dried culinary herbs (REP22/CF, para. 85).

As an alternative, the EWG Chair proposed to discontinue work on MLs for fresh culinary herbs as they were not significantly traded at the international level. She further noted that to better address comments submitted to this session in relation to the proposed ML for dried culinary herbs, and in view of the inconsistencies identified in the GEMS/Food dataset, an additional call for data could be issued to further review this category/ML (REP22/CF, para. 86).

Delegations, while generally supported that work could continue on fresh and dry culinary herbs, however, no ML should be set at this Session and instead more data should be collected to establish an ML that is geographically representative and globally achievable (REP22/CF, para. 87).

CCCF15 agreed to return the MLs to Step 2/3 for further consideration by the EWG based on a new JECFA call for data in 2022; and encouraged interested Codex members to submit data with clear identification of the dried/fresh state of the samples to GEMS/Food to consider proposals for MLs for fresh and dried culinary herbs at CCCF17 (2024) and if no agreement is reached at CCCF17 to discontinue work on this category (REP22/CF, para. 90).

For spices, CCCF15 agreed to discontinue work on an ML for lead in dried garlic and to return the MLs for spices to Step 2/3 for further consideration by the EWG based on a new JECFA call for data in 2022 for dried spices, and encouraged interested Codex members to submit data to GEMS/Food in order to consider proposals for MLs for dried spices at CCCF17 (2024) (REP22/CF, para. 92).

For sugars, based on comments received in reply to CL 2022/16-CF, the EWG Chair explained that there was general support for an ML of 0.1 mg/kg for all sugars and an ML of 0.06 mg/kg for honey. Considerations could also be given to an ML of 0.1 mg/kg for honey due to some results being based on methodologies using higher LOQ values which might require a higher ML for this product. A separate ML for brown and raw sugar could be established as it is a high-value commodity in international trade that is likely to contain more lead than white or refined sugar (REP22/CF, para. 93).

CCCF15 agreed to:

- forward an ML of 0.1 mg/kg for lead in white sugar and refined sugar, honey, corn and maple syrups to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5/8;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

- consider an ML for brown and raw sugars based on data available from GEMS/Food and to submit a proposal for consideration by CCCF16 (2023); and
- discontinue work on an ML for molasses (REP22/CF, para. 96).

For sugar-based candies, following a reassessment of the GEMS/Food dataset, the EWG Chair advised CCCF to consider a single ML for all candies at 0.1 mg/kg which still provided a rejection rate below 5% (REP22/CF, para. 98). CCCF15 agreed to forward an ML of 0.1 mg/kg lead in sugar-based candies to CAC for adoption at Step 5/8 (REP22/CF, para. 101).

To summarize the general conclusion, CCCF15 (2022) agreed to:

- forward the MLs for lead in cereal-based foods for infants and young children at 0.02 mg/kg; white and refined sugar, corn and maple syrups, honey at 0.1 mg/kg and sugar-based candies at 0.1 mg/kg to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5/8 (REP22/CF, paras 79, 96, 101 and Appendix IV);
- forward the ML for ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children at 0.02 mg/kg to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5 (REP22/CF, para. 84 and Appendix IV);
- Discontinue work on fresh eggs, dried garlic and molasses and to inform CAC45 accordingly (REP22/CF, paras 73, 92, 96); and
- re-establish the EWG, led by Brazil to consider the following:
 - MLs for ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children (exclusion of certain foods) and brown and raw sugars based on data currently available on GEMS/Food for consideration by CCCF16 (2023).
 - MLs for culinary herbs (fresh/dried) and spices (dried) following a JECFA call for data in 2022 for consideration by CCCF17 (2024) (REP22/CF, para. 102).

CCCF15 recommended that the EWG works in close collaboration with the EWG on data analysis to ensure consistency in the methodology applied to derive the MLs, as information becomes available (REP22/CF, para. 103).

CCCF15 also encouraged all interested Members to submit data to GEMS/Food in response to the JECFA calls for data on culinary herbs and dried spices to facilitate the work of the EWG and discussion and decision-making at CCCF (REP22/CF, para. 104).

CAC45 adopted the MLs for lead in cereal-based foods for infants and young children, white and refined sugar, corn and maple syrups, honey and sugar-based candies at Steps 5/8, and noted the reservation of India on the ML for lead in white and refined sugar (REP22/CAC, para. 65 iv). CAC45 adopted the ML for lead in ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children at Step 5 (REP 22/CAC, para. 75). CAC45 endorsed the discontinuation of the work on MLs for lead in fresh eggs, dried garlic, and molasses for the reasons raised in CCCF15 (REP 22/CAC, para. 76).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed to forward to CAC46 the following (Appendix II) (REP23/CF, para.28):

- An ML of 0.15 mg/kg for soft brown, raw, and non-centrifugal sugars for adoption at Step 5/8; and
- An ML of 0.02 mg/kg for ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children for adoption at Step 8.

CAC46 adopted at Step 5/8 ML for lead in soft brown, raw and non-centrifugal sugars (REP23/CAC, para. 69); and adopted at step 8 ML for lead in ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children (REP23/CAC, para. 68).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead****Establishment new MLs**

CCCF11 (2017) agreed that work on new MLs for lead in food categories, which are currently not listed in the GSCTFF, would need further analysis based on their public health concern and their relevance to international trade and request the EWG led by Brazil to prepare a discussion paper on a structured approach to prioritize commodities not in the GSCTFF taking into account public health for which new MLs for lead could be established (REP17/CF, paras. 41-89).

CCCF12 (2018) recalled the decision of CCEXEC73 (2017) that CCCF not propose further work on the development of new MLs for lead for inclusion in the GSCTFF until work on the revision of existing MLs in the general standard was completed (REP18/CF, para.127).

The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by Brazil to prepare for CCCF13 a revised discussion paper and project document which also took into consideration exposure data (in addition to other criteria for prioritization of commodities) in establishing the prioritization categories for MLs, and to propose, if feasible, MLs for the categories indicated with a focus on commodities identified as high in the priority list; and noted that the JECFA Secretariat would issue a call for occurrence data for lead in the categories listed (CX/CF 18/12/14, Table 4) and encouraged Member countries to submit data to GEMS/Foods to assist in the development of the discussion paper and decision at CCCF13 on new work on MLs for lead for the categories identified as high priority (REP18/CF, para.131)

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to:

- (i) submit the revised project document (REP19/CF, Appendix VI) to CAC42 for approval as new work on establishment of MLs for lead in certain food categories; and
- (ii) establish an EWG, chaired by the Brazil to prepare, subject to approval of CAC42, proposed draft MLs for comments and consideration at CCCF14; and
- (iii) issue a call for data on the agreed categories in order to identify sub-categories for which MLs could be proposed for consideration by CCCF14 (REP19/CF, para. 96).

CAC42 (2019) approved new work on establishment of MLs for lead in certain food categories (REP19/CAC, Appendix V).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by Brazil, working in English only, to consider the MLs for culinary herbs (fresh/dried) and spices (dried) following a JECFA call for data in 2022 for consideration by CCCF17 (2024) (REP22/15, para. 102 iv b).

CCCF16 (2023) recalled that the EWG chaired by Brazil, working in English only, would continue to work on MLs for lead in culinary herbs (fresh/dried) and spices (dried) for consideration by CCCF17 and that a JECFA call for data had already been issued (REP23/CF, para. 29).

CCCF17 (2024) considered the proposals for MLs as follows (REP24/CF, para. 22):

Spices, dried flowers

The Chairperson noted general support to discontinue work on the ML for spices, dried flowers because Members considered that in most countries, chamomile is mostly used as herbal infusions (REP24/CF, para. 23) .

CCCF agreed to discontinue work on an ML for spices, dried flowers (REP24/CF, para. 24).

Spices, dried aril

CCCF noted the general support for an ML of 0.9 mg/kg for spices, dried aril and for the following reasons (REP24/CF, para. 25):

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

- A member stressed that more time/research was needed to collect data to contribute to the establishment of a more geographically representative ML. The Chair of the VWG explained that a new call for data was not expected to provide more geographically representative data as a call for data had already been issued three times, noting at the same time that, if new information would become available in the future, CCCF could revisit the ML.
- The proposed categories for the MLs were considered appropriate even though a member raised the concern that these were developed by the Codex Committee on Spices and Culinary Herbs (CCSCH) for internal use only, that for some categories only data were available for limited products and that MLs could better be set on individual spices.

CCCF further noted that, even though mace was the only aril spice, specifying MLs only for spices for which data was available might restrict the use of the proposed categories, and that the information on spices included in the data analysis could better be taken in the 'notes for CCCF' column in the working document presented at each session of the CCCF for information (CF/INF) and used in discussions related to contaminants rather than as a note to the ML in CXS 193 (REP24/CF, para. 26).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 0.9 mg/kg for Spices, dried aril, removing the note on mace and to include it in the information document (REP24/CF, para. 27).

Spices, dried seeds, excluding celery seeds

CCCF discussed the proposal for 0.9 mg/kg for spices, dried seeds, excluding dried celery seeds, and noted the following comments (REP24/CF, para. 28):

- A higher ML of 3.0 mg/kg for the spices categories dried bark, dried flower parts, dried fruits and berries, including Sichuan pepper and star anise, dried rhizomes, bulbs and roots, and also dried seeds, and also to include spice mixtures was more appropriate as the dried weight consumption of spices was relatively low otherwise to advance the ML to Step 5 only to allow further discussion on how to implement this ML on mixed spices.
- The rejection rate should not be too close to 5% and that the rejection rate at an ML of 0.9 mg/kg could be therefore supported.
- The statement "ML does not apply to celery seeds" should be specified in the notes/remarks in CXS 193 and not in the commodity/product name.
- A member state reiterated that more time/research was needed to collect more geographically representative data, including from developing countries.
- The EWG and the VWG had not proposed ML(s) for mixture of spices, as CXS 193 did not establish limits for multi-ingredient products, and it was possible to obtain MLs considering the percentage of specific ingredients in the mixture. In addition, the contamination profiles differed between spice mixtures dependent on the ingredients. CCCF noted that the issue of mixtures was not limited to spices, discussed a proposal in CRD37 to include a note in CXS 193 on the application of individual ML of ingredients to the whole mixture based on their relative proportions in the product and noted the following views:
 - For ingredients without Codex MLs, MLs may be considered as 0 when applying the ML to the mixture.
 - In case the proportions of the ingredient are unknown an alternative approach could be to apply the most conservative/lowest ML to the whole mixture.
 - A note was not necessary as information on calculation of maximum concentration in multi-ingredient foods was already included in Annex I of CXS 193.
 - A Member noted that mixtures may not include labelling to identify individual spices; also spice mixtures could be potentially more contaminated with lead, arising from the diversion of rejected spices to the production of spice mixtures. A request was made for an analysis of the available data for spice mixtures in order to determine the concentration range of lead in these products, to be presented at CCCF18 and enable further understanding of mixtures. In response to this request, the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

JECFA secretariat clarified that such an analysis was possible, but that no information was available on the composition of the spice mixtures which could limit the interpretation.

CCCF noted that the Codex Secretariat could issue a circular letter (CL) requesting comments on the necessity and content of further guidance for multi-ingredient products. The CL would include a sample calculation to reflect the proposal to include ingredients without Codex ML and a mixture where the proportion of ingredients are unknown (REP24/CF, para. 29).

CCCF agreed to request the JECFA Secretariat to review the data in the GEMS/Food database that are already available on products labelled as spice mixtures and to present an analysis of the data for discussion at CCCF18 (REP24/CF, para. 30).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 0.9 mg/kg for spices, dried seeds, excluding dried celery seeds, and to request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL requesting comments on the necessity and content of further guidance for multi-ingredient products (REP24/CF, para. 31).

Spices, dried celery seeds

CCCF noted the general agreement on the proposal for establishing an ML of 1.5 mg/kg for spices, dried celery seeds, while a member made a proposal for an ML of 0.9 mg/kg as this would be more appropriate based on As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) and the relevant data (REP24/CF, para. 32).

A member reiterated that more time and research was needed to collect data to contribute to the establishment of a more geographically representative ML, and that such data should also include relevant information from developing countries (REP24/CF, para. 33).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 1.5 mg/kg for spices, dried celery seeds (REP24/CF, para. 34).

Spices, dried rhizomes, and roots

CCCF considered the ML proposal of 1.5 mg/kg for spices, dried rhizomes and roots and noted the following comments (REP24/CF, para. 35):

- The proposed ML at 1.5 mg/kg presented a rejection rate at 4.8%, which was too close to 5%, and therefore an ML of 2.0 mg/kg was proposed with the rejection rate at 2.8%. Galangal should be included in the group, even though galangal contains a higher concentration of lead. However, since the number of galangal samples did not provide sufficient information to establish a separate ML for it, exclusion of galangal from the group ML could have a negative effect on galangal trade.
- The ML 1.5 mg/kg was too low considering the occurrence data of dried ginger as the root had a much higher rejection rate than 5%, and 2.0 mg/kg would be more appropriate.
- A member explained that considering the principle As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA principle), and with a view of protecting consumer health, a lower ML of 1.5 mg/kg would be more appropriate on the basis of available data.
- A member highlighted that, based on the data discussed during the EWG and VWG, the proposed MLs were based on one spice only, i.e. ginger and were therefore not representative of the entire group. The member further reiterated that more time and research was needed to collect data to contribute to the establishment of a more geographically representative ML.
- Garlic should be removed from the notes or remarks since it was decided to exclude bulbs from the category.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 2.0 mg/kg for spices, dried rhizomes and roots, including galangal and to remove garlic from the notes/remarks column (REP24/CF, para. 36).

Spices, dried bark

CCCCF considered the proposal of 3.0 mg/kg for spices, dried bark and noted the following comments (REP24/CF, para. 37):

- The ML of 3.0 mg/kg was a compromise solution agreed upon by the VWG as this had a sample rejection rate of 2.7%, which was considered more appropriate than the rejection rate of 4.2% at the level of 2.5 mg/kg.
- An ML of 2.0 mg/kg would be feasible and more appropriate as cinnamon was present in many products destined to children, particularly in pre-packaged foods and in home-made meals, and that children were especially vulnerable to the negative effects of lead.
- A member supported that an ML of 2.5 mg/kg was for dried bark but could also support an ML of 2.0 mg/kg.
- A Member noted they had new data available on cinnamon and requested that this data be analysed and not to forward the ML for adoption. The Member further noted that the intake for bark, was only 0.4 g per day when highly consumed.
- The Chair of the VWG, proposed to establish an ML of 2.5 mg/kg and to advance this ML to Step 5 and to further consider new data in the following year should such data be made available.
- Members supporting the proposal of the VWG Chair, further requested that any new data that could be reflective of economic adulteration needed to be excluded; that this task would fall on the EWG rather than on the GEMS/Food database; and that the EWG could, for example, remove the outliers as they could increase the high percentile samples. A member offered help in sorting out the data.

CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to advance an ML of 2.5 mg/kg to Step 5 for spices, dried bark, and to request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data with a note that data which could be related to economic adulteration should not be submitted and that the EWG would consider the newly collected data in their review (REP24/CF, para. 38) .

Spices, dried floral parts

While there was general agreement on the proposal for establishing an ML of 2.5 mg/kg for spices, dried floral parts, a member noted that considering the ALARA approach and based on the relevant available data for saffron and capers, an ML of 1.0 mg/kg was considered more appropriate. The member further noted that according to its data concentration of lead in cloves appeared to be below 0.5 mg/kg so the few samples with concentrations above 2 mg/kg could be considered to be outliers. Two members noted that their data were in line with the ones presented by the first member and that they would therefore support an ML of 1.0 mg/kg (REP24/CF, para. 39).

A member proposed to exclude saffron from this category as there were only 15 data points available and noted that more time and research was needed to collect data to contribute to the establishment of a more geographically representative ML (REP24/CF, para. 40).

CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 2.5 mg/kg for spices, dried floral parts (REP24/CF, para. 41).

Spices, dried fruit, and berries, excluding dried Sichuan pepper, star anise, paprika and sumac

CCCCF noted the general support for an ML of 0.6 mg/kg (REP24/CF, para. 42).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

A member noted that more time/research was needed to collect data to contribute to the establishment of a more geographically representative ML (REP24/CF, para. 43).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 0.6 mg/kg for spices, dried fruit, and berries, excluding dried Sichuan pepper, star anise, dried paprika and sumac (REP24/CF, para. 44).

Spices, dried paprika and sumac

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 0.8 mg/kg for spices, dried paprika and sumac (REP24/CF, para. 46).

Spices, dried Sichuan pepper and star anise

A member noted that based on data available in their region, a lower ML of 0.8 mg/kg for star anise could be established. The Delegation further noted that while they could not agree to an ML of 3.0 mg/kg for star anise, however, they could support an ML of 3.0 mg/kg for dried Sichuan pepper (REP24/CF, para. 47).

A member noted that more data was necessary to establish an ML for dried Sichuan pepper and dried Star anise and requested to hold the ML at Step 4 until such data would be made available (REP24/CF, para. 48).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 3.0 mg/kg for spices, dried Sichuan pepper and star anise (REP24/CF, para. 49).

Fresh and dried culinary herbs**Culinary herbs, dried**

While there was general agreement on the proposal for an ML of 2.5 mg/kg for culinary herbs, dried, a member noted that based on the data available in the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) database, composed by over 1500 samples for dry culinary herbs, a lower ML of 1.5 mg/kg could be established for dried culinary herbs (REP24/CF, para. 51).

The VWG Chair noted that these data were not identified in the GEMS/Food data extraction and that the current ML was based on the available data and that if this data should be considered, it could be proposed to advance the ML at Step 5 in order to allow for data submission. A request could be made to the JECFA secretariat to issue a call for data (REP24/CF, para. 52).

A Member proposed to use the term “moisture content” in place of “humidity” in the note to the ML (REP24/CF, para. 53).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an ML of 2.5 mg/kg to be advanced to Step 5 for dried culinary herbs, to change “humidity” with “moisture content” in the note to the ML, and to request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data for lead in dried culinary herbs and that the EWG should consider new available data in their review (REP24/CF, para. 54).

Fresh culinary herbs

CCCF considered the recommendation to discontinue establishment of an ML for fresh culinary herbs (REP24/CF, para. 55).

In response to a request for clarification, CCCF noted that the ML for fresh culinary herbs could be derived from the ML for the dried culinary herbs, taking into account the average water content of the fresh and the dry herbs (REP24/CF, para. 56).

Metals**Lead**

It was stressed that the note “MLs for fresh culinary herbs can be derived considering the moisture content of the fresh and dry herb” should be deleted based on the decision of CCCF14 to not support the use of concentration factors to derive an ML for dried culinary herbs (REP24/CF, para. 57).

A member proposed to defer discontinuation of work until the ML for culinary herbs, dried was adopted as the decision on an ML for fresh culinary herbs was contingent on having an ML for dried culinary herbs and it was not sure that there would be an ML for this category (REP24/CF, para. 58).

The Codex Secretariat explained that advancing the ML for dried culinary herbs to Step 5 was an indication that an ML for this category of culinary herbs would be established by CCCF (REP24/CF, para. 59).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to discontinue work on lead in fresh culinary herbs, in light of continuation of the development of an ML for dried culinary herbs, and to consider whether or not the note on the use of moisture content to the ML for fresh culinary herbs is warranted (REP24/CF, para. 60).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 61 and Appendix II):

(i) forward to CAC47 the following:

- (a) An ML of 0.9 mg/kg for spices, dried aril for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservation of India for the reasons explained in paragraph 25 of the report;
 - (b) An ML of 0.9 mg/kg for dried seeds, excluding celery seeds for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservations of India for the reasons explained in paragraph 28 of the report;
 - (c) An ML of 1.5 mg/kg for dried celery seeds for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservations of the European Union and India for the reasons explained in paragraphs 32 and 33 of the report;
 - (d) An ML of 2.0 mg/kg for dried rhizomes and roots for adoption at Step 5/8 noting the reservations of the European Union, Indonesia, Egypt, and India for the reasons explained in paragraph 35 of the report;
 - (e) An ML of 2.5 mg/kg for dried bark for adoption at Step 5;
 - (f) An ML of 2.5 mg/kg for dried floral parts for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservations of the European Union, Egypt, Türkiye, and India for the reasons explained in paragraphs 39 and 40 of the report;
 - (g) An ML of 0.6 mg/kg for spices, dried fruit, and berries, excluding Sichuan pepper, star anise, paprika and sumac for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservation of India for the reasons explained in paragraph 43 of the report;
 - (h) An ML of 0.8 mg/kg for spices, dried paprika and sumac for adoption at Step 5/8;
 - (i) An ML of 3.0 mg/kg for dried Sichuan pepper and dried Star anise for adoption at Step 5/8, noting the reservations of the European Union for the reasons explained in paragraph 47 of the report; and
 - (j) An ML of 2.5 mg/kg for dried culinary herbs for adoption at Step 5.
- (ii) discontinue work on the MLs for spices, dried flowers and for fresh culinary herbs and to inform CAC47 accordingly;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

(iii) re-establish the EWG chaired by Brazil to work on MLs for lead in dried bark and dried culinary herbs, to consider the relevance of the note on moisture content to the ML for fresh culinary herbs, for comments and consideration by CCCF18;

(iv) request JECFA to:

(a) issue a call for data for lead in spices, dried bark, including a note not to submit data that could be related to economic adulteration and for dried culinary herbs; and

(b) perform an analysis of the available data for spice mixtures for consideration by CCCF18; and

(v) request the Secretariat to issue a CL requesting comments on application of MLs to multi-ingredient products.

CAC47 (2024) adopted (REP24/CAC, para. 63 and Appendix II) the maximum levels (MLs) for lead in spices, at Step 5/8, as follows:

a) dried aril, noting the reservations of India, Morocco and the Russian Federation for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64, 65 and 66;

b) dried floral parts, noting the reservations of Egypt, the European Union, the Gambia, India, Morocco, Norway, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa and Switzerland for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64, 65, 66 and 67;

c) dried fruits and berries, noting the reservations of India and the Russian Federation for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64 and 65;

d) dried paprika and sumac, noting the reservations of India and the Russian Federation for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64 and 65;

e) dried Sichuan pepper and star anise, noting the reservations of the European Union, India, Norway, Russian Federation and Switzerland for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64, 65 and 67;

f) dried rhizomes and roots, noting the reservations of Egypt, the European Union, the Gambia, India, Morocco, Norway, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa and Switzerland for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64, 65, 66 and 67;

g) dried seeds, noting the reservations of India and the Russian Federation for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64 and 65;

h) dried celery seeds, noting the reservations of the European Union, India, Norway, Russian Federation and Switzerland for the reasons explained in paragraphs 64, 65 and 67;

India expressed reservations on all the MLs for spices, noting that the approach for setting group MLs for spices instead of single MLs for individual spices led to an uneven sample representation within the established categories of spices, making the ML unrepresentative of the entire category or the single spice within that category. In addition, the MLs were derived based on a small number of samples, with limited geographical representation, mainly from importing countries, reducing the representation of key production areas and adding another factor for potentially skewing the ML determination (REP24/CAC, para. 64).

The Russian Federation expressed reservations on all the MLs for lead in spices, noting many regional and country variations in lead contamination in these spices, for example in the Eurasian region, and that there was not enough information on the health risk criteria to support the proposed MLs, which might be overly stringent and negatively impact international trade on these products (REP24/CAC, para. 65).

The Gambia, Morocco, Senegal, and South Africa expressed their reservations on the MLs for the group of spices on dried floral parts, rhizomes, and roots. Noting that African countries were significant consumers of spices and, considering the lack of a clear consensus on the proposed MLs for these groups of spices at CCCF17, as well as the lack of

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

geographical representative data, these MLs should be advanced to Step 5 only and be further considered by CCCF18 (2025). Morocco expressed the same rationale for their reservation to dried aril (REP24/CAC, para. 66).

The European Union, supported by Norway and Switzerland reiterated their reservations and rationale made at CCCF17 (2024) on the MLs for the following spices. Egypt expressed the same reservations using the same rationale as the EU on the MLs for dried floral parts and dried rhizomes and roots (REP24/CAC, para. 67):

- Dried floral parts: Based on the As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) principle and relevant data available for caper and saffron, a lower ML of 1.0 mg/kg would be more appropriate. In addition, according to EU data, the lead concentration in cloves appeared to be below 0.5 mg/kg and therefore, the few samples with concentrations above 2 mg/kg could be considered outliers;
- Dried Sichuan pepper and star anise: Based on data available in the EU, a lower ML of 0.6 mg/kg for star anise could be established;
- Dried rhizomes and roots: Based on the ALARA principle and relevant data available, a lower ML of 1.5 mg/kg would be more appropriate to protect consumers' health;
- Dried celery seeds: A lower ML of 0.9 mg/kg would be more appropriate based on the ALARA principle and the relevant available data.

CAC47 adopted the MLs for lead in dried bark and dried culinary herbs, noting that a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) call for data was ongoing and encouraged Members to respond to the call for data to facilitate discussion and decision-making at CCCF18 (2025). CAC47 noted India's concern about the approach taken for setting group MLs for spices, which might lead to uneven distribution of samples, resulting in potentially unrepresentative MLs.

CAC47 discontinued work on certain MLs for lead in spices, dried flowers, and fresh culinary herbs (REP24/CAC, para. 69 and Appendix VI).

Quinoa

CAC40 (2017) requested that CCCF consider including quinoa in the MLs for lead and cadmium in cereal in GSCTFF (REP17/CAC, para. 81).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed to discuss the MLs for lead and cadmium in quinoa at CCCF13 based on the paper from the Codex and JECFA Secretariats (REP18/CF, para. 14).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed that JECFA would issue a call for data on occurrence data for cadmium and lead in quinoa through GEMS/Food; and based on the information collected, the JECFA secretariat, with the assistance of the Codex Secretariat, would finalize the paper for consideration by CCCF14 (REP19/CF, para.103).

At CCCF14 (2021), noting the diverse views expressed on whether or not to establish MLs, and if MLs were to be established, whether to extend the MLs for cadmium and lead in cereals to quinoa in CXS193 or whether to have separate MLs for quinoa, the limited data available, the need to consider the different cultivars and growing conditions, and ongoing work on data generation, the Chair proposed to postpone the discussion on MLs for cadmium and lead in quinoa for 3 years to allow data generation and submission to GEMS/Food. CCCF supported this proposal.

The Committee agreed:

- i) to request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data on cadmium and lead in quinoa and quinoa-based products, including foods for infants and young children, in two-years' time;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

- ii) that the call for data should include a request for data on occurrence of lead and cadmium, and in addition consumption data, and country of origin should be indicated in the remarks field in order to help assess the geographic representativity of the data and the JECFA Secretariat would prepare an analysis of the new data and prepare a paper for consideration by CCCF17 (REP21/CF, para. 180).

At CCCF16 (2023), the Codex Secretariat recalled the decision taken at CCCF14 on cadmium and lead in quinoa (REP23/CF, para. 118).

CCCF16 agreed that a call for data should be issued taking into account the points raised at CCCF14 and comments made at this Session (REP23/CF, para. 119).

CCCF16 request the JECFA Secretariat (REP23/CF, para. 133vii):

(a) to issue a call for data on cadmium and lead in quinoa and quinoa-based products, including foods for infants and young children;

1) that the call for data should include a request for data on occurrence of lead and cadmium for the last 10 years, consumption data, and country of origin (if known) should be indicated in the remarks field in order to help assess the geographic representativity of the data;

2) data collected with methods with a LOQ of 0.4 mg/kg or below, would be helpful but not required, given the current MLs in CXS193 for lead and cadmium in grains of up to 0.4 mg/kg.

(b) to prepare an analysis of the new data and prepare a paper for consideration by CCCF17.

At CCCF17 (2024), the Representative of the WHO introduced the item on behalf of the Joint FAO/WHO JECFA Secretariats and recalled the request from CCCF16. He explained that a call for data had been issued, the data points obtained for lead and cadmium in quinoa through the GEMS/Food database, the analysis undertaken and conclusions that an ML of 0.1 or 0.2 mg/kg for cadmium and lead in quinoa would have little impact on dietary exposure to cadmium and lead, respectively. He recommended that CCCF consider the recommendations as proposed in the paper. (REP24/CF, para. 115)

CCCF17 agreed to forward the ML of 0.2 mg/kg for lead in quinoa for adoption by CAC47. (REP24/CF, para. 119 and Appendix VII)

CAC47 adopted the MLs for lead in quinoa. (REP24/CAC, para. 63 and Appendix II)

Code of practice

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to

(i) submit the project document (REP19/CF, Appendix VII) to CAC42 for approval as new work revision of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of lead contamination in foods (CXC 56-2004); and

(ii) establish an EWG, chaired by USA and co-chaired by UK and Japan to prepare, subject to approval of CAC42, a revised version of the COP, based on the document provided in Appendix II of CX/CF 19/13/11, for comments and consideration at CCCF14. (REP19/CF, para. 107).

CAC42 (2019) approved new work on revision of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of lead contamination in foods (CXC 56-2004) (REP19/CAC, Appendix V).

CCCF14 (2021) agreed to:

i) forward the revised Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead Contamination in Foods (CXS 56-2004) to CAC44 for adoption at Step 5/8 and

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Lead**

ii) recommend to CCFA to request JECFA to:

- a. review the lead specifications for diatomaceous earth and charcoal (activated carbon) and
- b. evaluate available data to support development of a lead specification for bentonite. (REP21/CF, para. 106 and Appendix V)

CAC44 (2021) adopted the revision of the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead Contamination in Foods (CXS 56-2004) at Step 5/8. (REP21/CAC, para. 44)

Exposure to lead can occur from many sources but usually arises from industrial use. Lead and its compounds can enter the environment during mining, smelting, processing, use, recycling, or disposal. The main uses of lead are in batteries, cables, pigments, plumbing, gasoline, solder and steel products, food packaging, glassware, ceramic products, and pesticides. The main exposure of the general non-smoking adult population is from food and water. Airborne lead may contribute significantly to exposure, depending on such factors as use of tobacco, occupation, and proximity to sources such as motorways and lead smelters. Food, air, water, and dust or soil are the main potential sources of exposure of infants and young children.

The rate of absorption of lead after ingestion can range from 3% to 80%. It is heavily influenced by food intake, much higher rates of absorption occurring after fasting than when lead is ingested with a meal. Absorption is also affected by age, the typical absorption rates in adults and infants being 10% and 50%, respectively. Up to 50% of the inhaled lead compound may be absorbed. After its absorption and distribution in blood, lead is initially distributed to soft tissues throughout the body. Eventually, bone accumulates lead over much of the human life span and may serve as an endogenous source of lead. The half-life for lead in blood and other soft tissues is about 28-36 days, but it is much longer in the various bone compartments. The percentage retention of lead in body stores is higher in children than adults. Inorganic lead is not metabolized. Lead that is not distributed is mainly excreted through the kidney.

Lead is a classical chronic or cumulative poison. In humans, lead can result in a wide range of biological effects depending upon the level and duration of exposure. Health effects are generally not observed after a single exposure. Many of the effects that have been observed in laboratory animals have also been observed in humans, including hematological effects, neurological and behavioral effects, renal effects, cardiovascular effects, and effects on the reproductive system. In addition, lead has been shown to have effects on bone and on the immune system in laboratory animals. Children are more vulnerable to the effects of lead than adults. Lead has been shown to be associated with impaired neurobehavioral functioning in children. Impaired neurobehavioral development and increase in systolic blood pressure were considered to be the most critical effect (JECFA73, 2010).

Inorganic lead compounds are classified by the IARC as probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A; Vol. 87, 2006)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Mercury**

Reference to JECFA:	10 (1966), 14 (1970), 16 (1972), 22 (1978), 72 (2010)
Toxicological guidance value:	PTWI 4 µg/kg bw for inorganic mercury (2010)
Contaminant definition:	Mercury, Total
Synonyms:	Hg
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Natural mineral waters	0.001	Adopted	CXS 108-1981	NMW, CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 108-1981. The ML is Expressed in mg/l	1)
Salt, food grade	0.1	Adopted	CXS 150-1985	NFSDU, FA		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 150-1985.	

- 1) The Standard for Natural Mineral Waters contains the level in the Section 3.2 “Health-related limits for certain substances”. CCCF2 (2008) endorsed the section and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 27). CCCF5 (2011) decided that the Committee took no further action on the integration of the safety parameters in sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.16 into the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 90).

No CCFAC/CCCF position document was available about mercury.

JECFA72 (2010) considered that, based on the toxicological database for mercury (II) chloride, that there was limited evidence for carcinogenicity of inorganic mercury, but that direct DNA damage was not demonstrated, and that therefore setting a health-based guidance value was appropriate. The lowest BMDL₁₀ for relative kidney weight increase in male rats was calculated to be 0.11 mg/kg bw per day as mercury (II) chloride. This corresponds to 0.06 mg/kg bw per day as mercury, adjusted from a 5 day per week dosing schedule to an average daily dose and for the percent contribution of inorganic mercury to dose. After application of a 100-fold uncertainty factor, the Committee established a PTWI for inorganic mercury of 4 µg/kg bw. The previous PTWI of 5 µg/kg bw for total mercury, established at the sixteenth meeting, was withdrawn.

The new PTWI for inorganic mercury was considered applicable to dietary exposure to total mercury from foods other than fish and shellfish. For dietary exposure to mercury from these foods the previously established PTWI for methyl mercury should be applied. The upper limits of estimates of average dietary exposure to total mercury from foods other than fish and shellfish for adults (1 µg/kg bw per week) and for children (4 µg/kg bw per week) were at or below the PTWI for inorganic mercury.

The Committee noted that there was a lack of quantitative data on methylmercury in non-fish products and on inorganic mercury in foods in general.

Mercury is a naturally occurring metallic element which can be present in foodstuffs by natural causes; elevated levels can also occur due to e.g. environmental contamination by industrial or other uses of mercury. Methylmercury and also total mercury levels in terrestrial animals and plants are usually very low; the use of fish meal as animal feed can however also lead to higher methyl mercury levels in other animal products.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

Reference to JECFA: 22 (1978), 33 (1988), 53 (1999), 61 (2003), 67 (2006)
 Toxicological guidance value: PTWI 0.0016 mg/kg bw (2003; confirmed in 2006)
 Contaminant definition: Methylmercury
 Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Tuna	1.2	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for methylmercury in fish by analyzing total mercury in fish. If the total mercury concentration is below or equal to the ML for methylmercury, no further testing is required and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the total mercury concentration is above the ML for methylmercury, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the methylmercury concentration is above the ML. The ML also applies to fresh or frozen fish intended for further processing. Countries should consider developing nationally relevant consumer advice for women of childbearing age and young children to supplement the ML.	CAC41 agreed that CCCF could consider revising the ML in the light of additional data after three years. (REP18/CAC, para. 39)
Alfonsino	1.5	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	See notes for tuna	
Marlin	1.7	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	See notes for tuna	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Shark	1.6	Adopted	2018	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	See notes for tuna	
Orange roughy	0.8	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for methylmercury in fish by analyzing total mercury in fish. If the total mercury concentration is below or equal to the ML for methylmercury, no further testing is required, and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the total mercury concentration is above the ML for methylmercury, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the methylmercury concentration is above the ML. The ML also applies to fresh or frozen fish intended for further processing. Countries should consider developing nationally relevant consumer advice for women of childbearing age and young children to supplement the ML.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Pink cusk eel	1.0	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity fresh or frozen (in general after removing the digestive tract)	Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for methylmercury in fish by analyzing total mercury in fish. If the total mercury concentration is below or equal to the ML for methylmercury, no further testing is required, and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the total mercury concentration is above the ML for methylmercury, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the methylmercury concentration is above the ML. The ML also applies to fresh or frozen fish intended for further processing. Countries should consider developing nationally relevant consumer advice for women of childbearing age and young children to supplement the ML.	

CCFAC24 (1992) informed CAC and CCFFP that the recommended GLs for mercury in fish referred to total mercury rather than methylmercury. CAC20 (1993) decided to maintain the GLs for methylmercury in fish as previously adopted, while recommending that the establishment of corresponding GLs for total mercury in fish be considered by CCFAC at its next meeting. CCFAC26 (1994) noted that analysis of total mercury was generally adequate to ensure that GLs for methylmercury were not exceeded and decided that the establishment of GLs for total mercury in fish was not necessary. CCFAC29 (1997) noted that CCEXEC43 (1996) had recommended that CCFAC initiate a new risk analysis on methylmercury. It was decided to defer any decision on the question of GLs based on methylmercury or total mercury until JECFA had performed the risk assessment.

JECFA53 (1999) calculated the human exposure to methylmercury in regional diets to range from 0.3-1.5 µg/kg bw/week. Nationally reported dietary exposures are in the range 0.1-2.0 µg/kg bw/week. The Committee maintained the PTWI of 3.3 µg bw for methylmercury set in the previous meetings of JECFA and recommended that methylmercury be re-evaluated in 2002 when new information on the cohort in one of the studies could be assessed and possibly other new relevant data could be available. The Committee also recommended that the nutritional benefits of fish consumption are weighted against the possibility of harm when limits on methylmercury concentrations in fish or on fish consumption are being considered.

CCFAC32 (2000) took note of these recommendations made by JECFA53.

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed that the revision of the GLs requires more comprehensive consideration by CCFAC in order to take into account all factors related to the consumption of fish, in particular, risks and benefits. In the meantime, the existing GLs can be retained with the understanding that enforcement can be performed by determination of total mercury as a screening method (for facilitating control/monitoring). Methylmercury needs only be determined for verification purposes (ALINORM 05/28/12, para. 202).

Metals**Methylmercury**

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed: to forward a request to CAC for an FAO/WHO expert consultation on health risks associated with methylmercury and dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish and health benefits of fish consumption; to postpone consideration on the need to revise the guideline levels for methylmercury in fish pending the outcome of the requested FAO/WHO consultation and to retain the current Codex guideline levels; not to start compiling data on the ratio of methylmercury to total mercury in different fish species; and to postpone discussion on the risk communication aspects of methylmercury in fish (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 191-194).

JECFA67 (2006) confirmed the PTWI of 1.6 µg/kg bw, set in 2003, based on the most sensitive toxicological end-point (developmental neurotoxicity) in the most susceptible species (humans). However, the Committee noted that life-stages other than the embryo and fetus may be less sensitive to the adverse effects of methylmercury.

The Committee considered that intakes of up to about two times higher than the existing PTWI would not pose any risk of neurotoxicity in adults, except for women of childbearing age in order to protect the embryo and fetus. Concerning infant and children up to about 17 years no firm conclusions could be drawn; it is clear that they are not more sensitive than the embryo or fetus, but may be more sensitive than adults because significant development of the brain continues in infancy and childhood. Therefore, no level of intake higher than the existing PTWI could be identified of infants and children.

The Committee recommended that:

- Known benefits of fish consumption need to be taken in consideration in any advice aimed at different populations, since fish make an important contribution to nutrition, especially in certain regional and ethnic diets. Risk managers may wish to consider whether specific advice should be given concerning children and adults after weighing the potential risks and benefits.
- Setting of guideline levels for methyl mercury in fish may not be an effective way of reducing exposure for the general population, however advice to population subgroups that may be at risk may provide an effective method for lowering the number of individuals with exposures greater than the PTWI.

CCCCF1 (2007) was informed by the WHO Representative that JECFA's conclusion with respect to guideline levels must be considered in relation to the fact that guidelines already in place in some national jurisdictions had already influenced the range of observed mercury concentrations by eliminating fish containing high concentrations of mercury from the market. The Committee reaffirmed the decision made by CCFAC38 to postpone consideration of the need to revise the guideline levels for methylmercury in fish pending the outcomes of a joint FAO/WHO expert consultation on health risks associated with methylmercury and dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish and the health benefits of fish consumption and to retain the current Codex guideline levels for the time being (ALINORM 07/30/41, paras. 34-35).

CAC30 (2007) recalled that CAC29 had requested FAO and WHO for scientific advice on the health risks associated with methylmercury and dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish and the health benefits of fish consumption. The Representative of FAO, speaking on behalf of FAO and WHO, informed the Commission that a step-wise preparatory process was being taken, given the complex nature of the issue and the need for innovative principles and methodology. The Representative indicated that, possibly at a first stage, FAO and WHO would consider conducting qualitative risk-benefit assessment of fish consumption, specifically addressing issues related to the impact of methylmercury exposure on women of child-bearing age and at a later stage, conducting quantitative assessment including the intake of dioxin and dioxin-like PCBs, taking into account consumption of fatty fish, considered as a significant source of beneficial fatty acids (ALINORM 07/30/REP, para. 192).

FAO and WHO organized an expert consultation on the risks and benefits of fish consumption, taking into consideration the health risks associated with methylmercury (MeHg), dioxin and dioxin-like PCBs (DLC) and the nutritive and health benefits of eating fish, in response to the request of CAC29 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 24). The Expert Consultation was held in January 2010. It was concluded that consumption of fish provides energy, protein, and a range of other important nutrients, including the long-chain n-3 poly

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

unsaturated fatty acids (LC n-3 PUFA), that eating fish was part of the cultural traditions of many peoples and that in some populations fish was a major source of food and essential nutrients.

The Consultation concluded that among the general adult population, consumption of fish, particularly oily fish, lowers the risk of coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality and that probable or convincing evidence of CHD risks of MeHg was absent. When considering benefits of LC n-3 PUFA vs. risks of MeHg among women of childbearing age: maternal fish consumption lowered the risk of suboptimal neurodevelopment in their offspring compared to women not eating fish in most circumstances evaluated. Among infants, young children, and adolescents, the available data were insufficient to derive a quantitative framework of health risks and benefits of eating fish. However, the Consultation stated that healthy dietary patterns that include fish and are established early in life influence dietary habits and health during adult life. To minimize risks in target populations, the Consultation recommended a series of steps that member states should take to better assess and manage the risks and benefits of fish consumption and more effectively communicate with their citizens.

CCCF5 (2011) agreed to consider the need to review the existing GLs for methylmercury in fish and predatory fish when the full report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on the Risks and Benefits of Fish Consumption becomes available.

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to the development of a discussion paper on the review of the guideline level for methylmercury in fish and predatory fish through an EWG led by Norway and co-chaired by Japan for consideration and discussion at the 7th session with the view of identification of possible actions or new work on this issue (REP12/CF, para. 174).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed that consumer advice should not be developed at the international level and that such guidance was more appropriate at the national level. It was agreed to review the GLs with a view to their revision or conversion to MLs. The Committee therefore re-established the EWG, led by Japan and co-chaired by Norway, to prepare a discussion paper; collect data on total mercury and methylmercury in fish species important in international trade in order to review the current GLs; and explore the possibility of revising the GLs or their conversion to MLs and to identify the fish for which the level or levels could apply (REP13/CF, paras. 125,126).

CCCF8 (2014) noted that there was wide support for establishment of an ML for methylmercury, and agreed that this would be the approach with the use of total mercury for screening purposes, but that further consideration was needed on an appropriate level or levels; and the fish classification would have to be further developed as proposed by the chair of the EWG. The Committee further noted that this decision did not preclude the usefulness of consumer advice and confirmed the decision of the last session of the Committee that consumer advice should be developed at the national or regional level as the advice would vary between countries because of the risk of mercury exposure from the diet would depend on, amongst others, the patterns of consumption of fish and the types of fish consumed; and that no further work would be done at the international level. The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by Japan and co-chaired Norway to develop a discussion paper to provide proposals for ML(s) for methylmercury, to express to which fish species these should apply, and to include a project document for a new work proposal for consideration by the 9th session of the Committee (REP14/CF, paras. 113-114).

CCCF9 (2015) noted that the continued support for an ML for methylmercury and agreed that further work on this should continue through the development of another discussion paper to consider expanding the ML to fish species that can accumulate high methylmercury concentrations, other than tuna and that consideration should be given to narrowing down the ML ranges. It was recognised that development of this paper would require additional data and that an exposure assessment based on different MLs should be conducted. The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Japan and co-chaired by New Zealand to prepare a discussion paper with proposals for ML for methylmercury, including a project document for consideration by the next session. (REP15/CF, paras. 125-126)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

CCCCF10 (2016) agreed that it would establish an ML for tuna, but that it was not ready at this point to submit a project document to CAC through the CCEXEC for approval of new work, as it was necessary to determine whether it was possible to establish a single ML for tuna or whether it should be set for different species of tuna, and whether it was possible and appropriate to set MLs for canned tuna.

The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by The Netherlands, and co-chaired by New Zealand and Canada to prepare a discussion paper presenting a proposal for:

- one ML for fresh and frozen tuna, or for MLs for different tuna species, if the need of differentiation is justified;
- an ML for canned tuna, if possible and appropriate, and to determine whether it should be based on occurrence data or derived from the ML(s) for fresh tuna; and
- the need for MLs for other species of fish, based on the information in CRD18 and other relevant sources, together with a project document (REP16/CF, paras. 160-161).

CCCCF11 (2017) discussed following issues:

- Whether to establish the ML for tuna as a whole or for specific tuna species, noting that it was possible to distinguish in subspecies based on methylmercury levels;
- Whether to establish MLs for other identified fish species that accumulate methylmercury;
- Whether the MLs should be based on the ALARA principle or should be guided by risk/benefit;
- Not to establish MLs for canned tuna as levels were generally low and these products were consumed in lower quantities than fresh or frozen fish; and
- Consider setting MLs based on total mercury and not methylmercury. After several discussions, the Committee agreed:
 - To establish an ML for tuna as a group, and that the subspecies of tuna taken into account for this would be indicated;
 - To establish MLs for alfonsino, kingfish/amberjack, marlin, shark, dogfish and swordfish;
 - Not to establish MLs for canned tuna;
 - To continue with the previously decided approach to establish MLs for methylmercury, while screening for total mercury;
 - To establish MLs based on the ALARA principle, which was in line with the criteria for establishing MLs in the GSCTFF; and
 - To put a footnote to the higher MLs would be developed to indicate the need for additional risk management measures, namely consumer advice, to protect health. The Committee noted that MLs should be accompanied by sampling plans and to make this clear in the project document.

The Committee agreed to start new work on MLs for fish (tuna, alfonsino, kingfish/amberjack, marlin, shark, dogfish and swordfish), to submit a project document to CAC for approval and to establish an EWG, chaired by the Netherlands, and co-chaired by Canada and New Zealand subject to approval of new work, would prepare proposals for MLs and associated sampling plans for circulation for comments and consideration by CCCC12. The Codex Secretariat would request further data on total mercury and methylmercury in fish through a CL (REP17/CF, paras. 125-143).

CAC40 (2017) approved new work on MLs for methylmercury in fish species: tuna, alfonsino, kingfish/amberjack, marlin, shark, dogfish and swordfish (REP17/CAC Appendix VI).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

CCCF12 (2018) agreed on an ML of 1.2 mg/kg for tuna as a compromise as this was based on the data of all tuna species but with a next lower rejection rate than 5%. EU, Switzerland and Norway expressed their reservation to this decision for the reasons 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 (REP 18/CF, paras. 72, 74-76). The Committee agreed with an ML of 1.5 mg/kg for alfonsino, 1.7 mg/kg for marlin and 1.6 mg/kg for shark which were the proposed MLs based on a next lower rejection rate than 5% and noted the reservation of the EU, Switzerland and Norway for the reasons given in the above (REP 18/CF, paras. 72 and 77).

CCCF12 agreed to discontinue work on the ML for Amberjack by reason that the average and median concentration of total mercury and methylmercury fall below the 0.3 mg/kg used as selection criterion for selecting fish species for setting MLs, and for swordfish on the ground that no consensus could be reached on an appropriate ML (REP 18/CF, paras. 78, 82 and 83).

CCCF12 agreed that no further testing was needed when the total mercury was equal to or less than the ML for methylmercury (REP 18/CF, para, 84).

CCCF12 agreed to retain the note attached to the current GLs, but to amend the text to indicate that the ML applied also to fresh or frozen fish intended for further processing to ensure that fish not complying with the ML would not be used for canning. CCCF noted that with this amendment, the footnote would not make the ML applicable to canned tuna which was in line with the decision made at the previous session not to set an ML for canned tuna (REP 18/CF, para, 85).

CCCF12 agreed to the option c proposed by the EWG amended to refer to “women of child-bearing age” noting the clarification from the JECFA Secretariat that the most sensitive period for negative health impacts of methylmercury is very early in foetal development and that JECFA uses the term women of child-bearing age rather than pregnant women (REP 18/CF, para, 86). The Committee noted that for future ML development, data on both methylmercury and total mercury would need to be available, as it was shown that for certain fish species the ratio of methylmercury to total mercury was very low and for the data analysis it would not always be assumed that total mercury would be mostly present as methylmercury (REP 18/CF, para, 88).

The Representative of WHO informed CCCF that discussions are ongoing in the context of Minamata Convention on Mercury on methods for monitoring for baseline data and effectiveness monitoring. For signatories to the Convention human biomonitoring is mandatory, fish monitoring has been acknowledged as an important tool and this topic would be discussed at the Conference of the Parties (COP2) in June, 2019. WHO encouraged delegates to engage with their colleagues from the environment sector and delegates to the Minamata Convention in order to make them aware of the Codex sampling plan to coordinate fish monitoring for food safety with the monitoring for effectiveness within the Minamata Convention (REP 18/CF, para, 90).

The Committee agreed to:

- i. advance the MLs for tuna, alfonsino, marlin and shark to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8
- ii. inform the Commission of discontinuation of work on ML for amberjack and swordfish;
- iii. request revocation of the GLs for methylmercury; and
- iv. send the sampling plan to CCMAS for endorsement together with the following questions.
 - The necessary performance criteria for the MLs

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

- Whether there is evidence that methyl mercury can vary widely between individual fish sampled at the same time. How this would apply to large fish sold as individual units and whether the sampling plan provides enough basis to deal with this; and
- Whether the whole fish should be analyzed or only specific fractions of edible portions. Currently only mention is made that the mid-section should be sampled for some large fish.(REP 18/CF, para. 91 and Appendix IV)

CCCF12 agreed to establish an EWG chaired by New Zealand and co-chaired by Canada to prepare a discussion paper on the establishment of MLs for additional fish species. The paper should clearly identify the fish species for which MLs should be established and include a project document with proposals for MLs for consideration by CCCF13 (REP 18/CF, paras. 92-and 93).

CAC41(2018) adopted the proposed MLs, 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, and revoked GLs for methylmercury in predatory and non-predatory fish and discontinued the work on ML for methylmercury in amberjack and sword fish (REP 18/CAC, para. 39, Appendix III, V and VII).

CCCF13 (2019) considered the recommendations of the EWG on a work program for derivation of MLs based on prioritized fish species/taxonomic grouping, but that the work was contingent on submission of further data on total mercury and methylmercury concentrations into GEMS/Food, and the proposal of the EWG Chair to postpone starting of the work and to develop a further discussion paper.

After discussion, CCCF13 agreed to request JECFA to issue a call for data and to re-establish the EWG chaired by New Zealand and co-chaired by Canada to revise the discussion paper based on new data to be submitted to GEMS/Food to consider whether it is feasible to proceed with establishment of MLs for additional fish species. The paper should clearly identify the fish species for which MLs should be established. (REP19/CF, paras. 113-127)

CCCF14 (2021) noted that there was general support to start new work for orange roughy and pink cusk eel, but in view of the lack of sufficient data for Patagonian toothfish, it was felt that further review was needed on the feasibility for setting an ML for this species. An observer, while supporting the new work, expressed the view that when setting MLs for methylmercury, consideration should also be given to selenium content in fish as research, which it had consulted, had reported that mercury is toxic because it binds to selenium enzymes, thereby preventing the enzymes' proper function, so it is the ratio of selenium to mercury in fish that determines methylmercury's toxicity and not its absolute level in fish. The JECFA Secretariat announced that FAO/WHO would be convening another expert meeting to update the risk/benefit of fish consumption which had been done around 10 years ago, and would consider the claims around selenium and if there were sufficient clinical evidence to support this, then it would be taken into account (REP21/CF, paras. 153-155)

The committee agreed to:

- submit the project document for new work on MLs for methylmercury in orange roughy and pink cusk eel to CAC44 for approval;
- discontinue the review of MLs for any other additional species;
- establish an EWG chaired by New Zealand, and co-chaired by Canada to:
 - develop MLs for orange roughy and pink cusk eel;
 - consider further data to establish the feasibility of setting an ML for Patagonian toothfish;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

c. develop the sampling plan and

d. conduct a literature review to assess the feasibility of developing guidance for the management of methylmercury in fish.

iv) request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data specific for orange roughy, pink cusk eel and all toothfish. (REP21/CF, para. 166 and Appendix VI)

CAC44 (2021) approved MLs for methylmercury in orange roughy and pink cusk eel as new work (REP21/CAC, para. 46).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to advance the MLs of 0.8 mg/kg for orange roughy and of 1.0 mg/kg for pink cusk eel (Appendix V) to CAC for adoption at Step 5/8 and abandon work on the ML for Patagonian toothfish and on a separate guidance paper for the management of methylmercury in fish (REP22/CF, paras. 106, 110 and Appendix V).

CAC45 adopted the MLs for methylmercury in orange roughy and pink cusk eel at Steps 5/8 (REP22/CAC, para. 65v).

Sampling plan

CCMAS39 (2018) did not endorse the sampling plan for MLs for methylmercury in fish and agreed to return the sampling plan to CCCF for further consideration, and to inform CCCF that CCMAS was unable to respond to the questions raised in relation to the sampling plan as the questions were outside the remit of CCMAS. The reasons CCMAS did not endorse the sampling plan are as follows:

- Performance criteria for methods of analysis of mercury and methyl mercury in the sampling plan would need to be revised according to the requirements of the Procedural Manual or should be removed from the sampling plan and replaced with a reference to the Procedural Manual.
- The measurement uncertainty, in the view of some delegations, should not be used in decision rule in Codex standards for acceptance or rejection of lots (section on Interpretation of Results); and this approach was not consistent with other sampling plans already adopted for contaminants in foods.

The Committee endorsed the performance criteria for methods of analysis for methylmercury as amended to meet the format or information currently used in the requirements and format in the Procedural Manual and in the General Standard for Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CX/CF 21/14/11) and agreed to include examples of methods which could meet the criteria. The Committee noted that this list was not exhaustive and served only as examples of methods that meet the criteria for methods for methylmercury and that countries could choose any other methods that meet the criteria (REP 18/MAS, paras. 18-19).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to consider issues related to sampling plans for methylmercury in fish through the EWG on MLs for methylmercury in fish and the findings presented for consideration at CCCF14 (REP19/CF, paras. 124-127).

CCCF14 (2021) noted the support for further work on the sampling plan following the approach proposed in Appendix III of CX/CF 21/14/11 and that further work should ensure the practicality of the sampling plan (REP21/CF, para. 164).

CCCF15 agreed to continue work on the sampling plans as outlined in CX/CF 22/15/8 and agreed that monetary value of the fish would not be included in the provisions of the sampling plans and further agreed to request information on national sampling plans through a CL and that the work of CCMAS on the revision of the General Guidelines on Sampling (CXG 50-2004) should be considered in the work on sampling plans (REP22/CF, paras. 107 and 108).

CCCF15 noted that sufficient time should be provided to gather the information on national sampling plans and that CCMAS intended completion of its work on the revision of the General Guidelines on Sampling by June 2023, CCCF agreed that the recommendations for the sampling plans would be considered at CCCF17 (2024) (REP22/CF, para. 109)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

CCCCF15 agreed to:

i) re-establish the EWG chaired by New Zealand and co-chaired by Canada to develop the sampling plan taking into account the:

- a. Recommendation of the Committee in paragraphs. 107 and 108 of REP22/CF.
- b. Work of CCMAS on the revision of the General Guidelines on Sampling (CXG 50-2004).
- c. Information from national sampling plans.

ii) request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL in 2022 for information on national sampling plans for methylmercury in fish or other contaminants in fish; and

iii) consider the work of the EWG at CCCF17 (REP22/CF, para. 112).

At CCCF17, a member proposed to advance the sampling plan to Step 5 only in order to continue work on the distribution of methylmercury in fish. The VWG Chair clarified that currently there was no data on this except for tuna and that no new data would become available in the near future, and therefore the sampling plan should be advanced for final adoption (REP24/CF, para. 66).

Further points of clarification were requested as follows (REP24/CF, para. 67):

- Whether representative sample referred to the size of a sample, the frequency of the sample or the sample that is mixed before analysis. It was clarified that representative sample referred to taking the correct amount of sample from each size or weight class/category weight from appropriate lots or sublots.
- Whether the sampling plan should be for tuna only in view of the data used. It was clarified that the sampling plan was drafted on the basis of available national sampling plans or national guidance from the seafood industry for methylmercury in fish in general and was therefore applicable to all fish.

CCCCF noted an observation that it was important to gain experience on using the sampling plan and that in future CCCF could come back with a revision/amendment if needed (REP24/CF, para. 68).

CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 69):

(i) forward the sampling plan (Appendix III) to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8; and

(ii) send the sampling plan to CCMAS43 for endorsement.

CCMAS43 (2024)

i. endorsed the Sampling Plan as outlined in CX/MAS 24/43/3 Add.1 Appendix I) with a revised definition of the “Decision Rule.”

ii. agreed to inform CCCF of the revised definition of “decision rule” as follows:

The lot is accepted if the test result is less than or equal to the Codex maximum level (ML); otherwise, the lot is rejected.

iii. integration of the numeric performance criteria for methyl mercury and total mercury in the sampling plan into the numeric performance criteria table developed in the fish and fishery product workable package for inclusion in CXS 234. (REP 24/MAS, para. 12)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

CAC47 (2024) adopted:

ii the amended sampling plan for methylmercury in fish for inclusion in the General standard for contaminants and toxins in food and feed (CXS 193-1995). (REP24/CAC, para. 90 and Appendix II)

Methylmercury is the most toxic form of mercury and is formed in aquatic environments. Methylmercury therefore is found mainly in aquatic organisms. It can accumulate in the food chain; the levels in large predatory fish species are therefore higher than in other species and fish is the predominant source of human exposure to methylmercury. Methylmercury and also total mercury levels in terrestrial animals and plants are usually very low; the use of fish meal as animal feed can however also lead to higher methylmercury levels in other animal products.

In all experimental animal species evaluated, methylmercury was readily absorbed (up to 95%) after oral exposure. Methylmercury crossed both the blood–brain barrier and the placenta effectively, resulting in higher concentrations of mercury in the brain of the fetus than of the mother. Methylmercury is eliminated mainly via the bile and faeces, neonatal animals having a lower excretory capacity than adults. Methylmercury is toxic to the nervous system, kidney, liver and reproductive organs, neurotoxicity being the most sensitive end- point (WHO Food additives Series 52; 2004).

Metals**Methylmercury**

Annex

SAMPLING PLAN FOR METHYLMERCURY CONTAMINATION IN FISH**GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS****DEFINITION**

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings. A lot of whole fish should consist of one species and the length and/or weight should be comparable. In case the length and/or weight of the fish is not comparable, the consignment may still be considered as a lot, but a specific sampling procedure has to be applied (as described in paragraph 8).
Sublot	Designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sub-lot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	A procedure for sampling of food from a certain lot with a view of a specific chemical analysis of that lot, in order to ensure that the sample that is taken, is representative for the concentration of the concerned chemical within the lot.
Methylmercury test procedure	A methylmercury test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and methylmercury quantification. It contains an accept/reject level.
Decision rule	The lot is accepted if the test result is less than or equal to the Codex maximum level (ML); otherwise, the lot is rejected.
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sub-lot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sub-lot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined. The entire aggregate sample should be comminuted in a mill.
Laboratory sample	A sample intended for the laboratory, which consists out of a comminuted quantity of fish muscle, or whole fish. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample(s), the laboratory sample(s) should be removed in a random manner from the homogenised aggregate sample.
Test portion	A randomly removed portion of the comminuted laboratory sample for the extraction of the methylmercury for chemical analysis.

MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED

1. Each lot or sub-lot which is to be examined must be sampled separately.
2. Fresh or frozen whole (in general after removing digestive tract) or dressed fish (eviscerated fish with head and tail removed) and other non-bulk fishery products of lots greater than or equal to 15 metric tons (MT) should be subdivided into sub-lots of 15-30 MT in accordance with Table 2.
3. Lots of fishery products traded as bulk commodities of greater than 100 MT should be subdivided into sub-lots in accordance with Table 1 to be sampled separately.

Metals**Methylmercury****Table 1. Subdivision of sub-lots according to bulk consignment lot weight**

Commodity	Lot weight (MT ^a)	Weight or number of sub-lots (MT)
Fishery products (traded as bulk consignments)	≥ 1500	500
	> 300 and <1500	3 sub-lots (minimum 100 MT)
	≥ 100 and ≤300	100
	< 100	-

^a1 metric tonne (MT) = 1000 kilograms**Table 2. Subdivision of sublots according to other products lot weight**

Commodity	Lot weight (MT ^a)	Weight or number of sub-lots (MT)
Fish (traded as non-bulk consignments)	≥ 15	15-30
	< 15	-

^a1 metric tonne (MT) = 1000 kilograms

4. Taking into account that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of the weight of the sub-lots, the weight of the sub-lot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 20 %.

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

5. The recommended minimum number of incremental samples taken from the lot or sub-lot is dependent on the size of the lot or sub-lot as specified in Table 3.
6. The aggregate sample should contain a quantity of sample of at least 1 kilogram. The minimum weight of the incremental sample should be determined by dividing 1 kilogram by the required number of incremental samples as listed in Table 3. Incremental samples taken from a lot or sub-lot should be of comparable weight.

Table 3. Number of incremental samples to be taken depending on the weight of the lot or subplot

Lot weight (MT ^a)	Number of incremental samples	Minimum laboratory sample weight (kg)
≤ 0.05	3	1
> 0.05 - ≤ 0.5	5	1
> 0.5	10	1

^a1 metric tonne (MT) = 1000 kilograms

7. Whole fish are considered to be of comparable length and weight class where the differences in size and/or weight do not exceed about 50%.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

8. For lots where fish are not of comparable length and/or weight the following approaches are to be applied to taking the incremental samples:
- Where a length or weight class/category is predominant (80% or more of the fish lot or sub-lot are within the same length and/or weight class), the aggregate sample is combined only from incremental samples of fish within the predominant category and outliers are excluded. This aggregate sample is to be considered as being representative for the whole lot/sub-lot.
 - Where there is no predominant weight or size class and where the overall length and/or weight of the fish present in the lot or sub-lot varies by more than 50% but less than 100%, the lot or sub-lot is separated into two length or weight classes and separate aggregate samples are composited from incremental samples taken independently from each length and/or weight class.
 - Where there is no predominant weight or size class and where the overall length and/or weight of the fishes present in the lot differ more than 100%, the lot or sub-lot is separated into three length or weight classes and separate aggregate samples are composited from incremental samples taken independently from each length or weight class.
9. For lots or sub-lots of whole fish the part of the fish where the incremental sample is taken is informed by the weight of the whole fish as specified in Table 3. Some examples on sampling of batches of fishes of different size and/or weight can be found in Annex II.

Table 4. Tissue area the incremental sample is taken from for whole fish based on weight classes

Weight class of an individual whole fish	Sampled part
< 1 kg	Whole fish (after removing the digestive tract) For lots of 0.05MT or greater where the aggregate sample would exceed 3 kg the midline (halfway between the gill opening and the anus) strip from backbone to belly can be sampled
1-6 kg	Midline (halfway between the gill opening and the anus) strip from backbone to belly
> 6 kg	Midline (halfway between the gill opening and the anus) strip from backbone to belly Alternatively, equal composite parts of muscle from behind the head and close to the tail can be sampled For tuna, incremental samples can instead be taken from the muscle from close to the tail.

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

10. Each laboratory sample should be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, loss of analytes by adsorption to the internal wall of the container and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions, for example temperature control and storage in airtight containers, should be taken to avoid any change in composition of the sample which might arise during transportation or storage (for example avoiding excess heat or the sample drying out).

SEALING AND LABELLING OF SAMPLES

11. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sample, permitting each lot, or sub-lot, to be clearly identified and giving the date and place the sampling occurred, together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

SAMPLE PREPARATION PRECAUTIONS

12. In the course of sampling, precautions, such as correct-sampling technique and limitation of cross contamination, should be taken to avoid any changes which would affect the levels of methylmercury, adversely affect the analytical determination, or make the aggregate samples unrepresentative.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Methylmercury**

13. Wherever possible, apparatus and equipment coming into contact with the sample should not contain mercury and should be made of inert materials, e.g. plastics such as polypropylene, polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) etc. These should be acid cleaned to minimise the risk of contamination. High quality stainless steel may be used for cutting edges to take increment samples and make comminuted samples.

HOMOGENIZATION – GRINDING

14. The complete aggregate sample should be finely comminuted and thoroughly mixed using a process that has been demonstrated to achieve complete homogenization. Depending on the equipment available frozen samples may need to be thawed prior to homogenisation.

TEST PORTION

15. Procedures for selecting the test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. Following homogenization and thorough mixing, the test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
16. It is suggested that three test portions be selected from each comminuted laboratory sample. The three test portions will be used for enforcement, appeal, and confirmation if needed.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

17. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The performance criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific method. Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.
18. Refer to The Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for principles for the establishment of methods of analysis.
19. Method performance criteria for methylmercury and total mercury are detailed for the species of fish for which there are Codex MLs in Annex I.
20. Countries or importers may decide to use their own screening when applying the ML for methylmercury in fish by analysing total mercury in fish. If the total mercury concentration is below or equal to the ML for methylmercury, no further testing is required, and the sample is determined to be compliant with the ML. If the total mercury concentration is above the ML for methylmercury, follow-up testing shall be conducted to determine if the methylmercury concentration is above the ML.

RECONDITIONING LOTS/SUB-LOTS

21. A lot or sub-lot where fish are not of comparable length and/or weight that is separated into 2 to 3 length and/or weight classes should be analysed sequentially from the largest class first.
22. A lot or sub-lot where fish are not of comparable length and/or weight can be considered in compliance with the ML if the methylmercury concentration of the aggregate sample taken from the highest length and/or weight class is below the ML. However, export or trade requirements (e.g. certificates of analysis) may require testing lots or sub-lots of smaller length and/or weight classes.
23. Where the methylmercury concentration in the aggregate sample taken from a length and/or weight class is above the ML then the next largest length/weight class should also be analysed. If the methylmercury concentration in this sample is below the ML the lot or sub-lot can be reconditioned to remove length and/or weight classes that exceed the ML to ensure the remaining fish are in compliance with the ML.
24. For a lot or sub-lot separated into three length or weight classes paragraph 23 should be repeated for the smallest length/weight classes if the methylmercury concentration in the aggregate sample taken from the middle length/weight class is also above the ML.

Metals**Methylmercury****ANNEX I****Method performance criteria for methylmercury and total mercury in fish**

Species	ML (mg/kg)	LOD (mg/kg)	LOQ (mg/kg)	Precision (%)	Recovery (%)	Minimum applicable range (mg/kg)
Alfonsino	1.5	≤ 0.15	≤ 0.30	≤ 30	80-110	0.82 - 2.2
Marlin (all species)	1.7	≤ 0.17	≤ 0.34	≤ 30	80-110	0.95 – 2.5
Orange roughy	0.8	≤ 0.08	≤ 0.16	≤ 33	80-110	0.35- 1.04
Pink cusk-eel	1.0	≤0.10	≤ 0.20	≤ 32	80-110	0.52 – 1.5
Shark (all species)	1.6	≤ 0.16	≤ 0.32	≤ 30	80-110	0.88 - 2.3
Tuna (all species)	1.2	≤ 0.12	≤ 0.24	≤ 31	80-110	0.64 – 1.8

Metals**Methylmercury****ANNEX II****Examples on how to apply provisions in the Sampling Plan****EXAMPLE 1**

In case the size and/or weight of the fishes present in the lot differs more than 50 % but less than 100 %: two separate representative samples are taken from each size or weight class/category within a lot.

Example: 5 MT lot of fishes with weights from 2 kg to 3.5 kg.

A first aggregate sample is taken of the smaller sized (lot relative) fishes, which weigh about 2-2.75 kg: 10 incremental samples (fishes) are taken. Each incremental sample is constituted from the muscle meat of the middle part of the fish (slice backbone to belly, symmetrically taken around line B in Figure 1) and weighs about 100 grams. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg to be homogenised and analysed separately.

A second aggregate sample is taken of the larger sized (lot relative) fishes, which weigh about 2.75 -3.5 kg: 10 incremental samples (fishes) are taken. Each incremental sample is constituted from the muscle meat of the middle part of the fish (slice backbone to belly, symmetrically taken around line B in Figure 1) and weighs about 100 grams. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg to be homogenised and analysed separately.




Figure 1: The different sections of a fish.

A) Laboratory performs a sequential analysis:

First the sample of the larger sized fishes is homogenised and analysed separately.

- In case the analytical result is compliant, the whole lot is compliant.
- In case the analytical result is non-compliant, as a second step the sample of the smaller sized fishes is homogenised and analysed separately.
- In case the analytical result of the sample of the smaller sized fishes is non-compliant, the whole lot is non-compliant.
- In case the analytical result of the sample of smaller sized fishes is compliant, then the smaller sized fishes (2- 2.75 kg) have to be sorted out and these fishes are compliant. The remaining larger sized fishes (2.75- 3.5 kg) are non-compliant.

B) Laboratory analyses both samples at the same time:

- In case both analytical results are compliant, the whole lot is compliant.
- In case both analytical results are non-compliant, the whole lot is non-compliant.
- In case the sample of the smaller sized fishes (2-2.75 kg) is compliant and the sample of the larger sized fishes (2.75-3.5 kg) not, then the smaller sized fishes (2-2.75 kg) have to be sorted out and these small sized fishes are compliant. The remaining larger sized fishes (2.75-3.5 kg) are non-compliant.

Metals**Methylmercury****EXAMPLE 2**

In case the size and/or weight of the fishes present in the lot differs more than 100%: three separate representative samples are taken from each size or weight class/category within a lot

Example: 10 MT lot of fishes with weights from 2 kg to 8 kg.

A first aggregate sample is taken of the smaller sized (lot relative) fishes, which weigh about 2-4 kg: 10 incremental samples (fishes) are taken, each incremental sample is constituted from the muscle meat of the middle part of the fish (slice backbone to belly, symmetrically taken around line B in Figure 1) and weighs about 100 grams. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg, to be homogenised and analysed separately.

A second aggregate sample is taken of the fishes of medium size (lot relative) of about 4-6 kg: 10 incremental samples (fishes) are taken, each incremental sample is constituted from the muscle meat of the middle part of the fish (slice backbone to belly) and weighs about 100 grams. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg, to be homogenised and analysed separately.

A third aggregate sample is taken of the larger sized (lot relative) fishes of about 6-8 kg: 10 incremental samples (fishes) are taken, each incremental sample is

- constituted of the right side dorso-lateral muscle meat in the middle part of the fish (symmetrically around line B in Figure 1 and above the horizontal line in Figure 1) and weighs about 100 grams. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg to be homogenised and analysed separately.

OR

- constituted of equal parts of 50 grams of the muscled meat close to the tail part (the region around line C in Figure 1) and the muscle meat close to the head part of one fish (the region of line A in Figure 1) which are combined to form an incremental sample of about 100 grams per fish. This results in one aggregate sample of about 1 kg to be homogenised and analysed separately.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Tin**

Reference to JECFA:	10 (1966), 14 (1970), 15 (1971), 19 (1975), 22 (1978), 26(1982), 33(1988), 55 (2000), 64 (2005)
Toxicological guidance value:	PTWI 14 mg/kg bw (1988, Expressed as Sn; includes tin from food additive uses; maintained in 2000)
Contaminant definition:	Tin, total (Sn-tot) when not otherwise mentioned; inorganic tin (Sn-in); or other specification
Synonyms:	Sn
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Inorganic Tin Contamination in Canned Foods (CXC 60-2005) Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Canned foods (other than beverages)	250	Adopted	2007	FAC, CF		The ML does not apply to non-tinplate canned cooked cured chopped meat, cooked cured ham, cooked cured pork shoulder, corned beef and luncheon meat. Relevant Codex commodity standards include CXS 62-1981, CXS 254-2007, CXS 296-2009, CXS 242-2003, CXS 297-2009, CXS 78-1981, CXS 159-1987, CXS 42-1981, CXS 60-1981, CXS 99-1981, CXS 160-1987, CXS 66-1981, CXS 13-1981, CXS 115-1981, CXS 57-1981, CXS 145-1981, CXS 98-1981, CXS 96-1981, CXS 97-1981, CXS 88-1981, CXS 89-1981	1)
Canned beverages	150	Adopted	2007	FAC, CF		Relevant Codex commodity standards include CXS 247-2005.	
Cooked cured chopped meat	50	Adopted	CXS 98-1981	PMPP		The ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 98-1981.	
Cooked cured ham	50	Adopted	CXS 96-1981	PMPP		The ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 96-1981.	
Cooked cured pork shoulder	50	Adopted	CXS 97-1981	PMPP		The ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 97-1981.	
Corned beef	50	Adopted	CXS 88-1981	PMPP		The ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 88-1981.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Tin**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCC
Luncheon meat	50	Adopted	CXS 89-1981	PMPP		The ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 89-1981.	

- 1) Reference to CXS 159-1987 and CXS 42-1981 are still retained in the current GSCTFF though those were superseded by or incorporated into CXS 319-2015. CXS 3-1981, CXS 17-1981, CXS 37-1991, CXS 70-1981, CXS 73-1981, CXS 90-1981, CXS 94-1981, CXS 119-1981, CXS 241-2003 and CXS 319-2015 are not listed in the current GSCTFF as relevant Codex commodity standards though these are CXSs for canned foods.

In previous JECFA meetings it was noted that inorganic tin compounds generally have low systemic toxicity in animals, because of limited absorption from the gastrointestinal tract, low accumulation in tissues, and rapid passage through the gastrointestinal tract. Insoluble tin compounds are less toxic than soluble tin salts.

JECFA33 (1988) established a PTWI for inorganic tin of 14 mg/kg bw.

At JECFA55 (2000), it was concluded that the acute toxicity of inorganic tin in animals and humans results from irritation of the mucosa of the gastrointestinal tract, which may lead to vomiting, diarrhea, anorexia, depression, ataxia, and muscular weakness. There was insufficient data available to establish an ARfD for inorganic tin. The committee did not consider studies on organic tin compounds, since it had concluded at JECFA22 (1978), that these compounds differ considerably from inorganic tin compounds with respect to toxicity and should be considered separately. The Committee maintained the existing PTWI and reiterated that limited human data available indicated that concentrations of 150mg/kg tin in canned beverages and 250 mg/kg in other canned foods may produce acute manifestations of gastric irritation in certain individuals. This is considered to be a reversible effect however, which may occur in a limited number of sensitive subject only.

Following the discussions in CCFAC34 (2002) and in CCFAC35 (2003) (ALINORM 03/12, para.146 and ALINORM 03/12A, para.160), the proposed MLs were repeatedly returned to Step 3. CCFAC35 changed the terminology of the commodities to which the proposed draft MLs apply, which previously was "liquid canned foods resp. solid foods", to "canned beverages" and "canned foods other than beverages". The Committee decided to ask JECFA to evaluate current tin level in canned foods and to determine an acute reference dose; it was noted that new data would become available. CCFAC36 (2004) decided to hold the proposed MLs and reconsider these MLs in the light of JECFA64 re-evaluation (ALINORM 04/27/12, para.171).

JECFA64 (2005) concluded that the data available indicated that it is inappropriate to establish an ARfD for inorganic tin since whether or not irritation of gastrointestinal tract occur after ingestion of a food containing tin depends on the concentration and nature of in the product, rather than on the dose ingested on a body-weight basis.

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to circulate the proposed MLs for comments at Step 3 (ALINORM 05/28/12, para.163). CCFAC38 (2006) forwarded the proposed draft MLs to Step 5 (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.183). CAC29 adopted the proposed draft MLs and advanced it to Step 6 (ALINORM 06/29/41 para.106).

CCCCF1 (2007) agreed to forward the draft MLs to CAC30 for adoption at Step 8 and noted that the adoption of the ML for tin in canned foods (other than beverages) would result in consequential changes to MLs for tin in certain canned products (i.e. products in tin-layered cans), currently included in Schedule I (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 81).

CAC30 (2007) adopted these MLs at Step 8 with the understanding that the existing MLs for tin in certain canned foods included in Schedule I of the GSCTF would be replaced by the adopted MLs (ALINORM 07/30/REP).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Metals**Tin**

Tin is mainly used in tinned containers, but it is also extensively used in solders, in alloys including dental amalgams. Inorganic tin compounds, in which the element may be present in the oxidation states of +2 or +4, are used in a variety of industrial processes for the strengthening of glass, as a base for colours, as catalysts, as stabilizers in perfumes and soaps, and as dental anticariogenic agents. On the whole, contamination of the environment by tin is only slight. Food is the main source of tin for man. Small amounts are found in fresh meat, cereals, and vegetables. Larger amounts of tin may be found in foods stored in plain cans and, occasionally, in foods stored in lacquered cans. Some foods such as asparagus, tomatoes, fruits, and their juices tend to contain high concentrations of tin if stored in unlacquered cans (Environmental health criteria for tin; International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS); 1980). Inorganic tin is found in food in the +2 and +4 oxidation states; it may occur in a cationic form (stannous and stannic compounds) or as inorganic anions (stannites or stannates).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Reference to JECFA:	31 (1987), 46 (1996), 49 (1997), 68 (2007), 83 (2016)
Toxicological guidance value:	Carcinogenic potency estimates for aflatoxins B, G, M (1997, Intake should be reduced to levels as low as reasonably possible.)
Contaminant definition:	Aflatoxins total (B ₁ + B ₂ + G ₁ + G ₂)
Synonyms:	Abbreviations, AFB, AFG, with numbers, to designate specific compounds
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Tree Nuts (CXC 59-2005) Code of Practice for the Reduction of Aflatoxin B ₁ in Raw Materials and Supplemental Feeding stuffs for Milk Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Dried Figs (CXC 65-2008) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017) Code of Practice for Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cassava and cassava-based products (CXC 82-2023)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Almonds	15	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to almonds intended for further processing (*). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0660 1) CX/CF 25/18/16
Almonds	10	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to almonds "ready-to-eat" (**). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0660 CX/CF 25/18/16
Brazil nuts	15	Adopted	2010	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to shelled Brazil nuts intended for further processing (*). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	1) CX/CF 25/18/16
Brazil nuts	10	Adopted	2010	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to shelled Brazil nuts ready-to-eat (**). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	CX/CF 25/18/16
Hazelnuts	15	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to hazelnuts, also known as filberts, intended for further processing (*). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0666 1) CX/CF 25/18/16
Hazelnuts	10	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to hazelnuts, also known as filberts, "ready-to-eat" (**). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0666 CX/CF 25/18/16

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Peanuts	15	Adopted	1999	FAC	Unless specified, seed or kernels, after removal of shell or husk.	The ML applies for peanuts, also as known as groundnuts, intended for further processing (*). For sampling plan, see Annex 1. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 200-1995]	SO 0697 1) CX/CF 25/18/16
Peanuts	No specific value proposed	4		CF		The ML applies to peanuts labelled as “ready to eat”	CX/CF 25/18/8
Pistachios	15	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to pistachios intended for further processing (*). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0675 1) CX/CF 25/18/16
Pistachios	10	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity after removal of shell.	The ML applies to pistachios “ready-to-eat” (**). For sampling plan, see Annex 2.	TN 0675 CX/CF 25/18/16
Dried figs	10	Adopted	2012	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to dried figs “ready-to-eat” (**). For sampling plan see Annex 3.	DF 0297 CX/CF 25/18/16
Chili pepper, Nutmeg	20	Adopted	2023	CF	Whole/Powder/Crushed/Ground	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 352-2022 and CXS 353-2022. The ML applies to spices (dried/dry).	Sampling plan CX/CF 25/18/7
Maize grain, destinated for further processing	15	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	“Destined for further processing” means intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of AFs before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption. Codex members may define the processes that have been shown to reduce levels. The ML does not apply to maize destined to animal feed or wet milling. (For sampling plan see Annex 4.) [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 153-1985]	CX/CF 25/18/2
Flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize	10	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	[Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 154-1985 and CXS 155-1985]	CX/CF 25/18/2

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Husked rice	20	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	[Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 198-1995]	CX/CF 25/18/2
Polished rice	5	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	[Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 198-1995]	CX/CF 25/18/2
Sorghum grain, destined for further processing	10	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity	“Destined for further processing” means intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of AFs before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption. Codex members may define the processes that have been shown to reduce levels. (For sampling plan see Annex 4.) [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 172-1989]	CX/CF 25/18/2
Cereal-based food for infants and young children	5	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 74-1981. The ML applies to all cereal-based foods intended for infants (up to 12 months) and young children (12 to 36 months). (For sampling plan see Annex 4.)	CX/CF 25/18/2
Cereal-based food for infants and young children	10	Adopted	2022	CF	Whole commodity as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption.	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 74-1981. The ML applies to cereal-based foods destined for food aid programs intended for infants (6 to 12 months) and young children (12 to 36 months). (For sampling plan see Annex 4.)	CX/CF 25/18/2

(*) “destined for further processing” means intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption. Processes that have proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins are shelling, blanching followed by colour sorting, and sorting by specific gravity and colour (damage). There is some evidence that roasting reduces aflatoxins in pistachios but for other nuts the evidence is still to be supplied.

(**) “ready-to-eat” means “not intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins before being used as ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption.

- 1) For almonds, Brazil nuts, hazelnuts and pistachios, the wording of “intended for further processing” is used in the Notes/Remarks columns in the current GSCTFF instead of the wording of “destined for further processing”. This inconsistency should be amended in future.

CCFAC23 (1991) decided to discontinue the development of a ML for aflatoxins in foods in general, and to discuss the problems on a commodity basis.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CCCP19 (1994) decided not to proceed with the proposed GL for processed peanuts and to advance the proposed GL for raw peanuts (intended for further processing), associated with a specific sampling plan because the contamination is usually very inhomogeneous in a lot. It is assumed that raw peanuts are the major commodity in international trade.

It is acknowledged that for primary plant products the aflatoxin contamination is often not homogeneous, and a sampling plan is necessary to assure reasonable application of MLs. A general position paper on aflatoxins in food and feeds (CX/FAC 97/16) was presented to CCFAC29 (1997).

- Maize was included in a Technical Consultation on sampling plans for aflatoxins in commodities. See FAO Food and nutrition Paper 55 (Rome, 1993).
- CCFAC26 (1994) decided to discontinue the establishment of GLs for AFB₁ in supplementary feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (previously proposed at the level of 5 µg/kg), based on the assumption that the relationship between aflatoxins in milk and feeds is not (completely) clear and that there is not much international trade in (composite) supplementary feedingstuffs. International trade mostly is in the form of individual commodities which can be used as feed components in various quantities, directed to other feed uses than milk producing animals, or to other uses in general, or be decontaminated etc.

Therefore, a Code of practice for the reduction of aflatoxin B₁ in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals was developed and adopted as CXC 45-1997.

CCFAC35 (2003) agreed to the elaboration of MLs for aflatoxins in almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios, based on the ALARA principle and with the understanding that related sampling plans need to be established (ALINORM 03/12A para.129). CCFAC37 (2005) advanced the ML for unprocessed almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios while the Committee decided to circulate for comments at Step 3 the ML for processed almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios (ALINORM 05/28/12 para.141).

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to rename “processed” and “unprocessed” tree nuts to as “ready-to-eat” and tree nuts “for further processing” respectively and to hold at Step 7 the ML in tree nuts for further processing and to advance to Step 5 the ML in ready-to-eat tree nuts (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.132).

CAC29 (2006) adopted ML for ready-to-eat tree nuts at Step 5.

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to request JECFA to conduct a dietary exposure assessment on ready-to-eat tree nuts and impact on exposure taking into account hypothetical levels of 4, 8, 10 and 15 µg/kg, putting in the context of exposure from other sources and previous exposure assessments on maize and groundnuts. The Committee decided to expand the discussion paper on the aflatoxin level in ready-to-eat tree nuts, considering i) the detailed data on distribution on aflatoxins between lots, ii) consumer health risk assessment of different levels of aflatoxin in ready-to-eat tree nuts, iii) sampling plan for tree nuts, iv) effect of the COP and v) terminology of “ready-to-eat” and “for further processing” for consideration at CCCF1 (ALINORM 06/29/12 paras. 129-130).

CCFAC38 agreed to further elaborate the proposed draft sampling plan once a ML had been established by Committee and to include considerations on the draft sampling plan for tree nuts in the discussion paper on total aflatoxin levels in processed tree-nuts (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.125).

CCCF1 (2007) agreed that the proposed draft Sampling Plan for Aflatoxin Contamination in Almonds, Brazil Nuts, Hazelnuts and Pistachios be returned to Step 2 for redrafting by an EWG, with a view to circulation at Step 3 and consideration at Step 4 at the next session of CCCF. It was also agreed that the working document to be considered at the next session of CCCF incorporate a revised proposed draft Sampling Plan as well as an explanatory text in support of the consideration of the Sampling Plan (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 62).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

JECFA68 (2007) concluded that consumption of almonds, Brazil nuts, hazelnuts, pistachios and dried figs contributes to more than 5% of the total aflatoxin dietary exposure in only five of the 13 GEMS/Food cluster diets (clusters B, C, D, E and M). Setting an ML of 20 µg/kg for these products would only have an impact on the relative contribution to aflatoxin dietary exposure in these clusters (including the high-level consumers of tree nuts). This can solely be attributed to the elevated aflatoxin level in pistachios. For the tree nuts other than pistachios, as well as dried figs, setting an ML has no effect on aflatoxin dietary exposure. Also, enforcing an ML of 4, 8, 10 or 15 µg/kg has little further impact on the overall dietary exposure to aflatoxin compared to an ML of 20 µg/kg.

CCCCF2 (2008) forwarded the MLs for Total Aflatoxins in Almonds, Hazelnuts and Pistachios “For further processing” and “Ready-to-eat” to CAC31 for adoption at Step 8 and the Sampling Plans for Aflatoxin Contamination in Ready-to-eat Treenuts and Treenuts Destined for Further Processing: Almonds, Hazelnuts and Pistachios for adoption at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 127 and 142, and Appendix VIII and IX). CAC31 (2008) adopted the MLs as such (ALINORM 08/31/REP, Appendix VII).

CCCCF8 (2014) agreed to amend the definition for tree nuts “ready-to-eat” and dried figs “ready-to-eat” to provide further clarification on the description of the products they apply to and that this definition would also apply to peanuts (REP14/CF, para. 91). The Committee also agreed to add the assessments of aflatoxins, already evaluated by JECFA, to the priority list. An update of the risk assessment of aflatoxins may be desirable in view of additional data that have become available since the last full assessment by JECFA. The Committee agreed that the risk assessment of aflatoxins would not be a high priority. (REP14/CF, paras. 129-130, Appendix XIII)

JECFA83 (2016) updated the aflatoxin risk assessment at the request of CCCC. The Committee also evaluated co-exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins.

The Committee noted that there were limited contamination data from developing countries, which hindered a more comprehensive and global evaluation of aflatoxin occurrence and may have resulted in an underestimate of dietary exposure in these countries. Only five food commodities (maize, peanuts, rice, sorghum and wheat) each contribute more than 10% to international dietary exposure estimates for more than one GEMS/Food cluster diets, for either total aflatoxins (AFT) or AFB₁. Although overall concentrations of aflatoxins in rice and wheat are lower than concentrations in maize and groundnuts (a traditional focus for aflatoxin risk management), the high consumption of rice and wheat in some countries means that these cereals may account for up to 80% of dietary aflatoxin exposure for those GEMS/Food cluster diets.

Mean AFB₁ concentrations in sorghum from the GEMS/Food contaminants database are higher than those for maize; combined with high consumption levels of sorghum in some GEMS/Food clusters, this cereal contributes 16–59% of dietary exposure in six GEMS/Food clusters. The database on sorghum is considerably more limited than that on maize. The Committee did not assess acute dietary exposure, but noted that the estimates of chronic dietary exposure are at least 2–5 orders of magnitude lower than the doses associated with acute effects.

The Committee calculated global aflatoxin-related hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) risk based on the new central and upper-bound cancer potency estimates from the current dose–response analysis and international dietary exposures estimated at the current meeting. Aflatoxin-related cancer rates were calculated, accounting for prevalence of chronic HBsAg positivity, by GEMS/Food clusters. The low end of the range refers to lower-bound estimates at the mean dietary AFB₁ exposure, minimum HBsAg+ rates for countries in the cluster and the central cancer potency estimate. The high end of the range refers to upper-bound estimates at the 90th percentile of dietary AFB₁ exposure, maximum HBsAg+ rates for countries in the cluster and upper bound estimates of cancer potency. The lowest cancer risks were estimated for clusters G07 and G08 (European and other developed countries), with cancer risk estimates in the range <0.01–0.10 aflatoxin-induced cancers per year per 100 000 population, with wheat being the major contributing food commodity. For countries within these clusters, HBsAg+ rates were in the range 0.01–1.2%. The highest cancer risks were for cluster G13 (sub-Saharan African countries and Haiti), with cancer risk estimates in the range 0.21–3.94 aflatoxin-induced cancers per year per 100 000 population, with sorghum and maize being the major contributing food commodities. For countries within this cluster, HBsAg+ rates were in the range 5.2–19%. Other clusters with relatively high cancer risks were G03 (sub-Saharan African countries and Paraguay, with maize and sorghum being the major contributing food commodities), G05 (mainly Central and South American countries, with maize, rice,

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

sorghum and wheat being the major contributing food commodities) and G16 (sub-Saharan African countries, with maize and sorghum being the major contributing food commodities). (JECFA/83/SC).

At the request of CCCF, the Committee also evaluated co-exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins. The Committee concluded that there are few data available to support co-exposure as a contributing factor in human disease. However, the interaction between AFB₁, a compound with known genotoxic properties, and fumonisins, which have the potential to induce regenerative cell proliferation (particularly at exposures above the PMTDI), remains a concern. This is due to the fact that the incidences of chronic liver disease and stunting are high in the areas of the world where the exposures to both mycotoxins are high and the co-exposure has been confirmed with biomarkers.

Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in tree nuts – Brazil nuts

CCFAC38 agreed to forward the proposed draft Appendix to the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxins contamination in tree nuts – additional measures for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxins in Brazil nuts to CAC29 for adoption at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 06/29/12 para. 123). CAC29 endorsed this decision (ALINORM 06/29/41, Appendix IV).

CCCF3 noted that after the completion of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) project SafeNut which addressed the factors causing aflatoxin contamination in the Brazil nut production chain and the methods of control available, it appeared that an updating of the provisions on Brazil nuts in the COP was necessary in order to take into account the findings of the project. The Committee agreed to initiate new work on the revision of the Code to incorporate additional measures for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in Brazil nuts. It was further agreed that the Proposed Draft Revision prepared by Brazil would be circulated for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next session (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 121 and 123, Appendix IX). The proposal of new work was subsequently endorsed by CAC32 (ALINORM 09/32/REP, Appendix VI).

CCCF4 (2010) agreed to forward the proposed draft revision to CAC33 (2010) for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6 and 7). CAC33 adopted these revisions at Step 8 (ALINORM 10/33/REP, Appendix III).

Maximum Levels in Brazil Nuts

CCCF1 agreed that the discussion paper on aflatoxin contamination in Brazil nuts would be updated by the Brazil, incorporating additional data that would become available on the contribution of the shell to aflatoxin contamination of Brazil nuts, for consideration at the next session of the Committee (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 66).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to start new work on a Maximum Level for Total Aflatoxins in Brazil Nuts (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 147).

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to return the Proposed Draft Maximum Levels to Step 2/3 for redrafting by the Brazil for comments and consideration by the next session (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 78).

CCCF4 (2010) agreed to forward the proposed MLs for Shelled, ready to eat Brazil Nuts and Shelled, destined for further processing Brazil Nuts (including sampling plans) to CAC33 for adoption at Step 5/8 with omission of Steps 6 and 7 and not to set any maximum level for in-shell Brazil nuts (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 74 and 76, Appendix V). CAC33 adopted the MLs at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 10/33/REP, Appendix III).

Code of practice for dried figs

CCCF1 (2007) agreed to forward the project document proposing new work on a Code of practice for aflatoxins in dried figs to CCEXEC59 for critical review and for approval by CAC30. It was also agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a draft proposed Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in dried figs at Step 2,

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

with a view to its circulation for comments at Step 3 and its consideration at Step 4 at the second session, pending the formal approval of new work by the Commission (ALINORM 07/30/41, paras. 120-121). CAC30 (2007) approved the above new work (ALINORM 07/30/REP, Appendix VII).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the proposed draft COP to CAC31 for adoption at Step 5/8 with the recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7 (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 163 and Appendix XI). CAC31 adopted the Code at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 08/31/REP, Appendix VII).

Maximum levels in dried figs

CCCF4 (2010) agreed to initiate new work on maximum levels for total aflatoxins in dried figs. Subject to approval by the Commission, the Committee agreed that the proposed draft maximum levels would be developed by an electronic Working Group led by Turkey for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 5th session of the Committee (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 114, Appendix IX). CAC33 approved this new work (ALINORM 10/33/REP, Appendix VI).

CCCF5 (2011) agreed to return the Proposed Draft maximum levels for total aflatoxins in dried figs to Step 2/3 so that the sampling plans according to the proposed ML of 10 µg/kg can be developed for consideration by the 6th session of the Committee (REP11/CF, para. 50). CCCF6 (2012) agreed to forward the Proposed Draft ML of 10 µg/kg for Dried Figs including the sampling plan to CAC35 for adoption at Step 5/8 with omission of Steps 6 and 7 (REP12/CF, para. 72 and Appendix VI). CAC35 (2012) adopted the draft ML at Step 5/8 (REP12/CAC, Appendix III).

Numeric Performance Criteria for methods for Total Aflatoxins utilizing the sum of components concept

CCCF17 (2024) considered the request from CCMAS42 (2023) on sampling plans in the General Standard for Contaminants in Food and Feed (CXS 193-1995), specifically to provide numeric performance criteria for aflatoxin methods utilizing the sum of components concept for all relevant commodities to replace the existing numeric criteria, and to evaluate all sampling plans in CXS 193, to determine if the plans were still in line with the revised General Guidelines on Sampling (CXG 50-2004).

Brazil volunteered to review the numeric performance criteria for aflatoxins in CXS 193 with the objective of submitting proposals for consideration by CCCF18. The Committee noted that the review of all sampling plans in CXS 193 in light of the revised General Guidelines on Sampling could be considered under Agenda for Review of Codex Standards for contaminants.

CCCF17 agreed to request Brazil, to revise the Numeric Performance Criteria for methods for Total Aflatoxins utilizing the sum of components concept. (REP24/CF, paras. 11-13)

Code of practice for sorghum

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to initiate new work on the development of an annex for the management of aflatoxins and ochratoxin A in sorghum to the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXC 51-2003). The Committee agreed to establish an EWG to prepare the proposed draft annex for comments at Step 3 and consideration at CCCF07 the 7th session. (REP12/CF, para. 136 and Appendix IX). CAC35 (2012) approved the new work (REP12/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed to return the proposed draft Annex to Step 2/3 for further development by the EWG, circulation for comments and further consideration by the 8th session of the Committee (REP13/CF, para. 74).

CCCF8 (2014) agreed that in view of the considerable progress made on the annex that it would be advanced for adoption, with the understanding that the annex would be integrated into the COP and its annexes in the new work on the revision of the COP. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft Annex to Step 5/8 (with the omission of Steps 6/7) for adoption by the CAC37 (REP14/CF, paras. 76-77, Appendix V). CAC37 (2014) adopted the annex at Step 5/8 (REP14/CAC, para 47, Appendix III).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Maximum levels for cereals**

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to the development of a discussion paper on aflatoxins in cereals through an EWG for consideration and discussion at the 7th session with the view of identification of possible actions or new work on this issue (REP12/CF, para. 175).

CCCCF7 (2013) agreed that JECFA Secretariat would put out a public call for data; that this data would be submitted to GEMS/Food; and that the re-established EWG would review and analyze the data and provide a report and recommendations on how to proceed with aflatoxins in cereals for consideration by the 8th session of the Committee (REP13/CF, para. 140).

CCCCF8 (2014) noted that there was general support that rice should remain the focus of work until more data became available on other cereals, but that priority should be given to the revision of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals, noting that an annex on aflatoxins would take into account measures for control aflatoxins in rice and other cereals, rather than on establishing an ML for aflatoxins in rice. The committee agreed that countries would submit data, especially for wheat, maize and sorghum, to GEMS/Food and no further work would be undertaken on the establishment of MLs for aflatoxins in cereals for the time being (REP14/CF, paras. 102-103).

JECFA83 (2016) updated the aflatoxin risk assessment at the request of CCCF and calculated exposure to aflatoxins. The Committee noted that there were limited contamination data from developing countries, which hindered a more comprehensive and global evaluation of aflatoxin occurrence and may have resulted in an underestimate of dietary exposure in these countries. Only five food commodities (maize, peanuts, rice, sorghum and wheat) each contribute more than 10% to international dietary exposure estimates for more than one GEMS/Food cluster diets, for either total aflatoxins (AFT) or AFB₁.

Although overall concentrations of aflatoxins in rice and wheat are lower than concentrations in maize and groundnuts (a traditional focus for aflatoxin risk management), the high consumption of rice and wheat in some countries means that these cereals may account for up to 80% of dietary aflatoxin exposure for those GEMS/Food cluster diets. Mean AFB₁ concentrations in sorghum from the GEMS/Food contaminants database are higher than those for maize; combined with high consumption levels of sorghum in some GEMS/Food clusters, this cereal contributes 16–59% of dietary exposure in six GEMS/Food clusters. The database on sorghum is considerably more limited than that on maize (JECFA/83/SC).

CCCCF11 (2017) agreed, based on the recommendations of the in-session working group on the follow-up to JECFA evaluations, to establish an EWG, led by Brazil to prepare a discussion paper on aflatoxins and sterigmatocystin in cereals (in particular maize, rice, sorghum and wheat) to enable CCCF to take at CCCF12 an informed decision on the appropriate follow-up as regards possible risk management options for aflatoxins and sterigmatocystin in cereals (REP17/CF, para. 151).

CCCCF12 (2018) discussed a proposal for new work on ML(s) for aflatoxins in cereals and cereal-based foods including foods for infants and young children and noted the views that the COP for mycotoxins in cereals (CXC 51-2003) had been revised, including a specific annex for aflatoxins in 2016. It was therefore appropriate that the revised COP should be implemented for some period of time and updated occurrence data collected before beginning work on new MLs, also considering the workload of CCCF and that there were no current concerns for international trade. The Committee noted that it was necessary to distinguish the categories of cereals for which MLs were to be set, to be specific in the commodities and what data were representative of which commodity. It was also necessary to be clear in the scope of the proposed new work that the focus would be on total aflatoxins for grains or on products made from grains, for human consumption and that the impact of proposed MLs on grain availability also be considered. Some Delegations stressed the need to define the types of rice (grain, husked or polished rice) and that aflatoxins were rarely found on white or polished rice (REP 18/CF, para, 134).

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

The JECFA Secretariat noted concerns from a public health point of view when dealing with such potent contaminants in staple foods. CCCF had specifically requested the work and the call for data had been targeted to these commodities and a large number of occurrence data received from all over the world. It would be appropriate to develop MLs for the key cereals listed for which sufficient data are available and indicating higher levels of contamination (REP 18/CF, para, 134 and 135).

The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by Brazil and co-chaired by India, reporting to CCCF13, to further develop the discussion paper and provide proposed MLs for total aflatoxins in wheat, maize, sorghum and rice (specifying the categories) for grains for human consumption. The EWG should also propose MLs for flour and cereal-based foods for infants and young children (REP 18/CF, paras. 133-138).

CCCF13 (2019) discussed on the discussion paper prepared by the EWG. While there was general support for the establishment of MLs, it was noted that occurrence data in cereals used for the analysis by the EWG and the subsequent proposal for new work, relied heavily on data from a few countries and regions and that careful data analysis was required to prevent the erroneous inclusion of outliers. It was agreed to include sorghum in the list noting that it was a staple food in many parts of the world and encouraged countries to submit data to support this work. In the absence of a Codex definition for rice flour it was agreed that it would be more appropriate to first issue a call for data which should clearly specify the source of the rice flour to make a more informed decision on an ML. It was also proposed that rice flour should be considered as a lower priority as the commodity had a low impact on exposure. There was also agreement that a further call for data should be issued on whole wheat flour and parboiled rice to better assess whether these food categories should be added later. It was noted that it would be necessary to use geographically representative data to undertake an assessment of the health impact of hypothetical MLs before proceeding, including to determine if similar health impacts could be achieved at lower sample rejection rates, also that when undertaking the establishment of MLs consideration should be given to year-to-year variation, whether the MLs would take into account use of rapid field tests using higher LOQ than laboratory testing; and its impact on food security.

The Committee noted that the work would be quite extensive and agreed to (i) delete the wheat grain, destined for further processing and flour, meal, semolina, and flakes derived from wheat, excluding whole wheat flour from the list and to amend the project document accordingly and to (ii) follow a similar approach to the work on lead by first working on the MLs for the agreed categories and only once this work was completed to consider the remaining food categories.

The Committee agreed:

- i. to submit the project document to CAC42 for approval as new work on establishment of MLs for aflatoxins in maize grain destined for further processing and flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; Husked and Polished Rice; Cereal-based Food for infants and young children; and Sorghum grain.
- ii. to establish an EWG chaired by Brazil and co-chaired by India, to prepare the proposed draft MLs for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at CCCF14; and
- iii. to issue for a call for data for all discussed food categories for submission to GEMS/Food.
- iv. that once the work on the MLs for the current set of commodities were completed, to consider other cereals and cereal-based products. (REP19/CF, paras. 146-155 and Appendix IX)

CAC42 (2019) approved the new work for establishment of MLs for aflatoxins in certain cereals and cereal-based products including foods for infants and young children (REP 19/CAC, Appendix V).

CCCF14 (2021) noted that for maize grain, more data should be requested to ensure better geographic representative and that an entry on country of origin should be included in the data submission template to better assess regional representation of the data, that data should be examined in more detail as regards outliers. The year to year variations,

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

due to climatic conditions, and regional variations should be further examined to assess their impact on the ability to meet the proposed ML/to come to a rejection rate acceptable for the different years and regions (REP21/CF, paras. 111-114).

It was generally accepted that it would be difficult to segregate data for maize for human consumption from data for maize intended for animal feed, as its intended purpose was not always indicated on the lot. The JECFA Secretariat explained that the optimal option would be to find a way to separate the data, so only data on aflatoxin in actual food commodities are used in the assessment. This would require a lot of double-checking by the data submitters and probably only help CCCF part of the way. There was, however, no way to ensure that what is intended for feed does not end up as food. One way forward for JECFA was to consider a couple of scenarios in a future assessment. One scenario was that only data on aflatoxin in clearly stated food commodities are used in the assessment. Another scenario could be that all data, also data which might refer to aflatoxin levels in commodities that might end up being used as feed are used in the assessment which then would give a kind of upper bound (REP21/CF, paras. 122).

The committee agreed that the EWG would assess the data to:

- verify the outliers and whether they should be excluded or not;
- analyse year to year and regional variations;
- consider whether the ML would be set for maize for further processing or maize for direct human consumption and
- assess the impact of lower MLs on food aid/food security particularly cereal products for infants and young children.

The committee further agreed that the EWG should:

- try to gather more geographically representative data, including details on food and feed, request JECFA to issue a call for data and
- liaise with the WHO JECFA Secretariat whether it would be possible. (REP21/CF, paras. 124-125)

For other food categories: Flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; husked/polished rice; sorghum grain, destined for further processing; cereal-based food for infants and young children, CCCF14 (2021) agreed that the EWG should further the work on these categories, with the aim to finalize the MLs at CCCF15, taking into account the comments made during this session. This would include presentation of a wider range of MLs and rejection rates, especially up to and about 5%, which would also apply to maize grain, and to include considerations on the effect of processing on the reduction of aflatoxins contamination (REP21/CF, para. 131).

The committee agreed:

i) to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Brazil and co-chaired by India to:

- a. continue working on MLs for total aflatoxins in maize grain; flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; husked and polished rice; sorghum grain destined for further processing and cereal-based food for infants and young children, as well as associated sampling plans, taking into account the written comments submitted, comments, conclusions and decisions made at the session and new data from GEMS/Food and
- b. work in close collaboration with the EWG on data management (REP21/CF, paras. 190-210).

ii) to request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data on all the categories under discussion with a view to obtaining more geographically representative data and to include a request for country of origin and if possible to differentiate between maize for food or feed with the aim to finalize the MLs next year and

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

iii) if no data are submitted, the MLs would be finalized on the existing data set by the next session of CCCF. (REP21/CF, para. 137)

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to consider proposed MLs as revised in CRD by the EWG Chair based on the comments indicated general supports for the establishment of lower MLs than proposed in the reports of the EWG (REP22/CF, paras 113 and 115).

For an ML for maize grain, destined for further processing, diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML of 20 µg/kg, and lower MLs of 5, 10 and 15 µg/kg were also proposed. After long discussion, CCCF15 agreed on the ML of 15 µg/kg with the same explanation in the notes on 'destined for further processing' as done for the ML for DON and noted the reservations of Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda for the reasons expressed in paragraph 124. CCCF agreed to review the ML in 5 years' time, and that Members should continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food, with the details as expressed in paragraph 127, and should continue to implement the Code of Practice on for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003). In advance of the consideration of reviewing the ML in 5 years' time, CCCF will consider whether a call for data should be issued (REP22/CF, paras. 116-128).

For an ML for flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize, diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML of 10 µg/kg, and lower MLs of 2.5 or 4 to 5 µg/kg were also proposed. As a result, CCCF15 agreed on the ML of 10 µg/kg for flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize and noted the reservations of Egypt, EU and Kazakhstan. CCCF agreed to review the ML in 5 years' time and that countries should continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food. In advance of the consideration of reviewing the ML in 5 years' time, CCCF will consider whether a call for data should be issued (REP22/CF, para. 129-133).

For ML for Husked rice, diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML of 20 µg/kg, and lower MLs of 10 and 5 µg/kg were also proposed. As a result, CCCF15 agreed on the ML of 20 µg/kg for husked rice noting the reservations of Egypt, EU, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Singapore and Sudan, and to review the ML in 5 years' time and that countries should continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food. In advance of the consideration of reviewing the ML in 5 years' time, CCCF will consider whether a call for data should be issued (REP22/CF, para. 134-139).

For an ML for polished rice, CCCF15 agreed with the ML of 5 µg/kg noting the reservation of India who proposed a higher ML (REP22/CF, para. 140).

For an ML for sorghum grain, destined for further processing, CCCF15 agreed to the ML of 10 µg/kg on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed in 5 years' time, that the same description for 'destined for further processing' would be added to the notes to the ML as would be done for maize grain and that Members were encouraged to continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food. Members with high consumption of sorghum were particularly encouraged to submit data (REP22/CF, para. 142).

For an ML for cereal-based food for infants and young children, diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML of 5µg/kg.

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. It was pointed out that 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 (REP22/CF, para. 144).

Those in favour 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.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

- 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/CF, para. 145).

The Observer from WFP, informed CCCF that WFP provided cereal-based foods to children at risk of malnutrition in more than 75 countries on an annual basis and that organizations providing food aid were currently using the ML of 10 µg/kg as previously proposed by the EWG. This ML enabled WFP to maintain a pipeline on nutritious food for vulnerable children in need. The new proposed ML of 5 µg/kg or any lower ML could constrain humanitarian responses by impacting the availability of suitable suppliers at competitive prices especially in the context of crises driven by conflict and climate change. The Observer proposed that the ML of 10 µg/kg be considered or alternatively to establish an ML for corn-based cereal foods (maize-based cereal foods) separate from other cereal-based food noting the high risk of aflatoxin contamination in corn (maize) and that 85% of WFP supplies were corn-based while the rest were wheat-based. Several delegations spoke in favour of the latter proposal (REP22/CF, para. 146).

WFP, supported by UNICEF, made an alternative proposal to have a separate ML of 10 µg/kg for cereal-based foods for infants and young children for food aid programs and this proposal was put forward by the Chair for agreement WFP clarified that cereal based foods are not consumed by very young infants and that these foods are only for older infants beyond 6 months (in footnote last part) (REP22/CF, para. 149)

CCCF15 (2022) agreed:

- on an ML of 5 µg/kg for cereal-based foods for infants and young children excluding products destined for food aid programs, noting the reservations of the Egypt, EU, Iran, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Singapore, Uganda and the United Kingdom; and
- on an ML of 10 µg/kg for cereal-based foods for infants and young children destined for food aid programs, noting the reservations of the Egypt and EU consistent with their reservations on cereals-based foods for infants and young children.
- that the MLs would apply to the same portion of the commodity product in line with the earlier decision on the ML for lead in the same food category and to consequentially amend the ML for DON accordingly for this food category for consistency; and
- to review the MLs in 5 years' time. In advance of the consideration of reviewing the ML in 5 years' time, CCCF will consider whether a call for data should be issued (REP22/CF, para. 150)

For a sampling plan, CCCF15 agreed with the recommendations of the WG to consider harmonizing the sampling plans for maize grain and flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize with the sampling plan for DON and fumonisins and the sampling plan for cereal-based food for infants and young children with the sampling plan for DON in cereal-based foods for infants and young children, when appropriate, and to collect data on:

- the typical ratio of the 4 aflatoxins in naturally contaminated samples of the cereals for which MLs have been established; and
- the variation in sampling, sampling preparation and analysis for husked rice, polished rice and sorghum grain (REP22/CF, para. 153).

To summarize the general conclusion, CCCF15 agreed to:

- advance the MLs for maize grain, destined for further processing; flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; husked rice; polished rice; sorghum grain, destined for further processing; cereal-based food for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs) and cereal-based food for infants and young children for food aid programs to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5/8 and to include the clarification notes agreed, noting the reservations from above mentioned members;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

- ii. review the MLs for total aflatoxins (AFT) in maize grain destined for further processing; flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; sorghum grain destined for further processing; husked rice; cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs) and cereal-based foods for infants and young children for food aid programs in 5 years' time and encouraged Members to continue generating and submitting data to GEMS/Food; and to continue implementing the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003);
- iii. send the consequential amendment to the "Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies" column for DON in cereal-based foods for infants and young children to CAC45 for adoption (REPCF/22, Appendix VI, Part II);
- iv. re-establish the EWG chaired by Brazil and co-chaired by India, to develop the sampling plan further taking into account the possibility to harmonize the sampling plans for maize grain; flour, meal, semolina and flakes with the sampling plan for DON and fumonisins; and the sampling plan for cereal-based foods for infants and young children with the sampling plan for DON, noting the points raised (see REP22/CF, para.153);
- v. request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL to request data on:
 - a. the typical ratio of the 4 aflatoxins in naturally contaminated samples of the cereals for which MLs were established; and
 - b. the variation in sampling, sampling preparation and analysis for husked rice, polished rice and sorghum.
- vi. consider the work of the EWG at CCCF16 (REP22/CF, para. 154).

At CAC45 (2022), the following views against adoption of the MLs were expressed leading to these Members entering reservations as reported in the conclusion under each category:

- The MLs were not in line with the MLs in their national legislation and should be lowered to provide adequate protection to their consumers in view of their high consumption or dietary patterns.
- There should not be separate MLs for cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs) and for these products for food aid, as in their view MLs for aflatoxins should be set as low as reasonably achievable, in particular for foods destined for infants and young children, regardless of whether these foods were for normal consumption or for food aid (REP22/CAC, para. 66).

The Representatives of WFP and Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) (Doctors without borders) supported the proposed MLs and explained that cereal-based food for infants and young children in food aid was typically for a short period of time during crisis and that a lower level could negatively impact on the food supply, which was already severely challenged and constrained humanitarian responses (REP22/CAC, para. 67).

Other Observers supported the concerns expressed by Members in order to give best possible protection, especially for those in vulnerable positions, including the differences in MLs proposed for aflatoxins in cereal-based food for infants and young children in different circumstances (REP22/CAC, para. 68).

The FAO Representative underlined that the risk assessments had taken into account national diets as well as composition of food aid and different intake levels REP22/CAC, para. 69).

The Chairperson of CCCF highlighted that the Committee did not have any new data and hence no new MLs could be proposed within the next few years. Therefore, if the proposed MLs were not adopted, there would be no ML to restrict exposure to aflatoxin (REP22/CAC, para. 70).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CAC45 adopted the MLs for aflatoxins for the following food categories at Steps 5/8: i. Maize grain destined for further processing, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

ii. Flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, EU, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Russian Federation, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

iii. Husked rice, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, EU, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

iv. Polished rice, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Bahamas, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

v. Sorghum grain, destined for further processing, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Russian Federation, Senegal, Seychelles, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

vi. Cereal-based food for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs), a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, EU, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

vii. Cereal-based food for infants and young children for food aid programs, a. Noted the reservation of the following countries: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, EU, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (REP22/CAC, para. 71).

CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years' time, if sufficient data were submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, but in any event to undertake this review in no more than five years' time (REP22/CAC, para. 72).

CAC45 further requested FAO, WHO, other relevant intergovernmental organizations and the donor community to support capacity development in respect of implementation of codes of practice to reduce aflatoxin contamination and in respect of data generation (REP22/CAC, para. 73).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed to forward the sampling plan to:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

(i) CCMAS42 for endorsement; and

(ii) CAC46 for adoption at Step 5/8 and inclusion in the General Standard for Contaminants in Food and Feed (CXS 193-1995). (REP23/CF, paras. 37-41 and Appendix IV)

CCMAS42 (2023):

- endorsed the sampling plan (see Appendix II, Part 1: Sampling plans for total aflatoxins in certain cereals and cereal-based products including foods for infants and young children); and
- requested CCCF to evaluate the sampling plans in CXS 193, including the one just endorsed to determine if the plans were still within the revised General Guidelines on Sampling (CXG 50-2004).

CCMAS42 noted that the PWG had agreed with the sum of components approach, but that the footnote was removed since it created a set of multiple numeric criteria at each ML. Instead, a 1:1:1:1 ratio of isomers was used as a basis to calculate a single set of numeric criteria using the sum of components approach, since this was implied by one option provided in the original footnote.

CCMAS42 noted that the Sum of components information document (and the guidance in the Procedural Manual) does allow for the sum of components to be addressed on a case-by-case basis and the Information Document provides examples. A request was made to update the Information Document to reflect this new example.

CCMAS42:

- endorsed the revised numeric performance criteria proposed by the PWG (Appendix II, Part 1);
- requested the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL to request information on example methods that meet the numeric performance criteria;
- agreed to inform CCCF of the rationale for the revised numeric performance criteria and to recommend that CCCF should provide numeric performance criteria for aflatoxin methods utilizing the sum of components concept for all relevant commodities to replace the existing numeric criteria in CXS 193;

CCMAS43 (2024) agreed to:

i. recommend to CCCF to include EN 17641 as an example method in the numeric performance criteria table contained in the sampling plan for aflatoxins in certain cereals and cereal-based products including foods for infants and young children in CXS 193 with the following footnote:

The sampling plan specifies a test portion size of 25.0 g and EN 17641 uses a test portion size of 5.0 g. No alternative method was found that meets the performance criteria, therefore EN 17641 is included as an example method as it is the best possible method at this time. The smaller test portion size may introduce additional variation in the test result.

ii. request CCCF to consider transferring all methods numeric performance criteria in sampling plans in CXS 193 to CXS 234 once the review of numeric performance criteria exercise in CCCF is completed. (REP24/MAS, para. 16)

Code of practice for mycotoxins in cassava and cassava-based products

CCCF14 (2021) noted that, based on the replies to CL 2019/74-CF and CL 2020/51-CF, as well as data and information provided by members of the EWG, it was possible to identify risk mitigation measures available to date that have proven to be cost-effective and applicable worldwide by large, medium and small-scale farmers and producers. The

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

replies also provided the scope of the COP as to the relevant mycotoxins (i.e. aflatoxins and ochratoxin A) and the stages of the production chain to be covered by the COP (i.e. pre-planting, planting, post-harvest processing including fermentation, drying, storing and distribution). The EWG Chair further informed CCCF that based on these facts, there was general support for the development of a code of practice to prevent and reduce mycotoxins contamination in these products as presented in the Appendix I to CX/CF 21/14/12 (REP21/CF, para. 167).

The committee agreed to:

- i) submit the project document on the development of a Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins contamination in cassava and cassava-based products to CAC44 for approval as new work and
- ii) establish an EWG, chaired by Nigeria and co-chaired by Ghana to work on the development of a Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins contamination in cassava and cassava-based products, with focus on aflatoxins and OTA, and the stages of production as identified in the project document, based on the data and information provided in Appendix II to CX/CF 21/14/12 (REP21/CF, para. 169 and Appendix VII).

CAC44 (2021) approved the code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based products as a new work (REP21/CAC, para. 46).

Since cassava was also used as feed for food-producing animals, one Member stated that it was important to clarify that the scope of the new work was limited to cassava as food (REP21/CAC, para. 47).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to:

- i. advance the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cassava and Cassava-Based Products to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5; and
- ii. re-establish the EWG, chaired by Nigeria and co-chaired by Ghana to further revise the CoP taking into account the comments provided by CCCF with a view to finalizing the CoP at CCCF16 (2023) (REP22/CF, para. 200 and Appedix VII).

At CAC45 (2022), one member, while not opposing the adoption of the Code of Practice at Step 5, requested that the scope and requirements of the Code of Practice be clarified to focus on cassava and cassava-based products for human consumption and not for animal feed (REP22/CAC, para. 74). CAC45 adopted at step 5 the Code of Practice for prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based products (REP22/CAC, para. 75 ii).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed to forward the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based products to CAC46 for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix III) (REP23/CF, para. 36).

CAC46 adopted at Step 8 Code of Practice for prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based product (REP23/CAC, para. 68i).

Maximum levels for ready-to-eat (RTE) peanuts

At CCCF7 (2013), a new work on the establishment of a maximum level for total aflatoxins in ready-to-eat peanuts and associated sampling plan was proposed. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper for consideration at the 8th session that defines the issue, identifies the available data and specifies data requirements for establishing the ML (REP13/CF, para. 149-151).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CCCF8 (2014) agreed to forward the proposal to initiate new work on MLs for total aflatoxins in RTE peanuts for approval by CAC37 (Appendix X). Russian Federation expressed its reservation to this decision. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by India to prepare proposals for MLs for total aflatoxins in RTE peanuts, for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 9th session of the Committee (REP14/CF, paras. 119-120).

CAC37 (2014) adopted the new work (REP14/CAC, para. 96. Appendix VI).

CCCF9 (2015) agreed to request JECFA to conduct an exposure assessment for health impact and calculate violation rates based on the hypothetical MLs of 4, 8, 10 and 15 µg/kg for total aflatoxins in RTE peanuts and agreed that work on the ML for aflatoxins in RTE would be undertaken when the results of the JECFA impact assessment became available. It was clarified that the RTE peanuts include several categories of peanuts, such as raw shelled peanuts, raw-in-shell peanuts, roasted in shell peanuts, roasted/blanched shelled peanuts, fried shelled peanuts with or without skin, coated peanuts in all types of packing (consumer or bulk), and any other products having preparation of more than 20% of peanuts. The Committee noted that the definition for RTE peanuts had been included in the GSCTFF. Noting that the ML should be established for RTE peanuts, the Committee agreed to remove mixed preparations from the list of RTE peanuts. The Committee agreed to hold the proposed draft ML and sampling plan at Step 4 pending the outcome of the JECFA exposure assessment for health impact (REP15/CF, paras. 96-100).

CCCF10 (2016) recalled the MLs for total aflatoxins in RTE peanuts had been held at Step 4 pending the outcome of the JECFA exposure assessment for health impact. Noting that this would be addressed at JECFA83, the Committee agreed that India would prepare proposals for MLs taking into account the outcomes of JECFA83 for consideration by CCCF11 (REP16/CF, paras 170 and 173)

JECFA83 (2016) calculated that five food commodities (maize, peanuts, rice, sorghum and wheat) each contribute more than 10% to international dietary exposure estimates for more than one GEMS/Food cluster diets, for either total aflatoxins (AFT) or AFB1. The Committee performed an impact assessment of different MLs for RTE peanuts and concluded that enforcing an ML of 10, 8 or 4 µg/kg for RTE peanuts would have little further impact on dietary exposure to AFT for the general population, compared with setting an ML of 15 µg/kg. At an ML of 4 µg/kg, the proportion of the world market of RTE peanuts rejected would be approximately double the proportion rejected at an ML of 15 µg/kg (about 20% versus 10%) (JECFA/83/SC).

CCCF11 (2017) discussed the revised proposed draft ML of 15 µg/kg, prepared by India as chair of the EWG based on the outcome of JECFA83. In view of the lack of consensus on the recommendation and the need for further consideration of the JECFA report, the Committee agreed to request comments on the levels of 10 µg/kg or 15 µg/kg at Step 3.

Comments should be accompanied by a rationale for the proposed draft ML and any additional/further information to support the proposed draft ML and to establish an EWG led by India to consider the comments and information received and to prepare a revised proposal for further comments and consideration by CCCF12. (REP17/CF, paras. 104-108 and Appendix IV)

CCCF12 (2018) considered the proposed draft ML of 10 µg/kg for AFT in peanuts RTE. Those in favour expressed the view that the level matched what was achievable in their countries or in their national legislation; that it was consistent with the ML established for tree nuts and that it was important to have a separate ML different from peanuts for further processing which would encourage better practices and better RTE peanuts in the market (REP18/CF, para, 104 and 105)..

The Representative of FAO reminded CCCF about the importance of Codex standards for international trade. He urged CCCF to focus on the need to find a compromise as the absence of an international standard would not be facilitating trade and might put public health at risk. The Representative emphasized that for the goal of alleviating poverty and eradicating hunger the work of Codex and suitable international food safety standards were critical (REP18/CF, para, 109).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Noting the lack of consensus, the Committee considered as a compromise an ML of 12 µg/kg, however, the Committee could not reach consensus. The MLs for other tree nuts would need to be revised since the MLs of these nuts are based on a JECFA evaluation with an outcome similar to the one for peanuts. The Committee then considered a proposal from the JECFA Secretariat to hold an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts, while producing countries would make clear efforts to implement the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004) and collect occurrence data. The work could then be taken up again in 3 to 5 years once new data were made available and assessed by JECFA. There was general support for the proposal of the JECFA Secretariat. It was clarified that data should be specifically for RTE peanuts and as moved in trade and that the data should clearly indicate if they referred to RTE or for further processing such as oil production or for feed. (REP 18/CF, para. 111 and 114)

The Committee agreed:

- to hold the proposed draft ML of 10 µg/kg at Step 4 (REP 18/CF, Appendix VII) to ensure implementation of the COP (CXC 55-2004);
- that JECFA would issue a call for data in three-years' time; and
- that an EWG would be re-established, once the data were submitted, to prepare a proposal for consideration by CCCF15. (REP18/CF, para. 115)

In considering the decision on the ML for total aflatoxins in ready-to-eat peanuts during the Critical Review, CCEXEC75 (2018) recommended that CCCF accelerate the process to finalize the ML and sampling plan for this contaminant / commodity combination (REP18/EXEC2-Rev.1, paragraph 23).

CCCF13 (2019) noted that this agenda item was not for discussion and recalled that it was only held on the agenda as a reminder that the ML for total aflatoxins in ready-to-eat peanuts and associated sampling plans were held at Step 4 pending further implementation on the COP (REP 19/CF, paras. 11 and 80).

At CCCF14 (2021), delegations emphasized the following:

- The importance of accelerating the finalization of the ML and sampling plan to ensure public health and fair practices in trade.
- The COP (CXC55) has been available for implementation by member countries for many years now.
- The GEMS/Food should be the reference source of data to derive MLs for contaminants in Codex.
- The impact assessment conducted by JECFA83 should be taken into account when considering proposals for MLs for AFTs in ready-to-eat peanuts.
- The new dataset (data from 2018 onward) should be utilized in addition to the old dataset when considering proposals for MLs to enable identifying possible differences between the old and new ML proposals due to the implementation of the COP.
- The ML should take into consideration the previous ML set for peanuts intended for further processing (REP21/CF, para. 140).

The committee agreed to:

i) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India to:

- a. consider new or additional data available on GEMS/Food only and take into account old and new data for comparison;
- b. update the working paper that was last presented at CCCF12 (2018) (CX/CF 18/12/10) and

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

c. prepare revised proposals for MLs for total aflatoxins in Ready-To-Eat Peanuts and associated sampling plan for comments and consideration by CCCF15 (2022), taking into consideration the outcome of the impact assessment conducted by JECFA83 and the new and old datasets available on GEMS/Food.

ii) request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data to collect data for further consideration by the EWG (REP21/CF, para. 143).

At CCCF15 (2022), diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML of 10 µg/kg (REP22/CF, para. 163).

Proposals were made that it would be more appropriate to have an ML for RTE peanuts lower than the ML for peanuts intended for further processing and if data could be segregated in future, then the work should be postponed, until such data could be used for the derivation of the ML (REP22/CF, para. 168).

If work were postponed, then concerns on the data analysis and presentation of the analysis should be addressed, such as:

- The timeframe after the implementation of the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004) should be 2018-2021.
- An analysis year-by-year and region-by-region both before and after the adoption of the CoP.
- An analysis by geographic region would help to illustrate the impact of producer versus importer data. EU data could be used to reflect geographical variation based on origin, but it was evident that these data were not necessarily reflecting the situation in producing countries as the EU data were biased by the strict EU requirements for import.
- A summary and justification on the inclusion or exclusion of data into the dataset used for data analysis should be provided as some data from GEMS/Food appeared to be missing and to address also what challenges were faced in the data review.
- A clear presentation of the rejection rates for all proposed MLs should be provided (REP22/CF, para. 170).

A further proposal was made that if there were no agreement on an ML at this session, it could be taken up again in light of the possible future review of the ML for AFT in peanuts intended for further processing, which was identified in List A.2 of the pilot for review of Codex Standards given that it was established in 1999 (see Item 18). If prioritized for future review, the MLs for peanuts could be reconsidered, if necessary, in the context of available data and proportionality (REP22/CF, para. 176).

In addition to the points raised in paragraph 170, it was proposed that if work continued in the EWG, that:

- An ML should be based on a specific dataset on RTE peanuts, but that in its absence, it might be possible to look into the free text fields of the existing dataset and look at the information provided, such as whether the peanuts were sorted, blanched, roasted or in retail packages, which could give an indication whether the samples were RTE peanuts.
- The EWG members should be consulted on the data review, what should be considered RTE and on which data should be considered in the data analysis and analysis should also include MLs in the range of 10 µg/kg to 15 µg/kg.
- There should be at least two rounds of comments in the EWG on the Codex Forum (REP22/CF, para. 177).

The Representative of WHO speaking as the GEMS/Food administrator explained that he would look into the current data on GEMS/Food and to provide support the EWG by assisting with identifying and segregating data specific for RTE peanuts (REP22/CF, para. 178).

CCCF15 agreed to apply the same principles for the sampling plan for peanuts intended for further processing in the GSCTFF (CXS 193-1995) and that the EWG should present the proposal to CCCF16 (REP22/CF, para. 179).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CCCF15 (2022) agreed:

- i. to return the ML and associated sampling plan to Step 2/3 for further consideration;
- ii. to re-establish the EWG chaired by India and co-chaired by Senegal to prepare:
 - a. new proposal for an ML for AFT in RTE peanuts; and
 - b. an associated sampling plan applying the same principles for the sampling plan for peanuts intended for further processing in the GSCTFF (CXS 193-1995).
- iii. that the EWG should carefully consider all the data and take into account all comments submitted to and made at the plenary session (see REP22/CF, paras. 170 and 177) and identified in the report of CCCF14 (REP21/CF14, para. 140) and present a paper that clearly presents the data analysis for consideration by CCCF16 (REP22/CF, para. 180).

CCCF16 (2023) noted there was general agreement that work should continue on developing MLs for AFT in RTE peanuts. However, comments were made requesting the precise meaning to RTE peanuts in the context of this work before proceeding on the development of MLs in order to clarify which data be considered by the EWG (REP23/CF, para. 46).

CCCF16 agreed:

- (i) to re-convene the EWG, chaired by India, working in English, to work over the next two years on the ML for AFT in RTE peanuts and the associated sampling plan, as follows:
 - (a) to prepare a proposal on a clear definition for RTE peanuts for the establishment of an ML for AFT in RTE peanuts and categorization of the occurrence data for consideration by CCCF17, working in close collaboration with the GEMS Administrator;
 - (b) following discussion and agreement on the definition for RTE peanuts at CCCF17 and working closely with the EWG on data analysis to propose an ML for RTE peanuts and associated sampling plans for consideration by CCCF18.
- (ii) the EWG should take into account the decision of CCCF15 as highlighted in REP22/CF15, paragraph 180(iii) in particular in relation to the data analysis and the need to have at least two rounds of comments each year in the EWG (REP22/CF15, paragraphs 170 and 177); and
- (iii) to inform CCEXEC of the decision and request extension of the timeline for completion of work to 2025 (REP23/CF, para. 52).

At CCCF17, the chair of the EWG, introduced the item, recalled the decision of CCCF16 to work over 2 years to first develop a definition for ready to eat (RTE) peanuts, followed by data compilation and analysis for the development of the ML for this category of peanuts. She summarized the discussion in the EWG and explained that the definition proposed by the EWG included wide variants of peanuts considered to be ready to eat. The proposed definition had been shared with the GEMS/Food database administrator who had concluded based on his analysis that it would not be possible to compare concentrations of total aflatoxins (AFT) between RTE peanuts and peanuts intended for further processing (FFP), because all the peanuts could be considered RTE under the proposed definition (REP24/CF, para. 70).

The EWG Chair recommended that CCCF consider the proposed definition and to request a call for occurrence data from producers and importing countries in RTE peanuts in line with the definition to be concluded for RTE peanuts after ensuring that the data to be submitted reflect the implementation of the CoP (REP24/CF, para. 71).

The WHO Representative informed CCCF that the data from GEMS/Food supports the work of ML setting in CCCF. He presented the interactions between the GEMS/Food database administrator and the EWG since 2022, as well as the findings from the available data analysis. The analysis demonstrated the difficulties in discriminating between

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

RTE peanuts and FFP peanuts. More than 80% of the supplied data could not be categorized (Unknown), in particular the data supplied as raw peanuts. This emphasized the importance of a high-quality description of submitted data. The GEMS/Food database administrator suggested to extend the Codex definition for RTE treenuts in CXS 193 to RTE peanuts. Its application in classifying samples as RTE/non-RTE would be substantially facilitated in the future by stating whether raw peanuts are intended for human consumption with or without further processing to reduce aflatoxin (REP24/CF, para. 72).

On the issue of examples in Codex definitions, the Codex Secretariat explained that definitions need to be clear, concise and easy to use and that examples were not normally included in definitions used by CCCF or Codex in general (REP24/CF, para. 73).

Concerns were expressed on the aspect of “labelled as RTE” as RTE products intended for direct human consumption are usually readily identifiable. This requirement should therefore be removed from the definition. It was noted by a delegation that such a requirement should be retained in the definition and to restrict this requirement to raw peanuts as other RTE peanuts were easily identifiable. The delegation also noted that the term “labelled as RTE” could be expanded to “labelled or clearly identified as RTE” (REP24/CF, para. 74).

In relation to the examples, delegations expressed the view that the examples could be removed from the definition, as they were more relevant for data submission and could therefore be a guide in calls for data. Furthermore, concerns were expressed on the inclusion of peanut butter as an example of RTE peanuts since peanut butter was not considered an RTE peanut, but a product derived from peanuts which could contain other ingredients (REP24/CF, para. 75).

A Member noted that the definition by itself would not solve the problem of sorting the data submitted to GEMS/Food as the definition would not provide clarity on how data should be submitted and that there was still a lack of clarity in the GEMS/Food database especially with regard to raw peanuts, whether these were RTE or FFP as they could be both (REP24/CF, para. 76).

The Chairperson noted the issue was not so much about the definition, but rather about the guidance that is given on how data is submitted especially in relation to raw peanuts, and these could better be considered as two separate issues (REP24/CF, para. 77).

The Chairperson therefore proposed that the existing definition for RTE treenuts in CXS 193 is used for RTE peanuts. She noted that the issue of data sorting would then have to be addressed. There was the current data set as well as a proposal to have a new call for data. For the new call for data, the call would include guidance that for raw peanuts (shelled or in-shell) it has to be specified whether raw peanuts were FFP or RTE and the call should be (i) clear in which field of the GEMS Food database template this information should be recorded so to ensure consistency in the reporting and (ii) the call would request data from 2014 onwards, to capture 10 years of data to allow comparison before and after implementation of the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004) (REP24/CF, para. 78).

For the current data set already in GEMS/Food, the Chairperson proposed to request the GEMS/Food administrator to go back to submitters of the data to clarify whether the products sampled and currently identified as unknown were RTE or FFP. This would be down to a tight schedule to have the data available by September 2024. If clarification on certain the data cannot be provided in this timeframe, these would not be used for the establishment of the ML. In addition, peanut butter would not be considered RTE peanuts. An additional proposal was made to compare the data before and after 2018. It was clarified by the EWG Chair that the analysis would be done for AFT and not the individual aflatoxin components (REP24/CF, para. 79).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 80):

(i) apply the existing definition for RTE treenuts in CXS 193 to RTE peanuts;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

- (ii) establish an EWG chaired by India and co-chaired by USA to develop the ML for AFT in RTE peanuts and the associated sampling plan for comments and consideration by CCCF18;
- (a) to include in the data analysis the elements as described in paragraphs 78-79;
- (b) request that the EWG should work closely with the GEMS/Food Administrator and the WG on data analysis, should take into account the points raised in REP22/CF15, paragraphs 170-177, and to have two rounds of comments.
- (iii) request JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data, with a guidance to specify the raw peanuts as RTE or FFP; and
- (iv) request the GEMS/Food database administrator to clarify with the submitters whether the data currently identified as unknown were RTE or for further processing.

Code of Practice for peanuts

In the review of Codex Standards for contaminants, CCCF16 (2023) noted the interests of Brazil to develop discussion papers to review the codes of practice for aflatoxins in peanuts to determine the need and feasibility for revision, such as if there are new measures for aflatoxin control in peanuts. CCCF agreed with the following for consideration by CCCF17 to establish an EWG chaired by Brazil, working in English, to develop a discussion paper to explore whether there are new measures supporting revision of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in peanuts (CXC 55-2004). (REP23/CF16, para 105 (iv)(a))

At CCCF17 (2024), the chair of the EWG, introduced the item, provided background to the work, a summary of discussions in the EWG and its recommendations. She highlighted that new measures/practices had been identified for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in peanuts that support the revision of CXC 55 and that the EWG had prepared a proposal for such revision to support this new work (REP24/CF17, para. 120).

CCCF noted the general support to start new work on the revision of CXC 55 and made slight amendments to the project document to indicate that this new work would be to support the implementation of MLs for AFT in peanuts (REP24/CF17, para. 121).

To a comment on also addressing feed in CXC 55 and merging this work with the revision of Code of Practice for the Reduction of Aflatoxin B1 in Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk-producing Animals (CXC 45-1997) (Agenda item 15). CCCF noted (REP24/CF17, para. 122):

- that the scope of CXC 55 was limited to peanuts for human consumption but that the EWG could consider possible extension of the scope to animal feed; and
- that merging of CXC 55 with CXC 45 could be considered under Agenda item 15.

CCCF17 agreed to (REP24/CF17, para. 123):

- (i) start new work on the revision of Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004);
- (ii) forward the project document (Appendix VIII) to CAC47 for approval; and
- (iii) establish an EWG, chaired by Brazil and co-chaired by India to prepare a proposed revision of the CoP for comments and consideration by CCCF18.

CAC47 (2024), a member indicated the importance of peanuts from an economic and dietary perspective and highlighted the need for training and capacity development on good practices to minimize aflatoxin contamination. The Representatives of FAO and WHO expressed their willingness to provide support (REP24/CAC, para. 153).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CAC47 approved the new work (REP24/CAC, Appendix V)

Maximum levels for spices

CCCF8 (2014) discussed proposals for new work on MLs for aflatoxins in spices and AFT and AFB₁ in nutmeg, and associated sampling plans. The Committee had a general discussion on how best to approach the establishment of MLs in spices and considered a proposal by the Chairperson that a review of mycotoxins in spices first be conducted to allow the Committee to understand which mycotoxins to address and in which spices.

Such a study could allow for a possible 100prioritization of the work on spices for the Committee. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by India and co-chaired by EU and Indonesia to prepare a discussion paper as outlined in the proposal by the Chairperson for consideration at the next session (REP14/CF, paras. 134 and 137).

In view of the interest to continue with work on MLs in spices, but the need for further clarity on which mycotoxin/spice(s) combination to establish MLs and the rationale for this, as well as further need for 100prioritization of the work, CCCF9 (2015) agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by India and co-chaired by Indonesia and EU to prepare a new discussion paper and project document for establishment of ML for spices. The discussion paper should also include proposals for possible MLs to assist the next session of the Committee to take a decision on new work (REP15/CF, paras. 138-139).

CCCF10 (2016) agreed that further work was needed to expand on the MLs through an EWG chaired by India and co-chaired by the EU with the following terms of reference:

- provide a rationale for selection of spices (chilli, paprika, ginger, nutmeg, pepper, turmeric)
- provide rationale for selection of total aflatoxins and OTA
- take into account the outcome of the JECFA evaluation of 2016
- consider trade aspects of existing national standards
- prepare a Project document for new work with proposals for MLs for spice (REP16/CF, paras. 143-148)

CCCF11 (2017) agreed to start new work on MLs for AFT and OTA in nutmeg, chilli and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric and to submit the revised project document for approval by CAC40 and to establish an EWG, led by India subject to approval of new work by CAC40, would prepare a proposal for circulation for comments and consideration by CCCF12.

The Committee also recalled a previous decision that EWG chairs should use data from GEMS/Food database and ensure that any data collected by EWGs should be uploaded to the GEMS/Food database. This was consistent with the recommendation of CCCF9 to use the GEMS/Food platform for data submission and analysis for its work in the development of MLs. When additional information needed to be collected that was not part of the database, (REP17/CF, paras. 118-124) The Committee agreed not to include mycotoxins in spices in the priority list (REP17/CF, para. 149).

CCCF12 (2018) discussed the proposals for MLs for AFT and OTA in nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric. In view of the range of views, the Committee could not agree on a single figure for the MLs for AFT and OTA in the specified spices.

The Committee agreed:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

- iii) to suspend work and to hold the ML of 20/30 µg/kg for AFT and 20 µg/kg for OTA in nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric, respectively, at Step 4 to give time to countries to implement the Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins in spices (CXC 78-2017);
- ii. that JECFA would issue a call for data in three-years' time; and
- iv) that an EWG would be re-established once the data were submitted to prepare a proposal for consideration by a future CCCF (REP 18/CF, paras. 116-120).

CCCF13 (2019) noted that this agenda item was not for discussion according to the decision of CCCF12 to hold these MLs at Step 4 to ensure the implementation of the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017) and to generate data to enable progress in the consideration of the MLs for mycotoxin in spices by a future CCCF. (REP19/CF, para. 81)

CCCF14 (2021) noted that there was a generally support in CCCF14 to resume work on the establishment of MLs for nutmeg, dried chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric and associated sampling plans (REP21/CF, para. 141).

The committee agreed to:

i) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India to:

- a. consider new or additional data available on GEMS/Food;
- b. update the working paper that was last presented at CCCF12 (2018) (CX/CF 18/12/11) and
- c. prepare revised proposals for MLs for total aflatoxins and ochratoxin A in spices: nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric, respectively, for comments and consideration by CCCF15 (2022) and associated sampling plans taking into account the new and old datasets available on GEMS/Food.

ii) request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data to collect data for further consideration by the EWG (REP21/CF, para. 145).

CCCF15 (2022) noted that there was no consensus on a single ML for AFT in all spices and noted the following comments:

- Delegations supporting a single ML noted that a much lower ML could be set and proposed an ML of 10 µg/kg.
- The proposed ML for AFT could be divided into two groups, one for dried chilies and paprika, nutmeg and ginger at 20 µg/kg and another for dried pepper and turmeric at an ML lower than 20 µg/kg.
- An ML of 20 µg/kg could be established noting that spices were consumed in low amounts and had a lesser impact on public health concerns, but its trade was significant and that a harmonized ML for AFT in spices (and also an ML for OTA) would prevent trade impediments.
- Further work was needed before a decision could be made and that a paper should be prepared for CCCF16 (2023) that includes a more elaborate data analysis and presentation thereof. In doing so, the following points should be clearly indicated:
 - o which data were included or excluded,
 - o whether the data were for ground or whole spices, and if possible, ground and whole spices should be examined separately;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

o the year-to-year variation by region; and

o revised groupings could be proposed once the occurrence data were more carefully looked at and consideration should be given to whether MLs were needed for spices with very low rejection rates, such as turmeric and pepper (REP22/CF, para. 185).

CCCF15 considered the appropriateness of ISO 948 as proposed by the EWG. CCCF however noted that ISO 948 was not an appropriate sampling plan for the control of heterogeneously distributed contaminants, such as AFT and OTA and that the sampling plan had a number of shortcomings, e.g. it did not provide incremental sample size and size of the bulk aggregate sample, amongst others. CCCF noted an alternative proposal for a sampling plan addressing the shortcomings was presented in CRD16 (REP22/CF, para. 191).

CCCF15 agreed:

i. return the MLs and sampling plan to Step 2/3 for further consideration;

ii. to re-establish the EWG chaired by India to prepare new proposals for MLs for AFT and OTA in spices: nutmeg, dried chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric; and an associated sampling plan;

iii. that the EWG should carefully consider all the data and prepare a paper that clearly presents a more elaborate data analysis, taking into account written comments submitted to and all comments made during CCCF15 (see REP22/CF, paras 185 and 191); and

iv. to request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL requesting comments on the sampling plan presented in CRD16 and information on other sampling plans for consideration by the EWG (REP22/CF, para. 193).

CCCF16 (2023) noted while there was general support for the proposed MLs, the EU expressed concern with the proposed ML noting that aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and a public health issue and therefore levels should be set as low as reasonably achievable and, in their opinion, applying good practices, lower levels were achievable (REP23/CF, para. 63).

The JECFA Secretariat clarified that it was unlikely that different MLs would have a noticeable impact on public health, but more likely an impact on trade. An impact assessment was always possible, but in the case of spices, it might not be a good use of resources required to do such an assessment as the difference in public health impact among the various MLs can reasonably expected to be negligible (REP23/CF, para. 65).

CCCF16 agreed:

(i) to forward the ML of 20 µg/kg for AFT in chili pepper and nutmeg (dry/dried) to CAC46 for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix V), noting the reservations of the European Union, Norway, and Switzerland for the MLs for AFT for the reasons explained in paragraph 63;

(ii) that the MLs could be reviewed in 3 years' time if sufficient data are submitted through GEMS/Food;

(iii) to discontinue work on MLs for AFT in paprika, ginger, pepper (black and white) and turmeric; and to inform CCEXEC and CAC46 accordingly; and

(iv) to re-convene the EWG, chaired by India, working in English, to develop sampling plans for the agreed MLs taking into account all written comments submitted to CCCF16; for comments and consideration by CCCF17 (REP23/CF, para. 69).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

CAC46 adopted at Step 5/8 the ML for total aflatoxins in dried chili and nutmeg. The MLs could be reviewed in 3 years' time if sufficient data were submitted through the Global Environment Monitoring System – Food Contaminant Monitoring and Assessment Programme (GEMS/Food) (REP23/CAC, para. 69).

CAC46 noted the reservations as described below in relation to the adoption of MLs for total aflatoxins for the selected spices (REP23/CAC, para. 70).

The European Union, Norway and Switzerland expressed their reservations on the ML of 20 µg/kg for total aflatoxins in dried chilli and nutmeg since aflatoxins were genotoxic carcinogens and thus a public health issue, and therefore levels should be set as low as reasonably achievable. They indicated that through the application of good practices, lower levels were achievable (REP23/CAC, para. 71).

Egypt expressed its reservation on the ML for total aflatoxins in dried chilli and nutmeg since these mycotoxins were genotoxic carcinogens and thus a public health issue, and consumption of chilli pepper and nutmeg was high in Egypt. Consequently, levels should be set as low as reasonably achievable as proposed in CRD19 (REP23/CAC, para. 72).

CAC46 noted:

- a. the intention of the CCCF Chairperson to issue a letter that set out an approach for the potential review of MLs for total aflatoxins in various cereal products as agreed by CAC45, subject to the availability of data; and
- b. that this approach would provide flexibility to consider proposals for additional MLs for which no Codex references were yet available (REP23/CAC, para. 75).

CAC46 discontinued work on the MLs for total aflatoxin in paprika, ginger, black and white pepper, and turmeric (REP23/CAC, para. 76).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 92 and Appendix IV):

- (i) forward the sampling plan to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5;
- (ii) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India to consider the outstanding issues with the aim of finalising the sampling plan at CCCF18. The revised sampling plan would be circulated for comments and consideration by CCCF18; and
- (iii) request CCEXEC86 to extend the timeline for completion of work to 2025.

CAC47 (2025) 16768 adopted the sampling plans for total aflatoxins and ochratoxin A in certain spices (dried chili pepper, nutmeg, and paprika) (REP24/CAC, para. 68 and Appendix III).

CAC47 endorsed the recommendation of CCEXEC86 to extend the timeline to complete the sampling plans for total aflatoxins and ochratoxin A in certain spices (dried chili pepper, nutmeg, and paprika) to 2025 (REP24/CAC, para. 70).

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Ochratoxin A

Code of practice for the reduction of aflatoxin B1 in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)

See the section on Aflatoxin M₁.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Aflatoxins are a group of highly toxic mycotoxins produced by fungi of the genus *Aspergillus*. The four main aflatoxins found in contaminated plant products are B₁, B₂, G₁ and G₂ and are a group of structurally related difuranocoumarin derivatives that usually occur together in varying ratios, AFB₁ usually being the most important one. These compounds pose a substantial hazard to human and animal health. IARC (1992) classified aflatoxin B₁ in Group 1 (human carcinogen) and aflatoxin M₁ in Group 2B (probable human carcinogen). The liver is the primary target organ.

A wide range of foods may be contaminated with aflatoxins; they are most commonly found in groundnuts (peanuts), dried fruit, tree nuts (such as almonds, pecans, walnuts, pistachio and Brazil nuts), spices, figs, crude vegetable oils, cocoa beans, maize, rice, cottonseed and copra. Aflatoxin B₁ present in animal feed can partly be transferred to milk in the form of the metabolite aflatoxin M₁ (mostly 1-2%, but higher percentages are found at low contamination levels in high producing animals.) Aflatoxin contamination is responsible for considerable economic losses and efforts are being made to reduce contamination of food and feedingstuff.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 1****SAMPLING PLAN FOR TOTAL AFLATOXINS IN PEANUTS INTENDED FOR FURTHER PROCESSING****INTRODUCTION**

1. The sampling plan calls for a single 20 kg laboratory sample of shelled peanuts (27 kg of unshelled peanuts) to be taken from a peanut lot (sub-lot) and tested against a maximum level of 15 micrograms per kilogram ($\mu\text{g/kg}$) total aflatoxins.
2. This sampling plan has been designed for enforcement and controls concerning total aflatoxins in bulk consignments of peanuts traded in the export market. To assist member countries in implementing the Codex sampling plan, sample selection methods, sample preparation methods and analytical methods required to quantify aflatoxin in bulk peanut lots are described in this document.

A. DEFINITIONS

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor or markings.
Sublot	Designated part of a large lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	Is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and an accept/reject limit. An aflatoxin test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and aflatoxin quantification. The accept/reject limit is a tolerance usually equal to the codex maximum limit.
Incremental sample	A quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the 20 kg laboratory sample.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of peanuts comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than 20 kg, a 20 kg laboratory sample should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample. The sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete a homogenization as possible.
Test portion	Portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire 20 kg laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted 20 kg sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the aflatoxin for chemical analysis. Based upon grinder capacity, the 20 kg aggregate sample can be divided into several equal sized samples, if all results are averaged.

B. SAMPLING**MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

3. Each lot which is to be examined must be sampled separately. Large lots should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. The subdivision can be done following provisions laid down in Table 1 below.
4. Taking into account that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of the weight of the sublots, the weight of the sublot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 20 %.

Table 1: Subdivision of large lots into sublots for sampling

Commodity	Lot weight – ton (T)	Weight or number of sublots	Number of incremental samples	Laboratory sample weight (kg)
Peanuts	≥ 500	100 tons	100	20
	>100 and <500	5 sublots	100	20
	≥ 25 and ≤ 100	2k5 tons	100	20
	>15 and ≤ 25	--1 sublot	100	20

NUMBER OF INCREMENTAL SAMPLES FOR LOTS OF LESS THAN 15 TONS

5. The number of incremental samples to be taken depends on the weight of the lot, with a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 100. The figures in the following Table 2 may be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken. It is necessary that the total sample weight of 20 kg is achieved.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Table 2: Number of incremental samples to be taken depending on the weight of the lot**

Lot weight tons – (T)	N° of incremental samples
$T \leq 1$	10
$1 < T \leq 5$	40
$5 < T \leq 10$	60
$10 < T < 15$	80

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE SELECTION

6. Procedures used to take incremental samples from a peanut lot are extremely important. Every individual peanut in the lot should have an equal chance of being chosen. Biases will be introduced by the sample selection methods if equipment and procedures used to select the incremental samples prohibit or reduce the chances of any item in the lot from being chosen.
7. Since there is no way to know if the contaminated peanut kernels are uniformly dispersed throughout the lot, it is essential that the aggregate sample be the accumulation of many small portions or increments of the product selected from different locations throughout the lot. If the aggregate sample is larger than desired, it should be blended and subdivided until the desired laboratory sample size is achieved.

STATIC LOTS

8. A static lot can be defined as a large mass of peanuts contained either in a single large container such as a wagon, truck, or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the peanuts are stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because the container may not allow access to all peanuts.
9. Taking an aggregate sample from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices used should be specially designed for the type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all product, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small increments of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.
10. For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot weight (LT), incremental sample weight (IS), aggregate sample weight (AS) and the individual packing weight (IP), as follows:

$$\text{Equation 1: } SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP).$$

The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All weights should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

11. True random sampling can be more nearly achieved when selecting an aggregate sample from a moving stream of peanuts as the lot is transferred, for example, by a conveyor belt from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small increments of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the peanuts to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample, then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample.
12. Automatic sampling equipment such as cross-cut samplers are commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, small increments of peanuts should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time peanuts flow past the sampling point.
13. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about three times the largest dimensions of the items in the lot.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

14. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a cross cut sampler is:

$$\text{Equation 2: } S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V).$$

D is the width of the diverter cup opening (in cm), LT is the lot size (in kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (in seconds), and V is cup velocity (in cm/sec).

15. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup is:

$$\text{Equation 3: } SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR).$$

16. Equation 2 can also be used to compute other terms of interest such as the time between cuts (T). For example, the required time (T) between cuts of the diverter cup to obtain a 20 kg aggregate sample from a 30 000 kg lot where the diverter cup width is 5.08 cm (2 inches), and the cup velocity through the stream 30 cm/sec. Solving for T in Equation 2.

$$T = (5.08 \text{ cm} \times 30\,000 \text{ kg}) / (20 \text{ kg} \times 30 \text{ cm/sec}) = 254 \text{ sec}$$

17. If the lot is moving at 500 kg per minute, the entire lot will pass through the sampler in 60 minutes and only 14 cuts (14 incremental samples) will be made by the cup through the lot. This may be considered too infrequent in that too much product passes through the sampler between the time the cup cuts through the stream.

WEIGHT OF THE INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

18. The weight of the incremental sample should be approximately 200 g or greater, depending on the total number of increments, to obtain an aggregate sample of 20 kg.

PACKAGING AND TRANSMISSION OF SAMPLES

19. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample which might arise during transportation or storage.

SEALING AND LABELLING OF SAMPLES

20. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

C. SAMPLE PREPARATION**PRECAUTIONS**

21. Daylight should be excluded as much as possible during the procedure, since aflatoxin gradually breaks down under the influence of ultra-violet light.

HOMOGENIZATION – GRINDING

22. As the distribution of aflatoxin is extremely non-homogeneous, samples should be prepared - and especially homogenized - with extreme care. All laboratory sample obtained from aggregate sample is to be used for the homogenization/grinding of the sample.
23. The sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete a homogenization as possible.
24. The use of a hammer mill with a #14 screen (3.1 mm diameter hole in the screen) has been proven to represent a compromise in terms of cost and precision. A better homogenisation (finer grind – slurry) can be obtained by more sophisticated equipment, resulting in a lower sample preparation variance.

TEST PORTION

25. A minimum test portion size of 100 g taken from the laboratory sample.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****D. ANALYTICAL METHODS****BACKGROUND**

26. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specified method. The performance criteria established for methods should include all the parameters that need to be addressed by each laboratory such as the detection limit, repeatability coefficient of variation, reproducibility coefficient of variation, and the percent recovery necessary for various statutory limits. Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities. Analytical methods that are accepted by chemists internationally (such as AOAC) may be used. These methods are regularly monitored and improved depending upon technology.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR METHODS OF ANALYSIS**Table 3: Specific requirements with which methods of analysis should comply**

Criterion	Concentration Range	Recommended Value	Maximum Permitted Value
Blanks	All	Negligible	-
Recovery-Aflatoxins Total	1 - 15 µg/kg	70 to 110 %	
	> 15 µg/kg	80 to 110 %	
Precision RSD _R	All	As derived from Horwitz Equation	2 x value derived from Horwitz Equation
Precision RSD _r may be calculated as 0.66 times Precision RSD _R at the concentration of interest			

- The detection limits of the methods used are not stated as the precision values are given at the concentrations of interest;
- The precision values are calculated from the Horwitz equation, i.e.:

$$RSD_R = 2^{(1-0.5\log C)}$$

where:

- * RSD_R is the relative standard deviation calculated from results generated under reproducibility conditions $[(S_r/\bar{x}) \times 100]$
- * C is the concentration ratio (i.e. 1 = 100 g/100 g, 0.001 = 1,000 mg/kg)

27. This is a generalized precision equation which has been found to be independent of analyte and matrix but solely dependent on concentration for most routine methods of analysis.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 2**

**SAMPLING PLANS FOR AFLATOXIN CONTAMINATION IN
READY-TO-EAT TREENUTS AND TREENUTS
DESTINED FOR FURTHER PROCESSING: ALMONDS, HAZELNUTS, PISTACHIOS
AND SHELLED BRAZIL NUTS**

DEFINITION

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings.
Sublot	Designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	It is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and an accept/reject limit. An aflatoxin test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and aflatoxin quantification. The accept/reject limit is a tolerance usually equal to the codex maximum level.
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of tree nuts comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample(s), the laboratory sample(s) should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample.
Test portion	A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the aflatoxin for chemical analysis.
Ready-to-eat treenuts	Nuts, which are not intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption.
Treenuts destined for further processing	Nuts, which are intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption. Processes that have proven to reduce levels of aflatoxins are shelling, blanching followed by color sorting, and sorting by specific gravity and color (damage). There is some evidence that roasting reduces aflatoxins in pistachios but for other nuts the evidence is still to be supplied.
Operating characteristic (OC) Curve	A plot of the probability of a accepting a lot versus lot concentration when using a specific sampling plan design. The OC curve provides an estimate of good lots rejected (exporter's risk) and bad lots accepted (importer's risk) by a specific aflatoxin sampling plan design.

SAMPLING PLAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

1. Importers may commercially classify treenuts as either "ready-to-eat" (RTE) or "destined for further processing" (DFP). As a result, maximum levels and sampling plans are proposed for both commercial types of treenuts. Maximum levels need to be defined for treenuts destined for further processing and ready-to-eat treenuts before a final decision can be made about a sampling plan design.
2. Treenuts can be marketed either as inshell or shelled nuts. For example, pistachios are predominately marketed as inshell nuts while almonds are predominately marketed as shelled nuts.
3. Sampling statistics, shown in [Annex I](#), are based upon the uncertainty and aflatoxin distribution among laboratory samples of shelled nuts. Because the shelled nut count per kg is different for each of the three treenuts, the laboratory sample size is expressed in number of nuts for statistical purposes. However, the shelled nut count per kg for each treenut, shown in [Annex I](#), can be used to convert laboratory sample size from number of nuts to mass and vice versa.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

4. Uncertainty estimates associated with sampling, sample preparation, and analysis, shown in [Annex I](#), and the negative binomial distribution¹⁸ are used to calculate operating characteristic (OC) curves that describe the performance of the proposed aflatoxin-sampling plans ([Annex II](#)).
5. In [Annex I](#), the analytical variance reflects a reproducibility relative standard deviation of 22%, which is suggested by Thompson and is based upon Food Analysis Performance Assessment Scheme (FAPAS) data¹⁹. A relative standard deviation of 22% is considered by FAPAS as an appropriate measure of the best agreement that can be reliably obtained between laboratories. An analytical uncertainty of 22% is larger than the within laboratory variation measured in the sampling studies for the three treenuts²⁰.
6. The issue of correcting the analytical test result for recovery is not addressed in this document. However, Table 2 specifies several performance criteria for analytical methods including suggestions for the range of acceptable recovery rates.

AFLATOXIN TEST PROCEDURE AND MAXIMUM LEVELS

7. An aflatoxin-sampling plan is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and a maximum level. A value for the proposed maximum level and the aflatoxin test procedure are given below in this section.
8. The maximum levels for total aflatoxins in treenuts (almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts) “ready-to-eat” and “destined for further processing” are 10 and 15 µg/kg, respectively.
9. Choice of the number and size of the laboratory sample is a compromise between minimizing risks (false positives and false negatives) and costs related to sampling and restricting trade. For simplicity, it is recommended that the proposed aflatoxin sampling plans use a 20 kg aggregate sample for all three treenuts.
10. The two sampling plans (RTE and DFP) have been designed for enforcement and controls concerning total aflatoxins in bulk consignments (lots) of treenuts traded in the export market.

Treenuts destined for further processing

Maximum level	–	15 µg/kg total aflatoxins
Number of laboratory samples	–	1
Laboratory sample size	–	20 kg
Almonds	–	shelled nuts
Hazelnuts	–	shelled nuts
Pistachios	–	inshell nuts (equivalent to about 10 kg shelled nuts that is calculated on the basis of the actual edible portion in the sample)
Brazil nuts	–	shelled nuts
Sample preparation	–	sample shall be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process, e.g., dry grind with a vertical cutter mixer type mill, that has been demonstrated to provide the lowest sample preparation variance. Preferably, Brazil nuts should be ground as slurry.

¹⁸ Whitaker, T., Dickens, J., Monroe, R., and Wiser, E. 1972. Comparison of the negative binomial distribution of aflatoxin in shelled peanuts to the negative binomial distribution. J. American Oil Chemists' Society, 49:590-593.

¹⁹ Thompson, M. 2000. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing. J. Royal Society of Chemistry, 125:385-386.

²⁰ The within laboratory analytical uncertainty for each treenut can be found at the website and Brazil nuts in the CONFORCAST

Website: <http://www5.bae.ncsu.edu/usda/www/ResearchActDocs/treenutwg.html>

CONFORCAST: Ferramentas Analíticas para Capacitação do Brasil na Garantia da Conformidade da Castanha-Do-Brasil (Bertholletia Excelsa) quanto ao Perigo aflatoxina. Projeto nº 1.265/05, Aprovado pela FINEP na Chamada Pública, “Ação Transversal - TIB - 06/2005 - Linha 1”. MAPA. Ministério da Agricultura, pecuária e do Abastecimento. Secretaria de Defesa Agropecuária - DAS, Departamento de Inspeção de Produtos de Origem Vegetal – DIPOV. Coordenação-Geral de Apoio Laboratorial – CGAL, Laboratório Nacional Agropecuario – LANAGRO/MG, United States Department of Agriculture (Thomas Whitaker and Andy Slate).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Analytical method	–	performance based (see Table 2)
Decision rule	–	If the aflatoxin test result is less than or equal to 15 µg/kg total aflatoxins, then accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

The operating characteristic curve describing the performance of the sampling plan for the three treenuts destined for further processing is shown in [Annex II](#).

Ready-to-eat treenuts

Maximum level	–	10 µg/kg total aflatoxins
Number of laboratory samples	–	2
Laboratory sample size	–	10 kg
Almonds	–	shelled nuts
Hazelnuts	–	shelled nuts
Pistachios	–	in-shell nuts (equivalent to about 5 kg shelled nuts per test sample that is calculated on the basis of the actual edible portion in the sample)
Brazil nuts	–	shelled nuts
Sample preparation	–	sample shall be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process, e.g., dry grind with a vertical cutter mixer type mill, that has been demonstrated to provide the lowest sample preparation variance. Preferably, Brazil nuts should be ground as slurry.
Analytical method	–	performance based (see Table 2)
Decision rule	–	If the aflatoxin test result is less than or equal to 10 µg/kg total aflatoxin in both test samples, then accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

The operating characteristic curve describing the performance of the sampling plan for the three ready-to-eat treenuts is shown in [Annex II](#).

11. To assist member countries implement these two sampling plans, sample selection methods, sample preparation methods, and analytical methods required to quantify aflatoxin in laboratory samples taken from bulk treenut lots are described in the following sections.

SAMPLE SELECTION**MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

12. Each lot, which is to be examined for aflatoxin, must be sampled separately. Lots larger than 25 tons should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. If a lot is greater than 25 tons, the number of sublots is equal to the lot weight in tones divided by 25 tons. It is recommended that a lot or a sublot should not exceed 25 tons. The minimum lot weight should be 500 kg.
13. Taking into account that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of 25 tone sublots, the weight of the sublot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 25%.
14. Samples should be taken from the same lot, i.e. they should have the same batch code or at the very least the same best before date. Any changes which would affect the mycotoxin content, the analytical determination or make the aggregate samples collected unrepresentative should be avoided. For example, do not open packaging in adverse weather conditions or expose samples to excessive moisture or sunlight. Avoid cross-contamination from other potentially contaminated consignments nearby.
15. In most cases any truck or container will have to be unloaded to allow representative sampling to be carried out.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****INCREMENTAL SAMPLE SELECTION**

16. Procedures used to take incremental samples from a treenut lot are extremely important. Every individual nut in the lot should have an equal chance of being chosen. Biases will be introduced by sample selection methods if equipment and procedures used to select the incremental samples prohibit or reduce the chances of any item in the lot from being chosen.
17. Since there is no way to know if the contaminated treenut kernels are uniformly dispersed throughout the lot, it is essential that the aggregate sample be the accumulation of many small incremental samples of product selected from different locations throughout the lot. If the aggregate sample is larger than desired, it should be blended and subdivided until the desired laboratory sample size is achieved.

NUMBER OF INCREMENTAL SAMPLES FOR LOTS OF VARYING WEIGHT

18. The number and size of the laboratory sample(s) will not vary with lot (sublot) size. However, the number and size of the incremental samples will vary with lot (sublot) size.
19. The number of incremental samples to be taken from a lot (sublot) depends on the weight of the lot. Table 1 shall be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken from lots or sublots of various sizes below 25 tons. The number of incremental samples varies from a minimum of 10 and to a maximum of 100.

Table 1. Number and size of incremental samples composited for an aggregate sample of 20 kg ^a as a function of lot (or sublot) weight

Lot or sublot weight ^b (T in tons)	Minimum number of incremental samples	Minimum incremental sample size ^c (g)	Minimum aggregate sample size (kg)
T < 1	10	2 000	20
1 ≤ T < 5	25	800	20
5 ≤ T < 10	50	400	20
10 ≤ T < 15	75	267	20
15 ≤ T	100	200	20

a / Minimum aggregate sample size = laboratory sample size of 20 kg

b / 1 Ton = 1 000 kg

c / Minimum incremental sample size = laboratory sample size (20 kg) /
minimum number of incremental samples,
i.e. for 0.5 < T < 1 ton, 2 000 g = 20 000/10

WEIGHT OF THE INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

20. The suggested minimum weight of the incremental sample should be approximately 200 g for lots of 25 metric tons (25 000 kg). The number and/or size of incremental samples will have to be larger than that suggested in Table 1 for lots sizes below 25 000 kg in order to obtain an aggregate sample greater than or equal to the 20 kg laboratory sample.

STATIC LOTS

21. A static lot can be defined as a large mass of treenuts contained either in a large single container such as a wagon, truck or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the nuts are stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because all containers in the lot or sublot may not be accessible.
22. Taking incremental samples from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices should be specifically designed for the commodity and type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all products, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small incremental samples of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

23. For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot weight (LT), incremental sample weight (IS), aggregate sample weight (AS) and the individual packing weight (IP), as follows:

$$\text{Equation 1: } SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP).$$

24. The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All weights should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

25. Representative aggregate samples can be more easily produced when selecting incremental samples from a moving stream of treenuts as the lot is transferred from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small incremental samples of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the incremental samples to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample(s), then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample(s).
26. Automatic sampling equipment such as a cross-cut sampler is commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic sampling equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, incremental samples should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time the nuts flow past the sampling point.
27. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of the flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about two to three times the largest dimensions of items in the lot.
28. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a cross cut sampler is:

$$\text{Equation 2: } S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V),$$

where D is the width of the diverter cup opening (cm), LT is the lot size (kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (seconds), and V is cup velocity (cm/sec).

29. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup can be computed from Equation 3 as a function of S, V, D, and MR.

$$\text{Equation 3: } SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR).$$

30. Equations 2 and 3 can also be used to compute other terms of interest such as the time between cuts (T). For example, the time (T) required between cuts of the diverter cup to obtain a 20 kg aggregate sample from a 20 000 kg lot where the diverter cup width is 5.0 cm and the cup velocity through the stream 30 cm/sec. Solving for T in Equation 2,

$$T = (5.0 \text{ cm} \times 20\,000 \text{ kg}) / (20 \text{ kg} \times 30 \text{ cm/sec}) = 250 \text{ sec.}$$

31. If the lot is moving at 500 kg per minute, the entire lot will pass through the sampler in 40 minutes (2 400 sec) and only 9.6 cuts (9 incremental samples) will be made by the cup through the lot (Equation 3). This may be considered too infrequent, in that too much product (2 083.3 kg) passes through the sampler between the time the cup cuts through the stream.

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

32. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, sunlight, and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample, which might arise during transportation or storage. Samples should be stored in a cool dark place.

SEALING AND LABELLING OF SAMPLES

33. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****SAMPLE PREPARATION****PRECAUTIONS**

34. Sunlight should be excluded as much as possible during sample preparation, since aflatoxin gradually breaks down under the influence of ultra-violet light. Also, environmental temperature and relative humidity should be controlled and not favor mold growth and aflatoxin formation.

HOMOGENIZATION - GRINDING

35. As the distribution of aflatoxin is extremely non-homogeneous, laboratory samples should be homogenized by grinding the entire laboratory sample received by the laboratory. Homogenization is a procedure that reduces particle size and disperses the contaminated particles evenly throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
36. The laboratory sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete homogenization as possible. Complete homogenization implies that particle size is extremely small, and the variability associated with sample preparation (Annex I) approaches zero. After grinding, the grinder should be cleaned to prevent aflatoxin cross-contamination.
37. The use of vertical cutter mixer type grinders that mix and comminute the laboratory sample into a paste represent a compromise in terms of cost and fineness of grind or particle size reduction²¹. A better homogenization (finer grind), such as a liquid slurry, can be obtained by more sophisticated equipment and should provide the lowest sample preparation variance²².

TEST PORTION

38. The suggested weight of the test portion taken from the comminuted laboratory sample should be approximately 50 g. If the laboratory sample is prepared using a liquid slurry, the slurry should contain 50 g of nut mass.
39. Procedures for selecting the 50 g test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. If mixing occurred during or after the comminution process, the 50 g test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample. Otherwise, the 50 g test portion should be the accumulation of several small portions selected throughout the laboratory sample.
40. It is suggested that three test portions be selected from each comminuted laboratory sample. The three test portions will be used for enforcement, appeal, and confirmation if needed.

ANALYTICAL METHODS**BACKGROUND**

41. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific method. The performance criteria established for methods should include all the parameters that need to be addressed by each laboratory such as the detection limit, repeatability coefficient of variation (within lab), reproducibility coefficient of variation (among lab), and the percent recovery necessary for various statutory limits. Analytical methods that are accepted by chemists internationally (such as AOAC, ISO) may be used. These methods are regularly monitored and improved depending upon technology.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR METHODS OF ANALYSIS

42. A list of criteria and performance levels are shown in Table 2. Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.

²¹ Ozay, G., Seyhan, F., Yilmaz, A., Whitaker, T., Slate, A., and Giesbrecht, F. 2006. Sampling hazelnuts for aflatoxin: Uncertainty associated with sampling, sample preparation, and analysis. J. Association Official Analytical Chemists, Int., 89:1004-1011.

²² Spanjer, M., Scholten, J., Kastrup, S., Jorissen, U., Schatzki, T., Toyofuku, N. 2006. Sample comminution for mycotoxin analysis: Dry milling or slurry mixing?, Food Additives and Contaminants, 23:73-83.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Table 2: Specific Requirements with which Methods of Analysis Should Comply**

Criterion	Concentration Range (ng/g)	Recommended value	Maximum Permitted Value
Blanks	All	Negligible	n/a
Recovery	1 to 15	70 to 110%	n/a
	>15	80 to 110%	n/a
Precision or Relative Standard Deviation RSD _R (Reproducibility)	1 to 120	Equation 4 by Thompson	2 x value derived from Equation 4
	>120	Equation 5 by Horwitz	2 x value derived from Equation 5
Precision or Relative Standard Deviation RSD _r (Repeatability)	1 to 120	Calculated as 0.66 times Precision RSD _R	n/a
	>120	Calculated as 0.66 times Precision RSD _r	n/a

n/a = not applicable

43. The detection limits of the methods used are not stated. Only the precision values are given at the concentrations of interest. The precision values are calculated from equations 4 and 5 developed by Thompson²³ and Horwitz and Albert²⁴, respectively.

Equation 4: $RSD_R = 22.0$ (for $C \leq 120 \mu\text{g/kg}$ or $c \leq 120 \times 10^{-9}$)Equation 5: $RSD_R = 2^{(1-0.5 \log c)}$ (for $C > 120 \mu\text{g/kg}$ or $c > 120 \times 10^{-9}$)

where:

- RSD_R = the relative standard deviation calculated from results generated under reproducibility conditions
- RSD_r = the relative standard deviation calculated from results generated under repeatability conditions = $0.66 RSD_R$
- c = the aflatoxin concentration ratio (i.e. $1 = 100 \text{ g}/100 \text{ g}$, $0.001 = 1 \text{ 000 mg/kg}$)
- C = aflatoxin concentration or mass of aflatoxin to mass of treenuts (i.e. $\mu\text{g/kg}$)

44. Equations 4 and 5 are generalized precision equations, which have been found to be independent of analyte and matrix but solely dependent on concentration for most routine methods of analysis.
45. Results should be reported on the edible portion of the sample.

²³ Thompson, M. 2000. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing. J. Royal Society of Chemistry, 125:385-386.

²⁴ Horwitz, W. and Albert, R. 2006. The Horwitz ratio (HorRat): A useful index of method performance with respect to precision. J. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Int., 89:1095-1109.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 2**

Uncertainty, as measured by the variance, associated with sampling, sample preparation, and analytical steps of the aflatoxin test procedure used to estimate aflatoxin in almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts.

Sampling data for almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts were supplied by the United States, Turkey, Iran, and Brazil respectively.

Variance estimates and the negative binomial distribution²⁵ were used to compute operating characteristic curves for each treenut in Annex II. Sampling, sample preparation, and analytical variances associated with testing almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts are shown in Table 1 below.

Because of the computational complexities associated with use of the negative binomial distribution to compute operational characteristic (OC) curves for various sampling plan designs, the effect of various laboratory sample sizes, various numbers of laboratory samples, and various maximum levels on the performance (OC curves) of sampling plan designs is provided at the website address <http://www5.bae.ncsu.edu/usda/www/ResearchActDocs/treenutwg.html> and for Brazil nuts in the CONFORCAST.

Table 1. Variances^a associated with the aflatoxin test procedure for each treenut.

Test Procedure	Almonds	Hazelnuts	Pistachios	Shelled Brazil nuts
Sampling ^{b,c}	$S^2_s = (7,730/ns) 5.759C^{1.561}$	$S^2_s = (10,000/ns) 4.291C^{1.609}$	$S^2_s = (8,000/ns) 7.913C^{1.475}$	$S^2_s = (1,850/ns) 4.8616C^{1.889}$
Sample Prep ^d	$S^2_{sp} = (100/nss) 0.170C^{1.646}$	$S^2_{sp} = (50/nss) 0.021C^{1.545}$	$S^2_{sp} = (25/nss) 2.334C^{1.522}$	$S^2_{sp} = (50/nss) 0.0306C^{0.632}$
Analytical ^e	$S^2_a = (1/na) 0.0484C^{2.0}$	$S^2_a = (1/na) 0.0484C^{2.0}$	$S^2_a = (1/na) 0.0484C^{2.0}$	experimental $S^2_a = (1/n) 0.0164C^{1.117}$ or FAPAS $S^2_a = (1/n) 0.0484C^{2.0}$
Total variance	$S^2_s + S^2_{sp} + S^2_a$	$S^2_s + S^2_{sp} + S^2_a$	$S^2_s + S^2_{sp} + S^2_a$	$S^2_s + S^2_{sp} + S^2_a$

a/ Variance = S^2 (s, sp, and a denote sampling, sample preparation, and analytical steps, respectively, of aflatoxin test procedure)

b/ ns = laboratory sample size in number of shelled nuts, nss = test portion size in grams, na = number of aliquots quantified by HPLC, and C = aflatoxin concentration in $\mu\text{g/kg}$ total aflatoxin.

c/ Shelled nut count/kg for almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and Brazil nuts is 773, 1 000, 1 600 and 185, respectively.

d/ Sample preparation for almonds, hazelnuts, and pistachios reflect Hobart, Robot Coupe, Marjaan Khatman and Turrax type mills, respectively. Laboratory samples were dry ground into a paste for each treenut except for Brazil nut that were prepared as a slurry Brazil nuts/water 1/1 w/w.

e/ Analytical variances reflect FAPAS recommendation for upper limit of analytical reproducibility uncertainty. A relative standard deviation of 22% is considered by Thompson²⁶ (based upon FAPAS data) as an appropriate measure of the best agreement that can be obtained between laboratories. An analytical uncertainty of 22% is larger than the within laboratory uncertainty measured in the sampling studies for the three treenuts²⁷.

²⁵ Whitaker, T., Dickens, J., Monroe, R., and Wiser, E. 1972. Comparison of the negative binomial distribution of aflatoxin in shelled peanuts to the negative binomial distribution. J. American Oil Chemists' Society, 49:590-593.

²⁶ Thompson, M. 2000. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing. J. Royal Society of Chemistry, 125:385-386.


²⁷ Horwitz, W. and Albert, R. 2006. The Horwitz ratio (HorRat): A useful index of method performance with respect to precision. J. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Int., 89:1095-1109.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 2**


Operating Characteristic Curves describing the performance of aflatoxin sampling plans for almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts.

Treenuts Destined for Further Processing

Operating Characteristic curve describing the performance of the aflatoxin sampling plan for almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts destined for further processing using a single laboratory sample of 20 kg and a maximum level of 15 µg/kg for total aflatoxins. The operating characteristic curve reflects uncertainty associated with a 20 kg laboratory sample of shelled nuts for almonds hazelnuts and shelled Brazil nuts and a 20 kg laboratory sample of inshell nuts (about 10 kg shelled nuts) for pistachios with dry grind with a vertical cutter mixer type mill almonds, hazelnuts, pistachio and slurry preparation for shelled Brazil nuts, 50 g test portion, and quantification of aflatoxin in the test portion by HPLC.

**Ready-to-Eats Treenuts**

Operating Characteristic curve describing the performance of the aflatoxin sampling plan for ready-to-eat almonds, hazelnuts, pistachios and shelled Brazil nuts using two laboratory samples of 10 kg each and a maximum level of 10 µg/kg for total aflatoxins, with dry grind with a vertical cutter mixer type mill almond, hazelnuts, pistachios and slurry preparation for shelled Brazil nuts, 50 g test portion, and quantification of aflatoxin in the test portion by HPLC.



Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 3****SAMPLING PLAN FOR AFLATOXIN CONTAMINATION IN DRIED FIGS****DEFINITION**

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings.
Sublot	Designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	It is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and an accept/reject level. An aflatoxin test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection of sample(s) of a given size, sample preparation and aflatoxin quantification. The accept/reject level is a tolerance usually equal to the Codex maximum level.
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of dried figs comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample(s), the laboratory sample(s) should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample.
Test portion	A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the aflatoxin for chemical analysis.
Ready-to-eat dried figs	Dried figs, which are not intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that have proven to reduce levels of aflatoxin before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption.
Operating characteristic (OC) curve	A plot of the probability of accepting a lot versus lot concentration when using a specific sampling plan design. The OC curve also provides an estimate of good lots rejected (exporter's risk) and bad lots accepted (importer's risk) by a specific aflatoxin sampling plan design.

SAMPLING PLAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

1. Importers commercially classify dried figs mostly as "ready-to-eat" (RTE). As a result, maximum levels and sampling plans are proposed for only ready-to-eat dried figs.
2. The performance of the proposed draft sampling plan was computed using the variability and aflatoxin distribution among laboratory samples of dried figs taken from contaminated lots. Because the dried fig count per kg is different for different varieties of dried figs, the laboratory sample size is expressed in number of dried figs for statistical purposes. However, the dried fig count per kg for each variety of dried figs can be used to convert laboratory sample size from number of dried figs to mass and vice versa.
3. Uncertainty estimates (variances) associated with sampling, sample preparation, and analysis and the negative binomial distribution²⁸ are used to calculate operating characteristic (OC) curves that describe the performance of the proposed aflatoxin-sampling plans for dried figs.

²⁸ Whitaker, T., Dickens, J., Monroe, R., and Wiser, E. 1972. Comparison of the negative binomial distribution of aflatoxin in shelled peanuts to the negative binomial distribution. J. American Oil Chemists' Society, 49:590-593.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

4. The analytical variance measured in the sampling study reflects within laboratory variance and was replaced with an estimate of analytical variance that reflects a reproducibility relative standard deviation of 22%, which is suggested by Thompson²⁹ and is based upon Food Analysis Performance Assessment Scheme (FAPAS) data². A relative standard deviation of 22% is considered by FAPAS as an appropriate measure of the best agreement that can be reliably obtained between laboratories. An analytical uncertainty of 22% is larger than the within laboratory variation measured in the sampling studies for dried figs.
5. The issue of correcting the analytical test result for recovery is not addressed in this document. However, Table 2 specifies several performance criteria for analytical methods including suggestions for the range of acceptable recovery rates.

AFLATOXIN TEST PROCEDURE AND MAXIMUM LEVELS

6. An aflatoxin-sampling plan is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and a maximum level. A value for the proposed maximum level and the aflatoxin test procedure are given below in this section.
7. The maximum level for “ready-to-eat” dried figs is 10 µg/kg total aflatoxins.
8. Choice of the number and size of the laboratory sample is a compromise between minimizing risks (false positives and false negatives) and costs related to sampling and restricting trade. For simplicity, it is recommended that the proposed aflatoxin sampling plan uses three 10 kg aggregate samples of dried figs.
9. The RTE sampling plan has been designed for enforcement and controls concerning total aflatoxins in bulk consignments (lots) of dried figs traded in the export market.

Maximum level	– 10 µg/kg total aflatoxins
Number of laboratory samples	– 3
Laboratory sample size	– 10 kg
Sample preparation	– water-slurry grind and a test portion that represents 55 g mass of dried figs
Analytical method	– performance based (see Table 2)
Decision rule	– If the aflatoxin test result is less than or equal to 10 µg/kg total aflatoxins for all three 10 kg laboratory samples, then accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

The operating characteristic curve describing the performance of the sampling plan for the ready-to-eat dried figs is shown in paragraph 46 at the end of this Annex.

10. To assist member countries implement the above Codex sampling plan, sample selection methods, sample preparation methods, and analytical methods required to quantify aflatoxin in laboratory samples taken from bulk dried fig lots are described in the following sections.

SAMPLE SELECTION**MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

11. Each lot, which is to be examined for aflatoxin, must be sampled separately. Lots larger than 15 tons should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. If a lot is greater than 15 tons, the number of sublots is equal to the lot weight in tons divided by 15 tons. It is recommended that a lot or a subplot should not exceed 15 tons.
12. Considering that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of 15 tons, the weight of the subplot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 25%.
13. Samples should be taken from the same lot, i.e. they should have the same batch code or at the very least the same best before date. Any changes which would affect the mycotoxin content, the analytical determination or make the aggregate samples collected unrepresentative should be avoided. For example, do not open packaging in adverse weather conditions or expose samples to excessive moisture or sunlight. Avoid cross-contamination from other potentially contaminated consignments nearby.

²⁹ Thompson, M. 2000. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing. J. Royal Society of Chemistry, 125:385-386.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

14. In most cases any truck or container will have to be unloaded to allow representative sampling to be carried out.

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE SELECTION

15. Procedures used to take incremental samples from a dried fig lot are extremely important. Every individual fig in the lot should have an equal chance of being chosen. Biases will be introduced by sample selection methods if equipment and procedures used to select the incremental samples prohibit or reduce the chances of any item in the lot from being chosen.
16. Since there is no way to know if the contaminated figs are uniformly dispersed throughout the lot, it is essential that the aggregate sample be the accumulation of many small incremental samples of product selected from different locations throughout the lot. If the aggregate sample is larger than desired, it should be blended and subdivided until the desired laboratory sample size is achieved.
17. For lots less than 10 tons, the size of the aggregate sample is reduced so that the aggregate sample size doesn't exceed a significant portion of the lot or subplot size.

NUMBER AND SIZE OF INCREMENTAL SAMPLES FOR LOTS OF VARYING WEIGHT

18. The number of incremental samples to be taken from a lot (subplot) depends on the weight of the lot. Table 1 shall be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken from lots or sublots of various sizes. The number of incremental samples varies from 10 to 100 for lots or sublots of various sizes.

Table 1. Number and size of incremental samples composited for an aggregate sample of 30 kg^a as a function of lot (or subplot) weight

Lot or subplot weight ^b (T in Tons)	Minimum number of incremental samples	Minimum incremental sample size ^c (g)	Minimum aggregate sample size (kg)	Laboratory sample size (kg)	Number of laboratory samples
15.0 ≥ T > 10.0	100	300	30	10	3
10.0 ≥ T > 5.0	80	300	24	8	3
5.0 ≥ T > 2.0	60	300	18	9	2
2.0 ≥ T > 1.0	40	300	12	6	2
1.0 ≥ T > 0.5	30	300	9	9	1
0.5 ≥ T > 0.2	20	300	6	6	1
0.2 ≥ T > 0.1	15	300	4.5	4.5	1
0.1 ≥ T	10	300	3	3	1

a/ Minimum aggregate sample size = laboratory sample size of 30 kg for lots above 10 tons

b/ 1 Ton = 1 000 kg

c/ Minimum incremental sample size = laboratory sample size (30 kg)/minimum number of incremental samples, i.e. for 10 < T ≤ 15 tons, 300 g = 30 000 g/100

19. The suggested minimum weight of the incremental sample is 300 g for lots and sublots of various sizes.

STATIC LOTS

20. A static lot can be defined as a large mass of dried figs contained either in a large single container such as a wagon, truck or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the dried figs are stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because all containers in the lot or subplot may not be accessible.
21. Taking incremental samples from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices should be specifically designed for the commodity and type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all products, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small incremental samples of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.
22. For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot weight (LT), incremental sample weight (IS), aggregate sample weight (AS) and the individual packing weight (IP), as follows:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Equation 1: $SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP)$.

23. The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All weights should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

24. Representative aggregate samples can be more easily produced when selecting incremental samples from a moving stream of dried figs as the lot is transferred from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small incremental samples of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the incremental samples to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample(s), then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample(s).
25. Automatic sampling equipment such as a cross-cut sampler is commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic sampling equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, incremental samples should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time the figs flow past the sampling point.
26. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of the flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about two to three times the largest dimensions of items in the lot.
27. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a cross cut sampler is:

Equation 2: $S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V)$,

where D is the width of the diverter cup opening (cm), LT is the lot size (kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (seconds), and V is cup velocity (cm/sec).

28. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup can be computed from Equation 3 as a function of S, V, D, and MR.

Equation 3: $SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR)$.

29. Equations 2 and 3 can also be used to compute other terms of interest such as the time between cuts (T). For example, the time (T) required between cuts of the diverter cup to obtain a 30 kg aggregate sample from a 20 000 kg lot where the diverter cup width is 5.0 cm and the cup velocity through the stream 20 cm/sec. Solving for T in Equation 2,

$T = (5.0 \text{ cm} \times 20\,000 \text{ kg}) / (30 \text{ kg} \times 20 \text{ cm/sec}) = 167 \text{ sec.}$

30. If the lot is moving at 500 kg per minute, the entire lot will pass through the sampler in 40 minutes (2 400 sec) and only 14.4 cuts (14 incremental samples) will be made by the cup through the lot (Equation 3). This may be considered too infrequent, in that too much product (1 388.9 kg) passes through the sampler between the time the cup cuts through the stream.

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

31. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, sunlight, and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample, which might arise during transportation or storage. Samples should be stored in a cool dark place.

SEALING AND LABELLING OF SAMPLES

32. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****SAMPLE PREPARATION****PRECAUTIONS**

33. Sunlight should be excluded as much as possible during sample preparation, since aflatoxin gradually breaks down under the influence of ultra-violet light. Also, environmental temperature and relative humidity should be controlled and not favor mold growth and aflatoxin formation.

HOMOGENIZATION – GRINDING

34. As the distribution of aflatoxin is extremely non-homogeneous, the laboratory samples should be homogenized by grinding the entire laboratory sample received by the laboratory. Homogenization is a procedure that reduces particle size and disperses the contaminated particles evenly throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
35. The laboratory sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete homogenization as possible. Complete homogenization implies that particle size is extremely small, and the variability associated with sample preparation approaches zero. After grinding, the grinder should be cleaned to prevent aflatoxin cross-contamination.
36. The use of vertical cutter mixer type grinders that mix and comminute the laboratory sample into a paste represent a compromise in terms of cost and fineness of grind or particle size reduction³⁰. A better homogenization (finer grind), such as a liquid slurry, can be obtained by more sophisticated equipment and should provide the lowest sample preparation variance³¹.

TEST PORTION

37. The suggested weight of the test portion taken from the comminuted laboratory sample should be approximately 50 g. If the laboratory sample is prepared using a liquid slurry, the slurry should contain 50 g of fig mass.
38. Procedures for selecting the 50 g test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. If mixing occurred during or after the comminution process, the 50 g test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample. Otherwise, the 50 g test portion should be the accumulation of several small portions selected throughout the laboratory sample.
39. It is suggested that three test portions be selected from each comminuted laboratory sample. The three test portions will be used for enforcement, appeal, and confirmation if needed.

ANALYTICAL METHODS**BACKGROUND**

40. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific analytical method. The performance criteria established for analytical methods should include all the parameters that need to be addressed by each laboratory such as the detection limit, repeatability coefficient of variation (within lab), reproducibility coefficient of variation (among lab), and the percent recovery necessary for various statutory limits. Analytical methods that are accepted by chemists internationally (such as AOAC) may be used. These methods are regularly monitored and improved depending upon technology.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR METHODS OF ANALYSIS

41. A list of criteria and performance levels are shown in Table 2. Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.

³⁰ Ozay, G., Seyhan, F., Yilmaz, A., Whitaker, T., Slate, A., and Giesbrecht, F. 2006. Sampling hazelnuts for aflatoxin: Uncertainty associated with sampling, sample preparation, and analysis. *J. Association Official Analytical Chemists, Int.*, 89:1004-1011.

³¹ Spanjer, M., Scholten, J., Kastrup, S., Jorissen, U., Schatzki, T., Toyofuku, N. 2006. Sample comminution for mycotoxin analysis: Dry milling or slurry mixing?, *Food Additives and Contaminants*, 23:73-83.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Table 2: Specific Requirements with which Methods of Analysis Should Comply**

Criterion	Concentration Range (ng/g)	Recommended Value	Maximum Permitted Value
Blanks	All	Negligible	n/a
Recovery	1 to 15	70 to 110%	n/a
	> 15	80 to 110%	n/a
Precision or Relative Standard Deviation RSD_R (Reproducibility)	1 to 120	Equation 4 by Thompson	2 x value derived from Equation 4
	> 120	Equation 5 by Horwitz	2 x value derived from Equation 5
Precision or Relative Standard Deviation RSD_r (Repeatability)	1 to 120	Calculated as 0.66 times Precision RSD_R	n/a
	> 120	Calculated as 0.66 times Precision RSD_r	n/a

n/a = not applicable

42. The detection limits of the methods used are not stated. Only the precision values are given at the concentrations of interest. The precision values (expressed as a %) are calculated from equations 4 and 5 developed by Thompson and Horwitz and Albert, respectively.

Equation 4: $RSD_R = 22.0$ Equation 5: $RSD_R = 45.25C^{-0.15}$

where:

- RSD_R = the relative standard deviation calculated from results generated under reproducibility conditions
- RSD_r = the relative standard deviation calculated from results generated under repeatability conditions = $0.66RSD_R$
- C = aflatoxin concentration or mass of aflatoxin to mass of dried figs (i.e. ng/g)

43. Equations 4 and 5 are generalized precision equations, which have been found to be independent of analyte and matrix but solely dependent on concentration for most routine methods of analysis.

44. Results should be reported on the sample.

UNCERTAINTY, AS MEASURED BY THE VARIANCE, ASSOCIATED WITH THE SAMPLING, SAMPLE PREPARATION, AND ANALYTICAL STEPS OF THE AFLATOXIN TEST PROCEDURE USED TO DETECT AFLATOXIN IN DRIED FIGS

45. The sampling, sample preparation, and analytical variances associated with the aflatoxin test procedure for dried figs are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Variances^a associated with the aflatoxin test procedure for each dried figs

Test Procedure	Variances for Dried Figs
Sampling ^{b,c}	$S_s^2 = (590/ns)2.219C^{1.433}$
Sample Prep ^d	$S_{sp}^2 = (55/nss)0.01170C^{1.465}$
Analytical ^e	$S_a^2 = (1/na)0.0484C^{2.0}$
Total	$S_t^2 = S_s^2 + S_{sp}^2 + S_a^2$

a / Variance = S^2 (t, s, sp, and a denote total, sampling, sample preparation, and analytical steps, respectively, of aflatoxin test procedure)

b / ns = laboratory sample size in number of dried figs, nss = test portion size in grams of fig mass, na = number of aliquots quantified by HPLC, and C = aflatoxin concentration in ng/g total aflatoxins.

c / Count/kg for dried figs averaged 59/kg.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

d / Sample preparation variance reflects a water-slurry method and a test portion that reflects 55 g fig mass.

e / Analytical variances reflect FAPAS recommendation for upper limit of analytical reproducibility uncertainty. A relative standard deviation of 22% is considered by Thompson³² (based upon FAPAS data) as an appropriate measure of the best agreement that can be obtained between laboratories. An analytical uncertainty of 22% is larger than the within laboratory uncertainty measured in the sampling studies for the three dried figs.

OPERATING CHARACTERISTIC CURVE DESCRIBING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DRAFT AFLATOXIN SAMPLING PLAN FOR READY-TO-EAT DRIED FIGS

46. The operating characteristic curve describing the performance of draft aflatoxin sampling plan for ready-to-eat dried figs is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Operating characteristic (OC) curve describing the performance of the aflatoxin sampling plan for ready-to-eat dried figs using three laboratory samples of 10 kg each and a maximum level of 10 µg/kg total aflatoxins, water-slurry comminution method, test portion that reflects 55 g fig mass, and quantification of aflatoxin in a the test portion by HPLC.

³² Thompson, M. 2000. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing. J. Royal Society of Chemistry, 125:385-386.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Annex 4**

**SAMPLING PLANS FOR TOTAL AFLATOXINS IN CERTAIN CEREALS AND
CEREAL-BASED PRODUCTS INCLUDING FOODS FOR INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN**

Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in maize grain, destined for further processing

Maximum level	15 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	Increments of 100g, depending on the lot weight (≥0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥5 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 15 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize

Maximum level	10 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	10 x 100g
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh), if necessary for coarse samples
Laboratory sample weight	1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 10 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in husked rice**

Maximum level	20 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	Increments of 100g, depending on the lot weight (≥0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥5 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 20 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in polished rice

Maximum level	5 µg/Kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	Increments of 100g, depending on the lot weight (≥0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥5 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 5 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in sorghum**

Maximum level	10 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	Increments of 100g, depending on the lot weight (≥0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥5 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 10 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in cereal-based food for infants and young children

Maximum level	5 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	10 x 100g
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh), if necessary for coarse samples
Laboratory sample weight	1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 5 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Sampling plans and performance criteria for aflatoxin (AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2) in cereal-based food for infants and young children destined for food aid programmes

Maximum level	10 µg/kg AFB1+AFB2+AFG1+AFG2
Increments	10 x 100g
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm – 20 mesh), if necessary for coarse samples
Laboratory sample size	1 kg
Number of laboratory weight	1
Test portion	25g
Method	Selected according to the established performance criteria in Table 3
Decision rule	If the sum of test results of AFB1, AFB2, AFG1 and AFG2 for the laboratory sample is equal to or less than 10 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot

DEFINITIONS

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings.
Sublot	Designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	It is defined by an aflatoxin test procedure and an accept/reject level. An aflatoxin test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and analysis or aflatoxin quantification. The accept/reject level is a tolerance usually equal to the Codex maximum level (ML).
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of cereal grains, shelled cereal grains and cereal-based products comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample (s), the laboratory sample (s) should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample in such a way to ensure that the laboratory sample is still representative of the sublot sampled.
Test portion	A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the aflatoxin for chemical analysis.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****SAMPLING PLAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS****MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

- Each lot of cereal grains and cereal-based products, which is to be examined for AFs, must be sampled separately. Lots larger than 50 tons should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. If a lot is greater than 50 tons, the lot should be subdivided into sublots according to Table 1.

Table 1. Subdivision of cereal grains sublots according to lot weight – Maize grain, sorghum, polished rice, and husked rice

Lot weight (t)	Maximum weight or minimum number of sublots	Number of incremental samples	Minimum laboratory sample weight (kg)
≥ 1500	500 tons	100	5
> 300 and < 1500	3 sublots	100	5
≥ 100 and ≤ 300	100 tons	100	5
≥ 50 and < 100	2 sublots	100	5
< 50	-	3-100*	5

*see Table 2

- Considering that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of the weight of sublots, the weight of the sublot may exceed the mentioned size by a maximum of 20%.

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

- The suggested minimum size of the incremental sample of cereal grains and cereal-based products should be 100 g for lots ≥ 0.5 tons.
- For lots less than 50 tons of cereal grains and cereal-based products, the sampling plan must be used with 3 to 100 incremental samples, depending on the lot weight. For very small lots (< 0.5 tons) a lower number of incremental samples may be taken, but the aggregate sample uniting all incremental samples shall be also in that case at least 5 kg. Table 2 may be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken.

Table 2. Number of incremental samples of cereal grains to be taken depending on the weight of the lot- Maize grain, sorghum, polished rice, and husked rice

Lot weight (t)	Number of incremental samples	Minimum laboratory sample weight (kg)
≤ 0.05	3	5
> 0.05 - ≤ 0.5	5	5
> 0.5 - ≤ 1	10	5
> 1 - ≤ 3	20	5
> 3 - ≤ 10	40	5
> 10 - ≤ 20	60	5
> 20 - < 50	100	5

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****STATIC LOTS**

5. A static lot can be defined as a large mass cereal grains and cereal-based products contained either in a large single container such as a wagon, truck, or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the cereal grains and cereal-based products is stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because all containers in the lot or subplot may not be accessible.
6. Taking incremental samples from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices should be specifically designed for the commodity and type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all products, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small incremental samples of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.
7. For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot size (LT), incremental sample size (IS), aggregate sample size (AS) and the individual packing size (IP), as follows:

$$SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP).$$

8. The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All sizes should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

9. Representative aggregate samples can be more easily produced when selecting incremental samples from a moving stream of cereal grains and cereal-based products as the lot is transferred from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small incremental samples of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the incremental samples to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample(s), then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample(s).
10. Automatic sampling equipment such as a cross-cut sampler is commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic sampling equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, incremental samples should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time the cereal flow past the sampling point.
11. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of the flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross-sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about two to three times the largest dimensions of items in the lot.
12. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a crosscut sampler is:

$$S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V),$$

where, D is the width of the diverter cup opening (cm), LT is the lot size (kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (seconds), and V is cup velocity (cm/sec).

13. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup can be computed as a function of S, V, D, and MR. $SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR)$.

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

14. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, sunlight, and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample, which might arise during transportation or storage. Samples should be stored in a cool dark place.

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****SEALING AND LABELLING OF SAMPLES**

15. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

SAMPLE PREPARATION PRECAUTIONS

16. Sunlight should be excluded as much as possible during sample preparation, since aflatoxin gradually breaks down under the influence of ultra-violet light. Also, environmental temperature and relative humidity should be controlled and not favour mould growth and aflatoxin formation.

HOMOGENIZATION - GRINDING

17. As the distribution of aflatoxin is extremely non-homogeneous, laboratory samples should be homogenized by grinding the entire laboratory sample received by the laboratory. Homogenization is a procedure that reduces particle size and disperses the contaminated particles evenly throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
18. The laboratory sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete homogenization as possible. Complete homogenization implies that particle size is extremely small, and the variability associated with sample preparation is minimized. After grinding, the grinder should be cleaned to prevent aflatoxin cross-contamination.

TEST PORTION

19. The suggested weight of the test portion taken from the comminuted laboratory sample should be approximately 25 g. If the laboratory sample is prepared using a liquid slurry, the slurry should contain 25 g.
20. Procedures for selecting the 25 g test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. If mixing occurred during or after the comminution process, the 25 g test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample. Otherwise, the 25 g test portion should be the accumulation of several small portions selected throughout the laboratory sample.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

21. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific method. A list of possible criteria and performance levels is shown in Table 3. Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.

Operation Characteristic curves

22. Using the online FAO Mycotoxin Sampling Tool, different scenarios were simulated with laboratory sample sizes of 1, 5, 10 and 30 kg and test portion sizes of 25 and 50 g to test maize grain sampling plan, as shown in Figure 1.
23. It was observed that using 1 kg as laboratory sample had a very distinct behaviour compared to the other sample sizes. It was also observed that 30 kg as laboratory sample size had a very similar behaviour compared to 10 kg. For these reasons, those options were not considered adequate. Another simulation was done, taking into account different test portion sizes of 25 g and 50g, as shown on Figure 2.
24. Figure 2 shows that lower levels of contamination up to the LM established by the CCCF and above 48 µg/kg, the sampling plans performed similarly. Otherwise, lots with contamination levels between 15 and 48 µg/kg, the OC #4 (10 kg as laboratory sample size and 50g as test portion size) is the one that has a lower probability of misclassifying the lot. Considering the applicability and cost of analysis, it seems reasonable to accept the OC #1 (5 kg as laboratory sample size and 25g as test portion size)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total****Table 3. Method criteria for total aflatoxins in cereals, considering AFB1: AFB2: AFG1: AFG2 of 1:1:1:1.**

Commodity	Analyte	ML (µg/kg)	LOD (µg/kg)	LOQ (µg/kg)	Precision (%)	Minimal applicable range (µg/kg)	Recovery (%)
Maize grain	AF B1+B2+G1+G2	15	≤ 3	≤ 6	<44	8.4 - 21.6	60-115
	AFB1	-	≤0.75	≤ 1.5	<44	2.1 – 5.4	40-120
	AFB2	-	≤0.75	≤1.5	<44	2.1 – 5.4	40-120
	AFG1	-	≤0.75	≤ 1.5	<44	2.1 – 5.4	40-120
	AFG2	-	≤0.75	≤ 1.5	<44	2.1 – 5.4	40-120
Maize flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; Sorghum grain; cereal- based foods for infants and young children for food aid programs	AF B1+B2+G1+G2	10	≤2	≤4	<44	5.6 - 14.4	60-115
	AFB1	-	≤0.5	≤1.0	<44	1.4 - 3.6	40-120
	AFB2	-	≤0.5	≤1.0	<44	1.4 - 3.6	40-120
	AFG1	-	≤0.5	≤1.0	<44	1.4 - 3.6	40-120
	AFG2	-	≤0.5	≤1.0	<44	1.4 - 3.6	40-120
Husked Rice	AF B1+B2+G1+G2	20	≤4	≤8	<44	11.2 - 28.8	60-115
	AFB1	-	≤1.0	≤2.0	<44	2.8 – 7.2	40-120
	AFB2	-	≤1.0	≤2.0	<44	2.8 – 7.2	40-120
	AFG1	-	≤1.0	≤2.0	<44	2.8 – 7.2	40-120
	AFG2	-	≤1.0	≤2.0	<44	2.8 – 7.2	40-120
Polished Rice; Cereal-based food for infants and young children	AF B1+B2+G1+G2	5	≤1	≤2	<44	2.8 - 7.2	40-120
	AFB1	-	≤0.25	≤0.5	<44	0.7 – 1.8	40-120
	AFB2	-	≤0.25	≤0.5	<44	0.7 – 1.8	40-120
	AFG1	-	≤0.25	≤0.5	<44	0.7 – 1.8	40-120
	AFG2	-	≤0.25	≤0.5	<44	0.7 – 1.8	40-120

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1


Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins, Total**

Figure 1: Probability of accepting a lot of corn, shelled (%) for different laboratory sample mass, considering test portion size of 50 g and accept/reject limit of 15 µg/kg. * Laboratory sample size: #1 = 1kg, #2 = 5 kg, #3 = 10 kg and #4 = 30kg




Figure 2: Probability of accepting a lot of corn, shelled (%) considering 5 and 10 kg as laboratory sample mass and either 25g or 50g as test portion. Accept/reject limit of 15 µg/kg. * Laboratory sample size: #1 = 5 kg, #2 = 5 kg, #3 = 10 kg and #4 = 10 kg; Test portion: #1 = 25 g, #2 = 50 g, #3 = 25 g and #4 = 50 g

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins M₁**

Reference to JECFA:	56 (2001), 83 (2016)
Toxicological guidance value:	Cancer potency estimates at specified residue levels (2001, Using worst-case assumptions, the additional risks for liver cancer predicted with use of proposed maximum levels of aflatoxin M ₁ of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg are very small. The potency of aflatoxin M ₁ appears to be so low in HBsAg- individuals that a carcinogenic effect of M ₁ intake in those who consume large quantities of milk and milk products in comparison with non-consumers of these products would be impossible to demonstrate. Hepatitis B virus carriers might benefit from a reduction in the aflatoxin concentration in their diet, and the reduction might also offer some protection in hepatitis C virus carriers.)
Contaminant definition:	Aflatoxin M ₁
Synonyms:	Abbreviation: AFM ₁
Related Code of Practice:	Code of Practice for the Reduction of Aflatoxin B ₁ in Raw Materials and Supplemental Feedingstuffs for Milk Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Milks	0.5	Adopted	2001	FAC	Whole commodity	Milk is the normal mammary secretion of milking animals obtained from one or more milkings without either addition to it or extraction from it, intended for consumption as liquid milk or for further processing. A concentration factor applies to partially or wholly Dehydrated milks.	ML0106

CCFAC24 (1993) decided to stop the development of a specific standard for AFM₁ in milk destined for use in baby foods. CCFAC has discussed 2 options for a standard for AFM₁ in milk: 0.05 µg/kg and 0.5 µg/kg.

At the request of CCFAC32 (2000), JECFA56 (2001) examined exposure to AFM₁ and conducted a quantitative risk assessment to compare the consequences of setting the ML in milk at 0.05 µg/kg and 0.5 µg/kg. The estimates of the potency of AFM₁ were combined with estimates of intake from the GEMS/Food European regional diet. The Committee noted that the calculation showed that, with worst case assumptions, the projected risks for liver cancer at the proposed maximum levels of AFM₁ of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg are very small. As a result, 0.5 µg/kg was forwarded to CAC24 by CCFAC33 (2001) which adopted this draft ML at Step 8, noting that data supporting the lower level, if and when available, could be examined by CCFAC at a future meeting when necessary. It is acknowledged that the AFM₁ level in milk is related to the AFB₁ level in the animal feed. See notes under Aflatoxins, total.

JECFA83 (2016) noted that given the relative cancer potencies and international dietary exposure estimates for AFB₁ and AFM₁, AFM₁ will generally make a negligible (<1%) contribution to aflatoxin-induced cancer risk for the general population. (JECFA/83/SC)

In the review of Codex Standards for contaminants, CCCF16 (2023) noted the interests Canada to develop discussion papers to review the codes of practice for aflatoxins in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals to determine the need and feasibility for revision. CCCF agreed with the consideration by CCCF17 to establish an

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins M₁**

EWG chaired by Canada to develop a discussion paper to explore whether there are new measures supporting revision of the Code of practice for the reduction of aflatoxin B₁ in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997). (REP23/CF16, para. 105 (iv)(b))

Code of practice for the reduction of aflatoxin B₁ in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)

At CCCF17 (2024), the Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, provided background to the work, and summarized key points of discussion and the recommendations to CCCF. The EWG Chair explained that the development of the current discussion paper was a result of the work in the working group on the Review of Codex Standards for Contaminants (Agenda item 18), and that this CoP was identified as a priority for revision (REP24/CF, para. 124).

The EWG Chair in particular highlighted some of the new/additional measures identified in the CX 24/17/15 to control AFB₁ in raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals and other possible revisions that might be needed for the CoP. She noted that revision of CX 45 would draw on information from other CoPs relevant to animal feed, i.e. Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003), Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Tree Nuts (CXC 59-2008) and the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004) and drew the attention to possible overlap with these CoPs and suggested that consideration should be given on how to leverage information from these CoPs. She proposed that the EWG be re-established to further develop the discussion paper and include a proposal for the revision of the CoP for consideration by CCCF18 (REP24/CF, para. 125).

CCCF generally agreed that there was sufficient information available for the revision of the CoP and agreed with the recommendation to further develop the discussion paper. CCCF further noted the following observations (REP24/CF, para. 126):

- Concerns were raised with the use of some chemicals as mitigation measures and its possible impact on the quality of feed.
- Other CoPs of relevance should be taken into account in the revision of the CXC 45. CXC 51 is of the most relevance and should be considered for alignment and that CXC 9 and CXC 55 was of less relevance, and of lesser priority for future alignment.
- The term “animal-derived” should be deleted as the usage of the term animal-derived milk and milk product seems to imply the possibility of using non-animal derived milk and milk products which would contradict the Codex definition for milk contained in the General Standard for The Use of Dairy Terms (CXS 206-1999).

On the question of alignment or merging of related Codex texts to avoid duplication, inconsistencies and overlap, the Codex Secretariat stressed that while it was important to ensure alignment, this could be considered as separate work in the future and proposed that in the review of CXC 51, issues of inconsistencies with other related texts could be flagged for possible action by the Committee, i.e. proposing consequential amendments (REP24/CF, para. 127).

CCCF17 agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 128):

- (i) re-establish the EWG chaired by Canada and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia to revise the discussion paper, with a proposal for a revised CoP and a project document for new work; and
- (ii) consider in future how the different CoPs could be integrated or merged to avoid overlap, inconsistencies, and redundancies.

The Chairperson in concluding this item, noted the decision to continue the development of the discussion paper in the EWG in order to have another year of discussion, to allow inclusion of a draft CoP to have a better basis for decision on starting new work. She noted that, as this practice was already applied several times in CCCF, this could be a common

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Aflatoxins M₁**

working practice for the Committee, i.e. first develop a discussion paper which contains a proposal for a new or revised CoP and the project document. This approach would allow CCCF to determine the feasibility of finalizing the work in a timely manner (REP24/CF, para. 129).

Aflatoxin M₁ is the hydroxylated metabolite of aflatoxin B₁ that can occur in milk and milk products from animals consuming contaminated feed. The metabolite is also present in the milk of nursing women who eat foods containing the toxin. Like its parent compound aflatoxin B₁, aflatoxin M₁ is a carcinogen, but less potent. Aflatoxin M₁ shows 2-10% of the carcinogenic activity of aflatoxin B₁. In studies of genotoxicity, such as in *Drosophila melanogaster*, aflatoxin M₁ was about 10-fold less mutagenic than aflatoxin B₁. Epidemiological studies tend to indicate that individuals who are carriers of persistent viral infection with HBV and who are exposed to aflatoxin in their diets are at increased risk for progression to liver cancer as compared with HBV carriers who are not exposed to aflatoxins, but for aflatoxin M₁ this could not be quantified in a dose-response relationship.

Aflatoxin M₁ is cytotoxic, as is aflatoxin B₁, as shown in human hepatocytes. The short-term toxicity of aflatoxin M₁ is similar to that of aflatoxin B₁, and it appears to act by the same mechanism. Aflatoxins may potentiate liver damage caused by bacterial lipopolysaccharide, which may affect acute toxicity in humans and domestic animals. This potentiation of liver damage by aflatoxins may also play a role in the interaction between hepatitis viruses and liver carcinogenesis. (WHO, FAO, Safety evaluation of certain mycotoxins in food, 2001).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol**

Reference to JECFA:	56 (2001), 72 (2010)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group PMTDI 0.001 mg/kg bw (2010, for DON and its acetylated derivatives) Group ARfD 0.008 mg/kg bw (2010, for DON and its acetylated derivatives)
Contaminant definition:	Deoxynivalenol
Synonyms:	Vomitoxin; Abbreviation: DON
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity/ Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) destined for further processing	2000	Adopted	2015	CF		“Destined for further processing” means intended to undergo an additional processing/treatment that has proven to reduce levels of DON before being used as an ingredient in foodstuffs, otherwise processed or offered for human consumption. Codex members may define the processes that have been shown to reduce levels. <i>For sampling plan, see Annex.</i> [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 199-1995 and CXS 153-1985]	
Flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley	1000	Adopted	2015	CF		<i>For sampling plan, see Annex.</i> [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 152-1985, CXS 154-1985, CXS 155-1985 and CXS 178-1991]	
Cereal-based foods for infants and young children	200	Adopted	2015	CF	Whole commodity as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 74-1981. The ML applies to all cereal-based foods intended for infants (up to 12 months) and young children (12 to 36 months)	

The PMTDI is based on a chronic dietary study with mice, applying a safety factor of 100. An intake at the level of the PMTDI is not expected to result in effects of DON on the immune system, growth or reproduction, which are the most critical effects. JECFA in 2001 recommended that toxic equivalency factors relative to DON be developed for the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol**

other trichothecenes commonly occurring in cereal grains, if sufficient data become available. The JECFA estimated that the PMTDI for DON could be exceeded in 4 out of 5 GEMS/Food regional diets.

The situation regarding deoxynivalenol has been reviewed in a discussion paper (last version CX/FAC 03/35); CCFAC35 (2003) discontinued the consideration of this discussion paper and agreed to commence work on the elaboration of MLs for DON (ALINORM 03/12A, paras. 180-182).

CAC26 (2003) approved the development of maximum levels for DON as new work (ALINORM 03/41, Appendix VIII).

CCFAC36 (2004) agreed to discontinue the consideration of maximum levels for deoxynivalenol for the time being. Instead, it agreed to request information on: the occurrence of deoxynivalenol in cereals; the influence of processing, decontamination, sorting, etc. to lower the level of DON in a lot; national levels or guideline levels for DON; sampling procedures and methods of analysis; etc. for consideration by CCFAC37 (ALINORM 04/27/12, paras. 156-158).

CCFAC37 (2005) noted that many data on the occurrence of DON in cereals and processed cereal products were already available or would soon be made available on a more global basis. The Committee therefore decided to ask JECFA to conduct an exposure assessment based on the new data. In this regard, the Committee reconfirmed the importance to take into account processed foods and the effects of processing on the level of DON. The Committee decided to establish an electronic Working Group to develop a discussion paper to provide comprehensive relevant data, including the occurrence of deoxynivalenol and the effects of processing on the levels of DON, for consideration at the 38th session (ALINORM 05/28/12, paras. 148-150).

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to endorse the recommendation of the ad hoc Working Group on Contaminants and Toxins in Foods to update the Discussion Paper on DON with: more data from regions where data on DON levels are missing or inadequate; additional data, especially on DON levels in maize; information on the effect on levels of seasonal variation; and information on the effect of processing on DON levels in foods (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 137-138). The Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the Working Group on the Priority List of substances for evaluation by JECFA to maintain the request for evaluation of DON in the Priority List and to add a question regarding the potential toxicity of 3-acetyl and 15-acetyl deoxynivalenol to the existing request (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 205-206).

CCCCF1 (2007) agreed, in view of the need for more occurrence data, including regional data on incidence and levels of DON in cereals over a period of several years, and for adequate information on consumption patterns for various countries as a pre-requisite to developing international standards, to discontinue consideration of this item for the time being and to encourage countries to submit data on DON contamination to GEMS/Food Databases electronically and in the prescribed format (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 108). The Committee noted that sufficient data on DON occurrence in food and fate at processing would not be available before the end of 2008 and that no information was provided on the availability of toxicological data. It agreed that DON remain on the priority list (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 126).

CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to maintain the high priority for DON in evaluation by JECFA and noted that occurrence data from ongoing surveys would be made available by the end of 2008 and that some data had already been submitted to the GEMS/Food data base (ALINORM 08/31/41, paras. 173 and 174).

JECFA72 (2010) decided to convert the PMTDI for DON to a group PTMDI of 1 µg/kg bw for DON and its acetylated derivatives (3-Ac-DON and 15-Ac-DON), as 3-acetyl-deoxynivalenol (3-Ac-DON) is converted to DON *in vivo* and therefore contributes to the total DON-induced toxicity. In this regard, the Committee considered the toxicity of the acetylated derivatives equal to that of DON. The Committee concluded that, at this time, there was insufficient information to include DON-3- glucoside in the group PMTDI.

The Committee derived a group acute reference dose (ARfD) of 8 µg/kg bw for DON and its acetylated derivatives, using the lowest lower limit on the benchmark dose for a 10% response (BMDL₁₀) of 0.21 mg/kg bw per day for emesis in pigs dosed with DON via the diet and application of an uncertainty factor of 25. Limited data from human case reports indicated that dietary exposures to DON up to 50 µg/kg bw per day are not likely to induce emesis.

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol**

The Committee concluded that all of the mean estimates of national exposure to DON were below the group PMTDI of 1 µg/kg-bw. Estimation of dietary exposure was made using data from 42 countries, representing 10 of the 13 GEMS/Food consumption cluster diets, and was therefore considered to be more globally representative than the previous evaluation. National reports showed dietary exposures that were above 1 µg/kg-bw per day in only a few cases, only for children at upper percentiles. For acute dietary exposure, the estimate of 9 µg/kg-bw per day, based on high consumption of bread and a regulatory limit for DON of 1 mg/kg food, was close to the group ARfD. The acetylated derivatives have not been included in the estimates of dietary exposure to DON but the Committee noted that, in general, they are found at levels less than 10% of those for DON, and inclusion would not be expected to significantly change the estimates of dietary exposure to DON. DON-3-glucoside was also not included in the dietary exposure estimates.

The Committee noted that data were limited on the occurrence of DON-3-glucoside, which might be an important contributor to dietary exposure.

During CCCF5 (2011) it was proposed that the Committee proceed with MLs, but that the Committee first focus on MLs for DON together with associated sampling plans before proceeding with MLs for its acetylated derivatives due to the lack of complete data and availability of analytical methods (REP11/CF, para. 38). The Committee agreed to return the proposed draft Maximum Levels for DON to Step 2/3 for further development the EWG led by Canada, circulation for comments and further consideration by the 6th session of the Committee (REP11/CF, para. 43), and that it would at the 8th Session of the Committee consider the extension of the ML to acetylated derivatives of DON (REP11/CF, para. 41).

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to return the proposed draft MLs for DON to Step 2/3 for further development by the electronic Working Group, circulation for comments and further consideration by the 7th session of the Committee (REP12/CF, para. 77).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed to the ML of 2 mg/kg for raw cereals (maize, wheat and barley) prior to sorting and removal of damaged kernels with the associated sampling plan with sample size of 5 kg for maize and 1 kg for wheat and barley. For flour, semolina, meal and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley, the Committee agreed to establish a ML of 1 mg/kg. For cereal-based foods for infants and young children, the Committee agreed to establish the ML of 0.2 mg/kg and that this ML would apply to cereal-based foods as consumed. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft MLs for raw cereal grains including sampling plans, and for flour, semolina, meal and flakes from wheat, maize or barley to Step 5 and the proposed draft ML for cereal-based foods for infants and young children to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC36 (REP13/CF, para. 64-66, 70 and APPENDIX III).

With regard to MLs for bran products, the Committee agreed to encourage members to collect and submit occurrence data for DON in wheat and corn brans for possible future work. (REP13/CF, para. 67)

The Committee recalled its earlier decision taken at the 5th Session of the Committee that it would consider the extension of the MLs for DON to its acetylated derivatives at the 8th Session of the Committee and agreed that an EWG led by Canada and Japan would prepare a discussion paper and proposals for the extension of MLs for DON to its acetylated derivatives for consideration at the 8th session of the Committee (REP13/CF, para. 68).

CAC36 noted that clarification was needed on whether the ML should apply to cereal-based foods for infants and young children “as consumed” or to the “dry matter” and therefore agreed to adopt the proposed draft ML at Step 5 for further consideration in CCCF. The Commission also adopted the draft maximum levels for DON in raw cereal grains (maize, wheat and barley) and associated sampling plan and in flour, semolina, meal and flakes from wheat, maize or barley at Step 5 (REP13/CAC, para. 80, APPENDIX IV).

CCCF8 (2014) noted that it was not possible to reach agreement on the MLs for raw cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley); flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley, nor for the ML for cereal-based foods for infants and young children and agreed to hold the MLs and associated sampling plans at Step 7 for consideration at the 9th session of the Committee in light of a discussion paper on additional ways of developing MLs, such as phasing in of lower MLs over a defined period of time, to be developed

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol**

by FAO, WHO and the Codex Secretariat. The Committee agreed that the ML for cereal-based foods for infants and young children should be set on a “dry matter basis”. (REP14/CF, paras. 57-59, Appendix XII).

The Committee, noting the decision taken on MLs for DON and the conclusions of the EWG, 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. The Committee agreed that no further consideration would be given to acetylated derivatives of DON as a separate item, but 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/CF, paras. 61-62).

CCCF9 (2015) discussed the note for cereal grains to which the ML applies and agreed to refer to cereal grains “destined for further processing” and to qualify that it meant that additional processing or treatments proven to reduce levels of DON could be applied and that Codex members could define the processes that have been shown to reduce levels. The Committee agreed that the MLs, 2 mg/kg for cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) for further processing, 1 mg/kg for flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley, and 0.2 mg/kg on dry matter basis for cereal-based foods for infants and young children, respectively, and agreed to advance the MLs and the associated sampling plans to CAC for adoption at Step 8. The sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis (aligned with fumonisins) being subject to endorsement by CCMAS. The Russian Federation expressed their reservation to all the MLs, while EU and Norway expressed their reservations to the ML for flour, meal, semolina and flakes (REP15/CF, paras. 76-91, Appendix VI).

CAC38 adopted the MLs at Step 8 subject to endorsement of the sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis by CCMAS, as recommended by CCEXEC70. The Commission noted the reservations of the Russian Federation to the ML for cereal-based foods for infants and young children and the reservations of EU, Norway, Jordan and the Russian Federation to the ML for flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley (REP15/CAC, para. 36).

CCMAS37 (2016) endorsed the sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis as revised by CCCF9 with an amendment to the title to read “Sampling plans and method performance criteria for DON in cereal-based foods for infants and young children in flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley and in cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) destined for further processing” (REP16/MAS, para 25 and Appendix II)

At CCCF15 (2022), delegations posted the following question for clarification:

The wording “as is” does not clearly describe the format and basis to which the ML for lead for ‘cereal-based foods for infants and young children’ applies. In order to advance an ML of 0.02 mg/kg for lead in this commodity, it was recommended that wording in the ‘Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies’ column of the GSCTFF read as follows: “as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption”. The wording used to describe MLs in cereal-based foods for infants and young children should align for all MLs if they apply to the same form and basis of the same food commodities. Further, the wording used to describe the DON ML for this commodity (the “ML applies to the commodity on a dry matter basis”) was not intended to apply to fully desiccated food products containing 0% moisture, but rather to the form in which it is typically sold, which are expected to contain between approximately 1 and 9% moisture, depending on the food. It was therefore proposed that wording to describe the lead, aflatoxin and DON MLs for ‘cereal-based foods for infants and young children’ in the ‘Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies’ column would be aligned to read as follows: “as sold; not reconstituted or otherwise prepared for consumption” (REP22/CF, para. 75).

CCCF15 agreed to send the consequential amendment to the ‘Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies’ column for DON in cereal-based foods for infant and young children to CAC for adoption (Appendix VI, Part II) (REP22/CF, para. 154 iii).

CAC45 (2022) adopted the consequential amendment to the ML for DON (deoxynivalenol) in cereal-based foods for infants and young children (REP22/CAC, para. 65).

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol****Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices**

See the section on Aflatoxins, total or Ochratoxin A.

Deoxynivalenol (DON) is the major compound of a group of chemically related mycotoxins called type B trichothecenes (which are epoxy-sesquiterpenoid compounds) and is produced by certain *Fusarium* species, which are pathogens of several cereal grains. Closely related compounds are e.g. nivalenol and several acetyl-DON derivatives. DON is water-soluble and chemically very stable under most normal food processing conditions. DON contamination is commonly found in various cereals and cereal products. It undergoes rapid metabolism and elimination in livestock species and the transfer from feed to animal products is probably negligible. Maximum levels in feed are not needed to protect public health, but are useful for the protection of animal health and productivity. Especially pigs are vulnerable. In animals, decreased feed consumption, diarrhea and vomiting have been observed as acute effects. JECFA recognized that DON can lead to outbreaks of acute illness in humans.

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol****ANNEX**

SAMPLING PLANS AND METHOD PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR DEOXYNIVALENOL (DON) IN CEREAL-BASED FOODS FOR INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN IN FLOUR, MEAL, SEMOLINA AND FLAKES DERIVED FROM WHEAT, MAIZE OR BARLEY AND IN CEREAL GRAINS (WHEAT, MAIZE AND BARLEY) DESTINE FOR FURTHER PROCESSING

Cereal grains (wheat, cereal and barley) destined for further processing

Maximum level	2000 µg/kg DON
Increments	increments of 100 g, depending on the lot weight (≥ 0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm - 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥ 1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g test portion
Method	HPLC
Decision rule	If the DON-sample test result for the laboratory samples is equal or less than 2000 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

Cereal-based foods for infants and young children

Maximum level	200 µg/kg DON
Increments	10 x 100 g
Sample preparation	None
Laboratory sample weight	1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g test portion
Method	HPLC
Decision rule	If the DON sample test result is equal or less than 200 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

Flour, semolina, meal and flakes derived from wheat, cereal or barley

Maximum level	1000 µg/kg DON
Increments	10 x 100 g
Sample preparation	None
Laboratory sample weight	1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g test portion
Method	HPLC
Decision rule	If the DON sample test result is equal or less than 1000 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol****DEFINITION**

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings.
Sublot	Designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	It is defined by a DON test procedure and an accept/reject level. A DON test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and analysis or DON quantification. The accept/reject level is a tolerance usually equal to the Codex maximum level (ML).
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of shelled cereal comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample(s), the laboratory sample(s) should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample in such a way to ensure that the laboratory sample is still representative of the sublot sampled
Test portion	A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the DON for chemical analysis.

SAMPLING PLAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

- Each lot of cereal, which is to be examined for DON, must be sampled separately. Lots larger than 50 tons should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. If a lot is greater than 50 tons, the lot should be subdivided into sublots according to Table 1.

Table 1. Subdivision of cereal sublots according to lot weight

Lot weight (t)	Maximum Weight or minimum number of sub lots	Number of incremental samples	Minimum laboratory Sample Weight (kg)
≥ 1500	500 tons	100	1
> 300 and < 1500	3 sublots	100	1
≥ 100 and ≤ 300	100 tons	100	1
≥ 50 and < 100	2 sublots	100	1
< 50	-	3-100*	1

* see table 2

- Considering that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of the weight of sublots, the weight of the sublot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 20%.

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

- The suggested minimum weight of the incremental sample should be 100 grams for lots ≥ 0.5 tons.
- For lots less than 50 tons, the sampling plan must be used with 3 to 100 incremental samples, depending on the lot weight. For very small lots (≤ 0.5 tons) a lower number of incremental samples may be taken, but the aggregate sample uniting all incremental samples shall be also in that case at least 1 kg. Table 2 may be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken.

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol****Table 2. Number of incremental samples to be taken depending on the weight of the lot of**

Lot weight (t)	Number of incremental samples	Minimum Laboratory Sample Weight (kg)
≤ 0.05	3	1
> 0.05 - ≤ 0.5	5	1
> 0.5 - ≤ 1	10	1
> 1 - ≤ 3	20	1
> 3 - ≤ 10	40	1
> 10 - ≤ 20	60	1
> 20 - < 50	100	1

STATIC LOTS

5. A static lot can be defined as a large mass of shelled cereal contained either in a large single container such as a wagon, truck or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the cereal is stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because all containers in the lot or subplot may not be accessible.
6. Taking incremental samples from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices should be specifically designed for the commodity and type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all products, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small incremental samples of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.
7. For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot weight (LT), incremental sample weight (IS), aggregate sample weight (AS) and the individual packing weight (IP), as follows:

$$SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP).$$
8. The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All weights should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

9. Representative aggregate samples can be more easily produced when selecting incremental samples from a moving stream of shelled cereal as the lot is transferred from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small incremental samples of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the incremental samples to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample(s), then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample(s).
10. Automatic sampling equipment such as a cross-cut sampler is commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic sampling equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, incremental samples should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time the cereal flow past the sampling point.
11. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of the flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about two to three times the largest dimensions of items in the lot.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol**

12. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a cross cut sampler is:

$$S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V),$$

where D is the width of the diverter cup opening (cm), LT is the lot size (kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (seconds), and V is cup velocity (cm/sec).

13. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup can be computed as a function of S, V, D, and MR. $SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR)$.

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

14. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, sunlight, and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample, which might arise during transportation or storage. Samples should be stored in a cool dark place.
15. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

SAMPLE PREPARATION

16. Sunlight should be excluded as much as possible during sample preparation, since DON may gradually break down under the influence of ultra-violet light. Also, environmental temperature and relative humidity should be controlled and not favor mould growth and DON formation.
17. As the distribution of DON is extremely non-homogeneous, laboratory samples should be homogenized by grinding the entire laboratory sample received by the laboratory. Homogenization is a procedure that reduces particle size and disperses the contaminated particles evenly throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
18. The laboratory sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete homogenization as possible. Complete homogenization implies that particle size is extremely small, and the variability associated with sample preparation approaches zero. After grinding, the grinder should be cleaned to prevent DON cross-contamination.

TEST PORTION

19. The suggested weight of the test portion taken from the comminuted laboratory sample should be approximately 25 g
20. Procedures for selecting the test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. If mixing occurred during or after the comminuting process, the test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample. Otherwise, the test portion should be the accumulation of several small portions selected throughout the laboratory sample.
21. It is suggested that three test portions be selected from each comminuted laboratory sample. The three test portions will be used for enforcement, appeal, and confirmation if needed.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

22. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific method. A list of possible criteria and performance levels are shown in Table 3). Utilizing this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.

Mycotoxins**Deoxynivalenol****Table 3. Method criteria for DON in cereals.**

Commodity	ML (mg/kg)	LOD (mg/kg)	LOQ (mg/kg)	Precision on HorRat	Minimum applicable range (mg/kg)	Recovery
Cereal grains (wheat, cereal and barley) destined for further processing	2.0	≤ 0.2	≤ 0.4	≤ 2	1-3	80 - 110%
Cereal-based foods for infants and young children	0.2	≤ 0.02	≤ 0.04	≤ 2	0.1 – 0.3	80 – 110%
Flour, semolina, meal and flakes derived from wheat, cereal or barley	1.0	≤ 0.1	≤ 0.2	≤ 2	0.5 – 1.5	80 – 110%

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Diacetoxyscirpenol**

Reference to JECFA:	83 (2016), 90 (2020), 93 (2022)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group ARfD 320 ng/kg bw (2022, for T-2, HT-2 and 4, 15-DAS) Group TDI of 25 ng/kg bw (2022, for T-2, HT-2 and 4, 15-DAS, alone or in combination)
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	Abbreviation: DAS, 4,15-DAS
Related Code of Practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

DAS has been detected with a high prevalence in sorghum samples analysed in the FAO/WHO Mycotoxins in Sorghum Project. This mycotoxin has not been assessed by JECFA and a full safety assessment may be warranted to facilitate the interpretation of the analytical results. CCCF8 (2014) agreed to add a full risk assessment of DAS in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA. (REP14/CF, paras. 125-130 and Appendix XIII)

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated DAS in response to a request from CCCF.

The Committee concluded that there are insufficient toxicological data available to derive a point of departure for the risk assessment of 4,15-DAS alone. There are limitations in the available short-term toxicity studies and no data from chronic exposure and reproductive and developmental toxicity studies. 4,15-DAS and T-2/HT-2 toxin are structurally similar, and there is evidence that they cause similar effects at the biochemical and cellular levels, have similarities in toxic effects in vivo and have an additive dose effect when co-exposure occurs. Therefore, the evidence was considered sufficient by the Committee to support including 4,15-DAS in the group PMTDI for T-2 and HT-2 toxin established at the JECFA56. The PMTDI of 0.06 µg/kg bw for T-2 and HT-2 toxin, alone or in combination, was established based on a LOAEL of 0.03 mg/kg bw per day associated with changes in white blood cell counts following 3 weeks of dietary exposure in pigs and the application of an uncertainty factor of 500. The inclusion of 4,15-DAS in the group PMTDI of 0.06 µg/kg bw is considered to be a conservative approach when taking into consideration the observation that T-2 toxin was consistently more potent than 4,15-DAS when comparing similar in vitro and in vivo end-points.

The Committee noted that only LB dietary exposure estimates for Europe were available for the sum of T-2, HT-2 and 4,15-DAS. From these estimates, the sum of the LB dietary exposure estimates for 4,15-DAS of up to 0.0028 µg/kg bw per day and the total dietary exposures estimated for T-2 plus HT-2 of 0.016 µg/kg bw per day results in a LB mean dietary exposure of 0.019 and in a LB high dietary exposure estimated at 0.038 µg/kg bw per day (twice the mean). The Committee concluded that these LB estimates for Europe do not exceed the group PMTDI for T-2, HT-2 and 4,15-DAS (JECFA/83/SC).

Following the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) agreed to request JECFA to update JECFA56 evaluation of T-2/HT-2 toxin taking into account new toxicity studies (i.e. inclusion in the priority list). Furthermore, the exposure assessment should be based upon more recent occurrence data on the presence of T-2 and HT-2 toxin and 4,15-DAS in food. Member countries are requested to provide recent occurrence data on the presence of T-2, HT-2 toxin and 4,15-DAS to the GEMS/Food contaminants database. (REP17/CF, para. 151)

CCCF12 (2018) listed DAS in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 18/CF, appendix X).

Mycotoxins**Diacetoxyscirpenol**

CCCF13 (2019) kept DAS in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 19/CF, appendix X).

JECFA90 (2020) evaluated tricothecenes including DAS. The Committee reviewed the information regarding analytical methods, sampling, effect of processing, prevention and control, occurrence in food commodities and dietary exposure since the last evaluation of T-2 and HT-2 at the fifty-sixth meeting in 2001. Analytical methods have been improved in the last two decades with multimycotoxin HPLC-MS methods allowing the quantification of T-2 and HT-2 below or close to 1 µg/kg. There were a large number of occurrence data for T-2 and HT-2 submitted to the GEMS/Food contaminants database in the last two decades, but these were largely from Europe with a paucity of data from other regions. This may be due to the generally low incidence and low concentrations of T-2 and HT-2 found outside Europe. In Europe T-2 and HT-2 occur frequently in cereal crops, particularly in oats. There was also evidence of co-occurrence of several other type A tricothecenes and their metabolites in cereals. It was concluded that dietary exposure to T-2 and HT-2 covering the known geographical distribution of T-2 and HT-2 was suitably covered by existing European estimates of chronic and acute dietary exposure. No additional international or national estimates of chronic or acute dietary exposure were derived by the Committee. The Committee derived chronic dietary exposure estimates of 6.0 to 18 ng/kg bw per day for T-2, HT-2 and diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS) combined. The Committee noted that the toxicological evaluation and overall risk assessment will follow at a future meeting (Summary and conclusions JECFA90).

JECFA93 (2022) reviewed the toxicological data on the T-2, HT-2 and DAS and conducted a safety evaluation and a re-evaluation of the combined dietary exposure. The Committee established a group ARfD for T-2, HT-2 and DAS using the lower 95% confidence limit on the benchmark dose for a 10% response (BMDL₁₀) of 2.6 µg/kg bw for emesis in mink following acute gavage exposure to T-2 or HT-2 as the point of departure. As DAS induces emesis in mink and reduced feed intake in mice via similar modes of action, the Committee established a group ARfD for T-2, HT-2 and DAS of 320 ng/kg bw and recommended a relative potency factor of 0.2 for acute exposure to DAS. The committee noted that there is insufficient information available to estimate combined acute exposure to T-2, HT-2 and DAS.

The Committee concluded that the most sensitive, reliable and reproducible effects observed following repeated dietary exposure were reported in the 3-week toxicity study in juvenile pigs. Dose–response analysis of body weights, daily body weight gain and daily feed intake was conducted and a BMDL₁₀ of 1.8 µg/kg bw per day based on reduced daily body weight gain was selected as point of departure. The Committee established a group TDI of 25 ng/kg bw for T-2, HT-2 and DAS, alone or in combination. The previous group provisional maximum tolerable daily intake (PMTDI1) of 60 ng/kg bw for T-2 and HT-2, established at the fifty-sixth meeting and amended at the eighty-third meeting to include DAS, was withdrawn. The relative potency factor of 0.2 should be applied in comparing dietary exposure to DAS with the group TDI (Summary and conclusions JECFA93).

Follow-up actions on JECFA evaluation

See the section on T2 and HT2 toxins.

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Aflatoxins, total or Ochratoxin A.

Diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS) is a tricothecene mycotoxin produced by certain species of *Fusarium*, such as *F. poae*, *F. semitectum*, *F. moniliforme*, *F. sporotrichioides* etc. DAS was discovered in 1961 as a phytotoxic compound from a culture of *F. equiseti* and *Gibberella intricans* and its chemical properties and structure have been characterized. According to chemical classification of tricothecenes, DAS as well as T-2 and HT-2 toxins, belongs to group A which is characterized by the absence of a ketone on C-8 position and the absence of a macrocyclic ring. Particularly, it is included in the scirpentriol subgroup which comprises a family of type A tricothecene toxins: scirpentriol, the parent alcohol and its seven acetylated derivatives such as DAS, monoacetoxyscirpenol and triacetoxyscirpenol. Among tricothecenes produced by *Fusarium* spp., DAS is one of the most toxic. The presence of DAS in animal feeds and human foods is a possible health threat to humans and animals in some parts of the world, as historically documented by studies

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Diacetoxyscirpenol**

on a variety of animal toxicosis, human alimentary toxic aleukia, Msleni joint disease, and more recently evidenced by studies on human toxicoses and bone and joint disease in China. The toxic effects of DAS in humans and animals are similar and include vomiting, diarrhea, hypotension, and myelosuppression.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ergot Alkaloids**

Reference to JECFA:	91 (2021)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group TDI and Group ARfD 0.4 µg/kg bw (2021, for the sum of total EAs)
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	abbreviation: EAs
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
	No ML						

CCFAC34 (2002) agreed to add ergot alkaloids for full evaluation to the priority list of food additives, contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA. (ALINORM 03/12, paras. 164-169)

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to delete ergot alkaloids from the priority list for evaluation by JECFA (details are not noted in the report of the session).

CCCF9 (2015) noted that a proposal had been made for an additional annex on ergot alkaloids to the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXC 51-2003) but that further information was needed on which the Committee could take a decision on the inclusion of such an annex. Germany agreed to develop a discussion paper for consideration by the next session of the Committee. (REP15/CF, para.103)

CCCF10 (2016) agreed to circulate the proposed draft annex for comments at Step 3. The Committee further agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by Germany and co-chaired by the United Kingdom to prepare a revised proposed draft taking into account written comments received for consideration by CCCF11 (REP16/CF, para.142).

The Committee agreed to include ergot alkaloids as new proposal in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA (REP16/CF, paras. 164 and 171).

CCCF11 (2017) agreed to advance the annex on ergot and ergot alkaloids in cereal grains for adoption at Step 5/8 by CAC and inclusion in the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXC 51-2003) (REP17/CF, paras. 58-59 and Appendix V).

CAC40 (2017) adopted the Annex at Step 5/8. (REP17/CAC Appendix III).

JECFA91 (2021) first evaluated ergot alkaloids and established a group ARfD of 0.4 µg/kg bw, based on a lowest oral therapeutic dose of 0.2 mg ergometrine maleate (equivalent to 2.5 µg/kg bw, expressed as ergometrine) and applying a composite uncertainty factor of 6.3 (2 × 3.16). The Committee noted that it is appropriate to establish a group acute reference dose for ergot alkaloids but concluded that the available data are not sufficient to establish toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for different ergot alkaloids. Therefore, the ARfD was established as a group ARfD for the simple sum of total ergot alkaloids in the diet. Taking into account the limitations of the available toxicity data would indicate derivation of a TDI of 1 µg/kg bw per day. The Committee considered that a TDI should not be higher than the ARfD and decided to establish a group TDI at the same value of 0.4 µg/kg bw per day. The Committee noted that some estimates of the mean (0.46–0.47 µg/kg bw per day) and high percentile (0.56–0.86 µg/kg bw per day) chronic dietary exposure in children and some estimates of the high percentile acute dietary exposure in children (0.65–0.98 µg/kg bw per day) and in adults (0.49 µg/kg bw per day) exceeded the ergot alkaloids group health-based guidance value (HBGV), and that this may indicate a human health concern (Summary and conclusions JECFA91).

Mycotoxins**Ergot Alkaloids**

CCCF16 (2023), the VWG Chair noted that the JECFA full report and toxicological monograph were now available for consultation. He reiterated that consideration of ergot alkaloids would cover the 12 ergot alkaloids (including their -inine epimers) evaluated by JECFA which may pose challenges from the analytical perspective. Data availability was still limited in terms of geographical spread and were quite diverse (e.g., for individual, group, or total ergot alkaloids). There would be a need to issue a call for data on the occurrence of these ergot alkaloids and to define in the discussion paper the minimum requirements for submission of data to GEMS/Food database that could support work on these toxins in future (REP23/CF, para. 108).

The VWG Chair informed CCCF that a number of member countries were in the process of generating data but work on validation of methods was needed to clarify what methods could be used to generate the data (REP23/CF, para. 109).

CCCF16 agreed to

(ii) reconsider the elaboration of a discussion paper on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on ergot alkaloids at CCCF17; and

(iii) reconvene, as necessary, the in-session WG at CCCF17, chaired by the European Union (REP23/CF, para. 113).

At CCCF17 (2024), the chair of the VWG, introduced the item and summarized the key points of discussions in the VWG held prior to the Session, as contained in CRD05. The VWG Chair presented recommendations on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of JECFA evaluations and a re-iteration on the follow-up to JECFA evaluations on ergot alkaloids (REP24/CF, para. 154).

At the VWG, it was brought to the attention of Members that while the WG in the previous year agreed to follow-up on the JECFA evaluation on ergot alkaloids, no member country volunteered to take up the work at CCCF16. No objection was raised at the WG this year to forward the recommendation, which was agreed at the WG in the previous year with slight updates, for consideration by CCCF (REP24/CF, para. 157):

- As regards ergot alkaloids, to establish an EWG, working in English, to prepare a discussion paper on ergot alkaloids to look into the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF18. In this discussion paper, analytical performance characteristics as guidance for generation and submission of data to the GEMS/Food database should be considered in view of issuing a call for data on the presence of ergot alkaloids in food and feed; and

It was also noted that no member country volunteered at the VWG this year to take up the work on preparing a discussion paper on ergot alkaloids (REP24/CF, para. 158).

CCCF17 (2024) agreed to reconsider the elaboration of a discussion paper on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on ergot alkaloids at CCCF18 by integrating the evaluations in the inventory of follow-up to previous JECFA evaluations (REP24/17, para.164).

“Ergot” is the term used for the solidified mycelium of the fungus *Claviceps purpurea*, *africana*, *fusiformis*, *sorghii* and related species, which can afflict grasses and cereals of all kinds and may contain ergot alkaloids. A dark, sometimes white ergot (sclerotium) is formed instead of a grain in the ears of cereal infected via the plant’s blossom. These bodies usually differ significantly from the cereal as an overall entity in terms of their shape, colour and composition. The main types of cereal affected are rye and triticale (*Claviceps purpurea*), sorghum (*Claviceps africana*, *sorghii*, *sorghicola*) and pearl millet (*Claviceps fusiformis*). In spring seasons with longer moist and cool periods, wheat and barley might also be affected. A contamination of the harvested product with ergot and the toxic compounds – ergot alkaloids (EA) – can occur. Out of 40 known ergot alkaloids the most relevant are ergocornine, ergocristine, ergocryptine, ergometrine, ergosine, ergotamine and their epimers. Moreover, in sorghum ergot also dihydro-ergosine and related

Mycotoxins**Ergot Alkaloids**

alkaloids are relevant components. Sclerotia contain different amounts of EAs, depending on the fungi species, the host, the weather conditions and the geographical region. The total alkaloid content in a single sclerotium varies and can reach up to 0.5%. A total ergot alkaloid mean of 0.08% in ergot bodies has been reported based on European data.

Intoxication induced by ergot alkaloids is commonly known as ergotism or “St. Anthony’s fire”, which was ubiquitous in the middle Ages. Local epidemics have occurred also in more recent years in France, India and Ethiopia, respectively. There are two symptomatic forms of ergotism: gangrenous and convulsive. In the gangrenous form, tingling effects are felt in peripheral tissues finally leading to the loss of limbs, whereas in convulsive ergotism the tingling is followed by hallucinations, delirium and epileptic-type seizures.

Chronic intake of moderate quantities of ergot alkaloid can have a negative impact on reproduction (e.g. trigger miscarriage, lower birth weight, deficient lactation).

Chronic oral ingestion of large quantities of ergot alkaloids result in symptoms which correspond to acute ingestion of high quantities of ergot alkaloids. This is known from observations of unwanted effects where certain ergot alkaloids were used as active ingredients in medicines or where, following ingestion of cereal products containing high levels of ergot, people became ill.” (Ref. CX/CF 16/10/13)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁ + B₂)**

Reference to JECFA:	56 (2001), 74 (2011), 83 (2016)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group PMTDI 0.002 mg/kg bw (2001, retained in 2011 and 2016 for FB ₁ , FB ₂ and FB ₃ , alone or in combination)
Contaminant definition:	Fumonisin (B ₁ +B ₂)
Synonyms:	(Several related compounds have been described, notably fumonisin B ₁ , B ₂ and B ₃ (abbreviation: FB ₁ etc.))
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Raw Maize grain	4000	Adopted	2014	CF	Whole commodity	<i>For sampling plan, see Annex.</i> [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 153-1985]	
Maize flour and maize meal	2000	Adopted	2014	CF	Whole commodity	<i>For sampling plan, see Annex.</i> [Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 154-1985 and CXS 155-1985]	

A position paper had been prepared for fumonisins (last version CX/FAC 00/22). CCFAC32 (2000) asked the USA to finalize the position paper as a potential basis for future work (ALINORM 01/12 paras. 106-109). No MLs had been proposed.

The Representative of WHO, speaking on behalf of the JECFA Secretariats, clarified at CCCF1 (2007) that there was no plan for JECFA to update the risk assessment conducted by JECFA56 and that an updated risk assessment could be conducted only when new data became available (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 135).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to establish an electronic working group to prepare a discussion paper, which should include an overview of available data and scope of the problem of fumonisin contamination for consideration at its next session (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 177).

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to initiate work on establishing maximum levels and developing a sampling plan for fumonisins in maize and maize-based products subject to approval by CAC32. It was further agreed to request JECFA to review the available toxicology and occurrence data in order to carry out a re-evaluation on fumonisins in maize and maize products and that, based on the outcome of JECFA re-evaluation, the maximum level might be revised. It was noted that work would be completed by 2012 noting that JECFA could only consider fumonisins at the earliest at its meeting in 2011 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 101). The proposal of new work was subsequently by CAC32 (ALINORM 09/32/REP, Appendix VI).

CCCF4 (2010) agreed to retain the proposed draft ML and sampling plans, as contained in Annex I and Annex II of CX/ CF 10/4/8 respectively, at Step 4 until further advice was provided by JECFA (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 95). Although occurrence of FB₃ was well documented and that JECFA in 2001 had allocated a PMTDI of 2 µg/kg/ bw/day for FB₁, FB₂ and FB₃ alone or in combination, it was noted that FB₃ made up only 10% of total intake; that the routine laboratory testing for FB₃ was expensive and that not all countries tested for FB₃, but that consideration could be given to their inclusion in the standard (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 90- 91).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁ + B₂)**

JECFA74 (2011) evaluated fumonisins and reviewed all relevant studies performed since 2001. Studies suitable for dose-response analysis have been conducted with rodents employing either purified FB₁ or *F. verticillioides* culture material containing FB₁. Although naturally contaminated corn would probably be more representative of actual human dietary exposure than either purified FB₁ or culture material, no suitable studies were identified that used naturally contaminated corn as test material.

For culture material, the lowest identified BMDL₁₀ using FB₁ as a marker was 17 µg/kg bw per day for renal toxicity in male rats. The Committee chose not to establish a health-based guidance value for culture material because its composition was not well characterized and may not be representative of natural contamination. For pure FB₁, the lowest identified BMDL₁₀ was 165 µg/kg bw per day for megalocytic hepatocytes in male mice. Using an uncertainty factor of 100 for intraspecies and interspecies variation, the Committee derived a PMTDI of 2 µg/kg bw. As this was the same value as the previous established group PMTDI, this group PMTDI for FB₁, FB₂, and FB₃, alone or in combination, was retained.

It was estimated that the dietary exposure to FB₁ for the general population ranges from 0.12 x 10⁻³ to 7.6 µg/kg bw per day (95th percentile: up to 33.3 µg/kg bw per day). Dietary exposure to total fumonisins for the general population would range, for a consumer with average consumption, from 0.087 x 10⁻³ to 10.6 µg/kg bw per day, whereas for consumers with high consumption, exposure would be up to 44.8 µg/kg bw per day. Maize was found to be the predominant source of exposure to FB₁ and total fumonisins. Comparison of the estimated dietary exposure with the group PMTDI indicated that the group PMTDI is exceeded at the population level in some regions within some countries. The Committee concluded that adverse effects from fumonisin exposure may occur and that reduction of exposure is highly desirable, particularly in areas of the world where maize is a major dietary staple food and where high contamination can occur.

As fumonisins do not carry over from feed to animal products in significant amounts, the occurrence of fumonisins in feed was considered not to be a human health concern.

The Committee concluded that implementation of the MLs proposed by CCCF could significantly reduce exposure (by more than 20%) to total fumonisins in six GEMS/Food consumption clusters (A, D, G, B, K, F). The main contribution to reduction was due to the proposed Codex ML for the category "Corn/maize grain, unprocessed". The Committee also noted that the national estimates of exposure to fumonisins show that the exceedance of the PMTDI occurs only in limited regions presenting high maize consumption levels and highly contaminated maize. The Committee concluded that no or little effect was noticed on the international exposure estimates resulting from the implementation of MLs higher than those proposed by CCCF.

The Committee recommended that, to be able to fully assess the toxic potential of culture material or naturally contaminated food, characterization and quantification of their mycotoxin content are necessary. Also, to obtain a realistic representation of the effects of "real life" exposure, and in order to compare its toxic potential with the studies used for the final evaluation, naturally contaminated feed should be tested in dose-response studies in animals. In addition, further studies must be performed to elaborate more appropriate analytical methods to obtain additional occurrence data and information on the effects of processing. As dietary exposure to fumonisins may occur together with exposure to other mycotoxins, such as aflatoxins, well-designed laboratory and epidemiological studies are needed to assess interactions. For evaluation of the co-occurrence, in food and feed, of fumonisins with other mycotoxins, levels of fumonisins and other mycotoxins must be provided at the level of the individual analytical sample (i.e. not aggregate data).

Additional data on fumonisin distribution in corn Commodity / Product Names should be collected in order to establish appropriate sampling procedures. To validate the potential candidate urinary FB₁ level for a human biomarker of short-term exposure, large-scale human studies that indicate a well characterized dose-response relationship between urinary FB₁ level and dietary fumonisin exposures are needed. A biomarker for long-term exposure is also needed. To investigate the association of fumonisin exposure with oesophageal cancer risk, child growth impairment and NTDs in humans, studies on fumonisin exposure and incidence of these conditions in individuals (such as a cohort or case-control study) are needed using a validated fumonisin exposure biomarker and controlling for confounders and for known risk factors.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁ + B₂)**

CCCF6 (2012) noted that there was agreement for the need for MLs on raw maize/corn grains and corn/maize flour, but that there was no agreement on the actual MLs and the further proposal to develop a code of practice for fumonisins in maize, the Committee agreed to develop a discussion paper to identify the gaps in the Code of practice for prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals and the need for a separate code of practice for fumonisins in maize and whether there are any other measures to control fumonisins in maize. The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group lead by Brazil and co-chaired by the United States of America and working to develop the discussion paper for consideration by the next session and to suspend development of the proposed draft MLs for fumonisins until the consideration of the discussion paper by the electronic working group at the 7th Session (REP12/CF paras. 92, 93 and 95).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed that it was too early to start new work on the revision of the COP and that it needed more information on the nature of the revision and agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by Brazil and co-chaired by the United States of America, working to further develop the discussion paper based on the discussions at the 7th session and, if possible, to prepare a proposed draft revision of the COP for consideration by the 8th session. (REP13/CF para 132). It agreed that the proposed draft MLs for fumonisins in maize and maize products and associated sampling plans previously discussed at the 6th Session of the Committee (CX/CF 12/6/18) would be circulated for comments and a revised proposal for proposed draft MLs for fumonisins in maize and maize products and associated sampling plans would be prepared by Brazil for comments and consideration by the 8th session (REP13/CF para 133).

CCCF8 (2014) agreed that the ML of 4 000 µg/kg for raw 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. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft MLs with associated sampling plans to Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) for adoption by CAC37. The sampling plans would be sent for endorsement by CCMAS. (REP14/CF, paras. 71-72, Appendix IV). The Committee also agreed to add the assessments of fumonisins already evaluated by JECFA, to the priority list. An updated exposure assessment for fumonisins shall be performed by JECFA after three years once more occurrence data from countries where limited data are available have been collected. (REP14/CF, paras. 129-130, Appendix XIII)

CAC37 (2014) adopted the adopted the MLs and sampling plans at Step 5/8 while noting that sampling plans should be endorsed by CCMAS. Egypt, supported by Jordan, expressed a reservation that lower MLs would be desirable considering the impact of these mycotoxins on human health, and in particular their cumulative effect in the human body and their carry-over from feed to food. (REP14/CAC, paras. 83 and 85, Appendix III).

CCMAS36 (2015) did not endorse the sampling plans noting that there were several inconsistencies between the tables and text in the sampling plans. The Committee agreed to request CCCF to consider removing the inconsistencies and to present a revised version to the next session of CCMAS. (REP15/MAS, paras. 17-20)

CCCF9 (2015) agreed to send the sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis, revised by in-session WG, to CCMAS for endorsement. (REP15/CF, paras. 11-13, Appendix III)

CCMAS37 (2016) endorsed the sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis as revised by CCCF9 with an amendment to the title to read "Sampling plans and method performance criteria for fumonisins (FB₁ + FB₂) in maize grain and maize flour and maize meal". (REP16/MAS, para 25 and Appendix II)

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated fumonisins in response to a request from CCCF for an updated exposure assessment. The Committee also evaluated toxicological and epidemiological studies that had become available since the previous evaluation in 2011.

The Committee evaluated the updated toxicological data 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.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁ + B₂)**

LB mean and high (90th percentile) chronic FB₁ exposures in adults were maximally 0.56 and 1.1 µg/kg bw per day, respectively. For total fumonisins, the corresponding exposure estimates were 0.82 and 1.6 µg/kg bw per day. The UB mean and high exposures were estimated to be as high as 1.2 and 2.3 µg/kg bw per day for FB₁, respectively, and as high as 2.1 and 4.3 µg/kg bw per day for total fumonisins, respectively. In children, the LB mean and high chronic FB₁ exposures were maximally 0.8 and 1.6 µg/kg bw per day, respectively, and for total fumonisins, maximally 1.2 and 2.3 µg/kg bw per day, respectively. In this population group, the UB mean and high exposures were estimated to be as high as 1.6 and 3.9 µg/kg bw per day for FB₁, respectively, and as high as 3.2 and 6.4 µg/kg bw per day for total fumonisins, respectively. Maize is the predominant source of LB exposure to FB₁ and total fumonisins in most cluster diets. In the UB scenario, wheat was also an important contributor to the exposure to fumonisins in some clusters. Comparison of the estimates of exposure to FB₁ and total fumonisins with the group PMTDI indicates no exceedance at the LB mean exposure level in both children and adults. Assuming that all non-detect samples contained fumonisin at the LOQ, the UB mean exposure to total fumonisins in children exceeded the PMTDI in several countries. This was also true for the high (90th percentile) exposure, independent of the fumonisin concentration assigned to the non-detect samples. For adults, only the UB high exposure exceeded the PMTDI.

The Committee noted that, due to the high percentage of non-detect samples in the concentration database (around 70%) and the wide range of LOQs reported in the GEMS/Food contaminants database for fumonisins, the UB estimates may be interpreted as a worst-case estimate of exposure based on the data available.

The Committee noted that the international exposure estimates for FB₁ and total fumonisins were lower than those estimated by the Committee at its 74th 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. Given these limitations of the occurrence data used in the exposure assessment and high exposures reported in the literature in some countries, it is likely that the exposures to fumonisins in areas where maize is a staple food and high contamination with fumonisins can occur are higher than those estimated by the Committee at this meeting, as can be seen in the previous evaluation, which was based on a larger and more representative data set.

At the request of CCCF, the Committee also evaluated co-exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins. The Committee concluded that there are few data available to support co-exposure as a contributing factor in human disease. However, the interaction between AFB₁, a compound with known genotoxic properties, and fumonisins, which have the potential to induce regenerative cell proliferation (particularly at exposures above the PMTDI), remains a concern. This is due to the fact that the incidences of chronic liver disease and stunting are high in the areas of the world where the exposures to both mycotoxins are high and the co-exposure has been confirmed with biomarkers (JECFA/83/SC).

Following the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) 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. (REP17/CF, para. 151)

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Aflatoxins, total or Ochratoxin A.

Fumonisin is a class of recently identified mycotoxins that are produced mainly by certain *Fusarium* species, especially *F. moniliforme* which is a pathogen of corn (*Zea mays*). Fumonisin is a structurally related group of diesters of propane-1,2,3-tricarboxylic acid and various 2-amino-12,16-dimethylpolyhydroxyeicosanes. There are at least 12 fumonisin analogues identified, classified into series A, B, F and P. The B-series, consisting mainly of fumonisin B₁ and fumonisin B₂, is believed to be the most abundant and

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁ + B₂)**

most toxic group. A typical ratio between these analogues is B₁:B₂:B₃ as 10:3:1. The worldwide occurrence of fumonisins in corn and corn-based products is well documented: sporadic natural occurrence in sorghum, rice and navy beans has been reported. Fumonisin is heat-stable, so cooking and other heat processes do not substantially reduce their levels in foods.

Processing involving treatment of wet milling fractions may, however, lead to elimination of most fumonisin. The human exposure via food can vary to a large extent because of the large range of fumonisin contents found in practice. Fumonisin undergoes rapid metabolism and elimination in livestock species and the transfer from feed to animal products is probably negligible. Maximum levels in feed are not needed to protect public health but are useful for the protection of animal health and productivity. In animals, various adverse effects have been observed. The horse appears to be the most sensitive species, and equine leukoencephalomalacia (ELEM) is the most frequently encountered disease. Fumonisin is also associated with liver damage, often also kidney lesions and changes in certain lipid classes, especially sphingolipids, in all animals studied. Carcinogenic effects have been observed in animals exposed to high dietary levels.

Nephrotoxicity, observed in several strains of rat, was considered by JECFA to be the most sensitive toxic effect. On the basis of the NOEL for renal toxicity and a safety factor of 100, the PMTDI was established. National estimates for the mean or median intake were generally much lower than the PMTDI (the highest being 0.2 µg/kg bw).

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁+B₂)****ANNEX****SAMPLING PLANS AND METHOD PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR FUMONISINS (FB₁ + FB₂) IN MAIZE GRAIN AND MAIZE FLOUR AND MAIZE MEAL****Maize grain, unprocessed**

Maximum level	4 000 µg/kg FB ₁ + FB ₂
Increments	increments of 100 g, depending on the lot weight (≥ 0.5 tons)
Sample preparation	dry grind with a suitable mill (particles smaller than 0.85 mm - 20 mesh)
Laboratory sample weight	≥ 1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g test portion
Method	HPLC
Decision rule	If the fumonisin-sample test result for the laboratory samples is equal or less than 4 000 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

Maize flour and maize meal

Maximum level	2 000 µg/kg FB ₁ + FB ₂
Increments	10 x 100 g
Sample preparation	None
Laboratory sample weight	≥ 1 kg
Number of laboratory samples	1
Test portion	25 g test portion
Method	HPLC
Decision rule	If the fumonisin-sample test result is equal or less than 2 000 µg/kg, accept the lot. Otherwise, reject the lot.

DEFINITION

Lot	An identifiable quantity of a food commodity delivered at one time and determined by the official to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer, consignor, or markings.
Sublot	The designated part of a larger lot in order to apply the sampling method on that designated part. Each sublot must be physically separate and identifiable.
Sampling plan	It is defined by a fumonisin test procedure and an accept/reject level. A fumonisin test procedure consists of three steps: sample selection, sample preparation and analysis or fumonisin quantification. The accept/reject level is a tolerance usually equal to the Codex maximum level (ML).
Incremental sample	The quantity of material taken from a single random place in the lot or sublot.
Aggregate sample	The combined total of all the incremental samples that is taken from the lot or sublot. The aggregate sample has to be at least as large as the laboratory sample or samples combined.
Laboratory sample	The smallest quantity of shelled maize comminuted in a mill. The laboratory sample may be a portion of or the entire aggregate sample. If the aggregate sample is larger than the laboratory sample(s), the laboratory sample(s) should be removed in a random manner from the aggregate sample in such a way to ensure that the laboratory sample is still representative of the sublot sampled.
Test portion	A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample. The entire laboratory sample should be comminuted in a mill. A portion of the comminuted laboratory sample is randomly removed for the extraction of the fumonisin for chemical analysis.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁+B₂)****SAMPLING PLAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS****MATERIAL TO BE SAMPLED**

- Each lot of maize, which is to be examined for fumonisin, must be sampled separately. Lots larger than 50 tons should be subdivided into sublots to be sampled separately. If a lot is greater than 50 tons, the lot should be subdivided into sublots according to Table 1.

Table 1. Subdivision of maize sublots according to lot weight

Lot weight (t)	Maximum Weight or minimum number of sub lots	Number of incremental sample	Minimum laboratory Sample Weight (kg)
≥ 1500	500 tons	100	1
> 300 and < 1500	3 sublots	100	1
≥ 100 and ≤ 300	100 tons	100	1
≥ 50 and < 100	2 sublots	100	1
< 50	-	3-100*	1

* see table 2

- Considering that the weight of the lot is not always an exact multiple of the weight of sublots, the weight of the sublot may exceed the mentioned weight by a maximum of 20%.

INCREMENTAL SAMPLE

- The suggested minimum weight of the incremental sample should be 100 grams for lots ≥0.5 tons.
- For lots less than 50 tons, the sampling plan must be used with 3 to 100 incremental samples, depending on the lot weight. For very small lots (≤ 0.5 tons) a lower number of incremental samples may be taken, but the aggregate sample uniting all incremental samples shall be also in that case at least 1 kg. Table 2 may be used to determine the number of incremental samples to be taken.

Table 2. Number of incremental samples to be taken depending on the weight of the lot

Lot weight (t)	Number of incremental sample	Minimum Laboratory Sample Weight (kg)
≤ 0.05	3	1
> 0.05 - ≤ 0.5	5	1
> 0.5 - ≤ 1	10	1
> 1 - ≤ 3	20	1
> 3 - ≤ 10	40	1
> 10 - ≤ 20	60	1
> 20 - < 50	100	1

STATIC LOTS

- A static lot can be defined as a large mass of shelled maize contained either in a large single container such as a wagon, truck or railcar or in many small containers such as sacks or boxes and the maize is stationary at the time a sample is selected. Selecting a truly random sample from a static lot can be difficult because all containers in the lot or sublot may not be accessible.
- Taking incremental samples from a static lot usually requires the use of probing devices to select product from the lot. The probing devices should be specifically designed for the commodity and type of container. The probe should (1) be long enough to reach all products, (2) not restrict any item in the lot from being selected, and (3) not alter the items in the lot. As mentioned above, the aggregate sample should be a composite from many small incremental samples of product taken from many different locations throughout the lot.
- For lots traded in individual packages, the sampling frequency (SF), or number of packages that incremental samples are taken from, is a function of the lot weight (LT), incremental sample weight (IS), aggregate sample weight (AS) and the individual packing weight (IP), as follows:

$$SF = (LT \times IS) / (AS \times IP).$$

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁+B₂)**

8. The sampling frequency (SF) is the number of packages sampled. All weights should be in the same mass units such as kg.

DYNAMIC LOTS

9. Representative aggregate samples can be more easily produced when selecting incremental samples from a moving stream of shelled maize as the lot is transferred from one location to another. When sampling from a moving stream, take small incremental samples of product from the entire length of the moving stream; composite the incremental samples to obtain an aggregate sample; if the aggregate sample is larger than the required laboratory sample(s), then blend and subdivide the aggregate sample to obtain the desired size laboratory sample(s).
10. Automatic sampling equipment such as a cross-cut sampler is commercially available with timers that automatically pass a diverter cup through the moving stream at predetermined and uniform intervals. When automatic sampling equipment is not available, a person can be assigned to manually pass a cup through the stream at periodic intervals to collect incremental samples. Whether using automatic or manual methods, incremental samples should be collected and composited at frequent and uniform intervals throughout the entire time the maize flow past the sampling point.
11. Cross-cut samplers should be installed in the following manner: (1) the plane of the opening of the diverter cup should be perpendicular to the direction of the flow; (2) the diverter cup should pass through the entire cross sectional area of the stream; and (3) the opening of the diverter cup should be wide enough to accept all items of interest in the lot. As a general rule, the width of the diverter cup opening should be about two to three times the largest dimensions of items in the lot.
12. The size of the aggregate sample (S) in kg, taken from a lot by a cross cut sampler is:

$$S = (D \times LT) / (T \times V),$$

where D is the width of the diverter cup opening (cm), LT is the lot size (kg), T is interval or time between cup movement through the stream (seconds), and V is cup velocity (cm/sec).

13. If the mass flow rate of the moving stream, MR (kg/sec), is known, then the sampling frequency (SF), or number of cuts made by the automatic sampler cup can be computed as a function of S, V, D, and MR.

$$SF = (S \times V) / (D \times MR).$$

PACKAGING AND TRANSPORTATION OF SAMPLES

14. Each laboratory sample shall be placed in a clean, inert container offering adequate protection from contamination, sunlight, and against damage in transit. All necessary precautions shall be taken to avoid any change in composition of the laboratory sample, which might arise during transportation or storage. Samples should be stored in a cool dark place.
15. Each laboratory sample taken for official use shall be sealed at the place of sampling and identified. A record must be kept of each sampling, permitting each lot to be identified unambiguously and giving the date and place of sampling together with any additional information likely to be of assistance to the analyst.

SAMPLE PREPARATION

16. Sunlight should be excluded as much as possible during sample preparation, since fumonisin may gradually break down under the influence of ultra-violet light. Also, environmental temperature and relative humidity should be controlled and not favor mold growth and fumonisin formation.
17. As the distribution of fumonisin is extremely non-homogeneous, laboratory samples should be homogenized by grinding the entire laboratory sample received by the laboratory. Homogenization is a procedure that reduces particle size and disperses the contaminated particles evenly throughout the comminuted laboratory sample.
18. The laboratory sample should be finely ground and mixed thoroughly using a process that approaches as complete homogenization as possible. Complete homogenization implies that particle size is extremely small, and the variability associated with sample preparation approaches zero. After grinding, the grinder should be cleaned to prevent fumonisin cross-contamination.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Fumonisin (B₁+B₂)****TEST PORTION**

19. The suggested weight of the test portion taken from the comminuted laboratory sample should be approximately 25 g
20. Procedures for selecting the test portion from the comminuted laboratory sample should be a random process. If mixing occurred during or after the comminuting process, the test portion can be selected from any location throughout the comminuted laboratory sample. Otherwise, the test portion should be the accumulation of several small portions selected throughout the laboratory sample.
21. It is suggested that three test portions be selected from each comminuted laboratory sample. The three test portions will be used for enforcement, appeal, and confirmation if needed.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

22. A criteria-based approach, whereby a set of performance criteria is established with which the analytical method used should comply, is appropriate. The criteria-based approach has the advantage that, by avoiding setting down specific details of the method used, developments in methodology can be exploited without having to reconsider or modify the specific method. A list of possible criteria and performance levels are shown in Table 3). Utilising this approach, laboratories would be free to use the analytical method most appropriate for their facilities.

Table 3. Performance criteria for Fumonisin B₁+ B₂.**MAIZE GRAIN**

Analyte	ML (mg/kg)	LOD (mg/kg)	LOQ (mg/kg)	RSD _R	Recovery (%)
FB ₁ + FB ₂	4.0	-	-	-	-
FB ₁		≤ 0.3*	≤ 0.6*	HorRat ≤ 2 (< 27%)	80 - 110
FB ₂		≤ 0.15*	≤ 0.3*	HorRat ≤ 2 (< 32%)	80 - 110

* The LOD and LOQ were derived based upon typical B₁:B₂ ratio of 5:2 in naturally-contaminated samples

MAIZE FLOUR/MEAL

Analyte	ML (mg/kg)	LOD (mg/kg)	LOQ (mg/kg)	RSD _R	Recovery (%)
FB ₁ + FB ₂	2.0	-	-	-	-
FB ₁		≤ 0.15*	≤ 0.3*	HorRat ≤ 2 (< 30%)	80 - 110
FB ₂		≤ 0.06*	≤ 0.15*	HorRat ≤ 2 (< 34%)	80 - 110

* The LOD and LOQ were derived based upon typical B₁:B₂ ratio of 5:2 in naturally-contaminated samples

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

Reference to JECFA:	37 (1990), 44 (1995), 56 (2001), 68 (2007)
Toxicological guidance value:	PTWI 0.0001 mg/kg bw (2001)
Contaminant definition:	Ochratoxin A
Synonyms:	(The term "ochratoxins" includes a number of related mycotoxins (A, B, C and their esters and metabolites), the most important one being ochratoxin A), Abbreviation: OTA
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Ochratoxin A Contamination in Wine (CXC 63-2007) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Ochratoxin A Contamination in Coffee (CXC 69-2009) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Ochratoxin A Contamination in Cocoa (CXC 72-2013) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins Contamination in Cassava and Cassava-Based Products (CXC 82-2023)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Barley	5	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to raw barley.	GC 0640
Rye	5	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to raw rye.	GC 0650
Wheat	5	Adopted	2008	CF	Whole commodity	The ML applies to raw common wheat, raw durum wheat, raw spelt and raw emmer. [Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 199-1995]	GC 0654
Chili Pepper, paprika, nutmeg	20	Adopted	2023	CF	Whole/Powder/Crushed/Ground	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 352-2022 and CXS 353-2022. The ML applies to spices (dried/dry)	Sampling plan CX/CF 25/18/7

The situation regarding ochratoxins has been reviewed in a position paper (last version CX/FAC 99/14).

The draft ML of 5 µg/kg for OTA in raw wheat, barley and rye and derived products was forwarded for adoption at Step 8 by CCFAC34 (2002) (ALINORM 03/12, paras. 111- 114), on the basis of the assumption that this level was ALARA. CAC26 (2003) discussed this proposal (ALINORM 03/41, paras. 45-47). Many delegations were of the opinion that this proposed ML was too low and, taking account of the evaluation of JECFA56 (2001), noted that a ML of 20 µg/kg could be adequate in terms of public health and safety. CAC concluded that there was a lack of consensus both regarding the appropriate ML and regarding the reference to derived products and returned the standard to Step 6 for further work by CCFAC. CCFAC36 (2004) noted that given the wide range of derived products and that many of them were of little or no importance in international trade, the maximum level should be limited to raw wheat, barley, and rye. The Committee agreed to hold the maximum level of 5 µg/kg for OTA in raw wheat, barley, and rye at Step 7.

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

The Committee also agreed, depending upon the available data, that JECFA should perform a comprehensive risk assessment by 2006, so that the Committee might reconsider this issue in the light of the outcome of the JECFA evaluation at its Session in 2007 (ALINORM 04/27/12, paras. 132-137).

The ad hoc working group of CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to forward to CAC for approval of new work, the project document "Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA contamination in wine", and agreed that MLs for OTA in wine might be considered in future, pending collection of data on levels in wine and the outcomes of the elaboration of the Code. The Committee agreed to endorse the recommendation of the ad hoc Working Group on Contaminants and Toxins in Foods to start new work on the elaboration of the Code and clarified that the scope of this work should be limited to wine only. The Committee also agreed that the proposed draft Code would be circulated for comments at Step 3 and considered at the next session of the Committee. CAC29 (2006) approved the development of the Code as a new work (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 139-142).

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the ad hoc Working Group to establish two electronic Working Groups to prepare separate discussion papers on OTA in coffee and OTA in cocoa, respectively, for circulation, comments and consideration at its next Session that might allow the Committee to decide if the development of Codes of Practice was appropriate (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 143-145).

CCCCF1 (2007) agreed to retain the draft MLs at Step 7 and to inform CCEXEC that work on this item would be completed by 2009 (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 50).

JECFA68 (2007) retained the PTWI of 100 ng/kg bw. The estimated overall dietary exposure to OTA from cereals (mainly European data) was adjusted to 8-17 ng/kg bw/week (processed cereals), compared with the 25 ng/kg bw/week (raw cereals) in the previous assessment. This is well below the PTWI. Moreover, contamination levels in the majority of raw cereal samples were below 5 µg/kg and only a few samples were above the highest proposed limit of 20 µg/kg. The Committee concluded that it would be unlikely that an ML of 5 or

20 µg/kg has an impact on dietary exposure to OTA. The committee was unable to reach a conclusion regarding developing countries due to the lack of adequate data to consider.

CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the draft Maximum Level of 5 µg/kg for OTA in raw wheat, barley and rye to CAC31 for adoption at Step 8 and subsequent inclusion in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 112 and Appendix VII). CAC31 adopted the draft ML at Step 8 (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 26 and Appendix VII).

OTA in coffee

CCCCF1 (2007) decided to establish an electronic working group, to be chaired by Brazil, to prepare a revised discussion paper for consideration at the second session. The revised discussion paper should incorporate new data and other relevant information including those submitted to the first session, and be accompanied by a project document proposing new work and possibly an outline of the proposed draft COP (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 113).

CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to establish an electronic working group to prepare a draft proposed Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA contamination in coffee at Step 2, with a view to its circulation for comments at Step 3 and its consideration at Step 4 at the next session of the Committee, pending the formal approval of new work by the Commission (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 168). CAC31 approved this work (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 101).

CCCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the proposed draft Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA contamination in coffee at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 95 and Appendix VI). CAC32 approved the proposed draft Code at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 09/32/REP, Appendix III).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A****OTA in cocoa**

CCCCF1 decided to establish an EWG to be chaired by Ghana to update the discussion paper with new data and other relevant information, and taking into account the comments made at the first session, for consideration at the second session (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 117).

CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to suspend the consideration of this matter with the understanding to re-consider OTA contamination in cocoa in light of the new data available in the near future (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 170).

CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to re-establish the EWG led by Ghana, to update the discussion paper with a view to the development a code of practice for cocoa, for consideration by the 6th session of the Committee (REP11/CF, para. 75).

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to initiate a new work on the development of a code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA in cocoa. The Committee agreed that the proposed COP would be developed by an EWG led by Ghana for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 7th session (REP12/CF, para. 141 and Appendix X). CAC35 (2012) approved the new work (REP12/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to forward the proposed draft Code to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC36 (REP13/CF, para. 79, Appendix IV). CAC36 approved the draft Code at Step 5/8 (REP13/CAC, Appendix III).

OTA in sorghum

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to initiate a new work on the development of an annex for the management of aflatoxins and OTA in sorghum to the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXC 51-2003), subject to approval by CAC35. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by Nigeria and co-chaired by Sudan to prepare the proposed draft annex for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 7th session (REP12/CF, para. 136 and Appendix IX). CAC35 (2012) approved the new work (REP12/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to return the proposed draft Annex to Step 2/3 for further development by the EWG, circulation for comments and further consideration by the 8th session of the Committee (REP13/CF, para. 74).

CCCCF8 agreed that in view of the considerable progress made on the annex that it would be advanced for adoption, with the understanding that the annex would be integrated into the COP and its annexes in the new work on the revision of the COP. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft Annex to Step 5/8 (with the omission of Steps /7) for adoption by CAC37 (REP14/CF, para. 76-77, Appendix V). CAC37 adopted the annex at Step 5/8 (REP14/CAC, para. 47, Appendix III).

MLs OTA in spices

CCCCF8 (2014) discussed proposals for new work on MLs for aflatoxins in spices and total aflatoxins and aflatoxin B₁ in nutmeg, and associated sampling plans. The Committee had a general discussion on how best to approach the establishment of MLs in spices and considered a proposal by the Chairperson that a review of mycotoxins in spices first be conducted to allow the Committee to understand which mycotoxins to address and in which spices. Such a study could allow for a possible prioritisation of the work on spices for the Committee. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by India and co-chaired by EU and Indonesia to prepare a discussion paper as outlined in the proposal by the Chairperson for consideration at the next session (REP14/CF, paras. 134 and 137).

In view of the interest to continue with work on MLs in spices, but the need for further clarity on which mycotoxin/spice(s) combination to establish MLs and the rationale for this, as well as further need for prioritisation of the work, CCCC9 (2015) agreed to re-establish the EWG, led by India and co-chaired by Indonesia and EU to prepare a new

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

discussion paper and project document for establishment of ML for spices. The discussion paper should also include proposals for possible MLs to assist the next session of the Committee to take a decision on new work (REP15/CF, paras. 138-139).

CCCF10 (2016) also agreed that further work was needed to expand on the MLs through an EWG chaired by India and co-chaired by the EU with the following terms of reference:

- provide a rationale for selection of spices (chilli, paprika, ginger, nutmeg, pepper, turmeric)
- provide rationale for selection of total aflatoxins and OTA
- take into account the outcome of the JECFA evaluation of 2016
- consider trade aspects of existing national standards
- prepare a Project document for new work with proposals for MLs for spices.(REP16/CF, paras. 143-148)

CCCF11 (2017) agreed to start new work on MLs for AFT and OTA in nutmeg, chilli and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric and to submit the revised project document for approval by CAC40 and to establish an EWG, led by India subject to approval of new work by CAC40, would prepare a proposal for circulation for comments and consideration by CCCF12.

The Committee also recalled a previous decision that EWG chairs should use data from GEMS/Food database and ensure that any data collected by EWGs should be uploaded to the GEMS/Food database. This was consistent with the recommendation of CCCF09 to use the GEMS/Food platform for data submission and analysis for its work in the development of MLs. When additional information needed to be collected that was not part of the database, WG chairs should consult with the GEMS/Food Secretariat when developing templates for the collection of data (REP17/CF, paras. 118-124)

CCCF12 (2018) could not agree on a single figure for the MLs for OTA in the specified spices and agreed:

- to suspend work and to hold the ML of 20 µg/kg for OTA in nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric, respectively, at Step 4 to give time to countries to implement the Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins in spices (CXC 78-2017);
- that JECFA would issue a call for data in three-years' time; and
- that an EWG would be re-established once the data were submitted to prepare a proposal for consideration by a future CCCF. (REP 18/CF, paras. 118-119, Appendix VIII)

CCCF13 (2019) noted that this agenda item was not for discussion according to the decision of CCCF12 to hold these MLs at Step 4 to ensure the implementation of the Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017) and to generate data to enable progress in the consideration of the MLs for mycotoxin in spices by a future CCCF (REP19/CF, para. 81).

CCCF14 (2021) agreed to:

i) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India to:

a. consider new or additional data available on GEMS/Food;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

- b. update the working paper that was last presented at CCCF12 (2018) (CX/CF 18/12/11) and
 - c. prepare revised proposals for MLs for total aflatoxins and ochratoxin A in spices: nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric, respectively, for comments and consideration by CCCF15 (2022) and associated sampling plans taking into account the new and old datasets available on GEMS/Food.
- ii) request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data to collect data for further consideration by the EWG (REP19/CF, para. 145).
- CCCF15 (2022) did not consider the recommendation presented by the EWG in light of the decision to continue work on establishment of an ML for AFT in spices (REP22/CF, para. 190).
- CCCF15 agreed that ISO 948 was not appropriate for use as a sampling plan and that further work was necessary to develop a sampling that should also take into account the ML to be established, and to circulate the sampling plan presented in CRD16 for comments and to call for information on other sampling plans (REP22/CF, para. 192).
- CCCF15 agreed:
- i. return the MLs and sampling plan to Step 2/3 for further consideration;
 - ii. to re-establish the EWG chaired by India to prepare:
 - a. new proposals for MLs OTA in spices: nutmeg, dried chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric; and
 - b. an associated sampling plan.
 - iii. that the EWG should carefully consider all the data and prepare a paper that clearly presents a more elaborate data analysis, taking into account written comments submitted to and all comments made during this Session (see REP22/CF, paras. 185 and 191), and
 - iv. to request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL requesting comments on the sampling plan presented in CRD16 and information on other sampling plans for consideration by the EWG (REP22/CF, para. 193).

OTA in dried chili pepper, paprika and nutmeg

CCCF16 (2023) noted there was general agreement with the ML of 20 µg/kg for OTA in dried chili pepper, paprika and nutmeg, while a proposal was made for a higher ML of 30 µg/kg due to a rejection rate of higher than 20% for an ML of 20 µg/kg and for a lower ML of 15 µg/kg for nutmeg giving the health concern related to the presence of OTA in food (REP23/CF, para. 58).

OTA in ginger, pepper (black and white) and turmeric

CCCF16 noted there was general agreement to not establish an ML for this group of spices as proposed by the EWG, given that the available data did not indicate significant presence of OTA in these spices, CCCF noted a proposal to continue work on MLs due to the diverse MLs worldwide for the commodities in question, and to also apply an ML of 20 µg/kg for these spices (REP23/CF, para. 61).

CCCF16 agreed:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

- (i) to forward the ML 20 µg/kg for OTA in chili pepper, paprika and nutmeg (dry/dried) to CAC46 for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix V), noting the reservations of the European Union, Norway, and Switzerland for the MLs for AFT for the reasons explained in paragraph 63;
- (ii) that the MLs could be reviewed in 3 years' time if sufficient data are submitted through GEMS/Food;
- (iii) to discontinue work on MLs for AFT in paprika, ginger, pepper (black and white) and turmeric and MLs for OTA in ginger, pepper (black and white) and turmeric; and to inform CCEXEC and CAC46 accordingly; and
- (iv) to re-convene the EWG, chaired by India, working in English, to develop sampling plans for the agreed MLs taking into account all written comments submitted to CCCF16; for comments and consideration by CCCF17 (REP23/CF, para. 69).

CAC46 adopted at Step 5/8 the ML for ochratoxin A in dried chilli, paprika, and nutmeg. The ML could be reviewed in 3 years' time if sufficient data were submitted through the Global Environment Monitoring System – Food Contaminant Monitoring and Assessment Programme (GEMS/Food) (REP23/CAC, para. 69ii).

CAC46 noted the reservations as described below in relation to the adoption of MLs for ochratoxin A for the selected spices (REP23/CAC, para. 70).

Egypt expressed its reservation on the ML for ochratoxin A in dried chilli and nutmeg since these mycotoxins were genotoxic carcinogens and thus a public health issue, and consumption of chilli pepper and nutmeg was high in Egypt. Consequently, levels should be set as low as reasonably achievable as proposed in CRD19 (REP23/CAC, para. 72).

CAC46 discontinued work on the MLs for ochratoxin A in ginger, black and white pepper, and turmeric (REP23/CAC, para. 76).

Sampling plan for spices

See the section on Aflatoxin total.

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

At CCCF8 (2014), a proposal for new work on a code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA in paprika was discussed. The Committee agreed that a more general approach should also be taken for this COP, similar to the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin Contamination in cereals; and that consideration could be given to development of annexes for specific mycotoxin-spice combinations. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by Spain and co-chaired by the Netherlands, to prepare a discussion paper on the feasibility for a code of practice for mycotoxins in spices with specific annexes for consideration at the 9th session (REP14/CF, paras. 138-140).

CCCF9 (2015) agreed to request CAC to approve new work on the COP for the Prevention and Reduction of mycotoxin contamination in spices and to forward the project document to the Executive Committee for critical review. The Committee also agreed to establish the EWG, chaired by Spain and co-chaired by India and The Netherlands to prepare, subject to approval by the Commission, a proposed draft of COP for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at its next session. The EWG would also prepare a discussion paper to outline the development of possible annexes for mycotoxin/individual spices or groups of spices combinations (REP15/CF, paras. 143-144 and Appendix VIII).

CAC38 (2015) approved the new work (REP15/CAC Appendix VI).

CCCF10 (2016) agreed to:

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Ochratoxin A**

- continue work on the COP and its annexes (for total aflatoxins and for OTA), and to use the categories of spices as a starting point
- issue a CL to request information on all available proven measures used in practice to reduce contamination by mycotoxins in spices that would help guide the development of possible annexes to the COP
- re-establish the EWG, chaired by Spain and co-chaired by The Netherlands and India to continue the drafting of the COP and its annexes taking into account the discussion at this session, written comments submitted to this session; and the information to be provided by the aforementioned CL. (REP16/CF, paras. 129-137)

CCCCF11 (2017) agreed to advance the proposed draft COP for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins contamination in spices for adoption at Step 5/8 by CAC and to discontinue work on annexes until further information on management practices specific spices became available. (REP17/CF, paras. 112-117 and Appendix VI)

CCCCF12 (2018) noted the high occurrence levels presented to the EWG, there was a need to reduce mycotoxin levels in spices by implementing the recently adopted code of practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins in spices (CXC 78-2017) and that the MLs, if agreed, could be revised based on new occurrence data following implementation of the COP (REP 18/CF, para, 116).

CAC40 (2017) adopted the COP at Step 5/8 with the amendment to section 2.3.2 (REP17/CAC, paras. 58-59 and Appendix III)

Code of practice for mycotoxins in cassava and cassava-based products

See section of Aflatoxin total.

Ochratoxin A is the major compound of a group of chemically related mycotoxins produced by species of the genera *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium*. Ochratoxin A contamination is commonly found in various cereals, some pulses, coffee, cocoa, figs, grapes, wine, nuts and coconut products. It can also be transferred through the feed to animal products and concentrates especially in the kidney, but may also be found in meat and milk. Most ochratoxin A is, however, converted to the less harmful ochratoxin-alpha in the rumen of ruminants. Ochratoxin A is a nephrotoxic mycotoxin, which is carcinogenic to rodents and has also teratogenic, immunotoxic and possibly neurotoxic properties. It has been associated with Balkan Endemic Nephropathy.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Patulin**

Reference to JECFA:	35 (1989), 44 (1995)
Toxicological guidance value:	PMTDI 0.0004 mg/kg bw (1995)
Contaminant definition:	Patulin
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Patulin Contamination in Apple Juice and Apple Juice Ingredients in Other Beverages (CXC 50-2003)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Apple juice	50	Adopted	2003	FAC	Whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration.	Relevant Codex commodity standard include CXS 247-2005 (apple product only). The ML applies also to apple juice used as an ingredient in other beverages.	

The situation regarding patulin was reviewed in a position paper (last version CX/FAC 99/16).

CAC26 (2003) adopted the ML. The possible reduction of the ML from 50 to 25 µg/kg will be reconsidered by CCFAC once the COP has been implemented (i.e., after 4 years). More data are requested on the level of patulin in apple juice and apple juice ingredients for other beverages.

CCCF1 (2007) agreed to take patulin out of the priority list, noting that there was an existing maximum level and this topic was no longer considered a high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127).

Patulin is a low molecular weight hemiacetal lactone mycotoxin produced by species of the genera *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium* and *Byssoschlamys*. The major sources of patulin contamination are apples with brown rot and blue mould. Because patulin does not spread much from spoilt tissue, the main human exposure can be expected from processed products, like apple juice and apple sauce, in which the contamination is not visible. Because fermentation destroys patulin, it is not normally present in cider and perry, unless unfermented apple juice has been added after fermentation. Patulin may also be a contaminant of soft fruits, some vegetables, barley, wheat and corn.

Potential health problems related to patulin are connected to cytotoxic, immunotoxic, neurotoxic, gastrointestinal and other effects observed in animals. Patulin is mostly eliminated within a few days after ingestion.

The PMTDI was set by applying a safety factor of 100 to the lowest NOAEL of 43 µg/kg bw/day in rats.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Sterigmatocystin**

Reference to JECFA:	83 (2016)
Toxicological guidance value:	BMDL ₁₀ : 0.16 mg/kg bw per day for hepatic haemangiosarcoma
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	Abbreviation: STC
Related Code of Practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

STC has been detected with a high prevalence in sorghum samples analysed in the FAO/WHO Mycotoxins in Sorghum Project. This mycotoxin has not been assessed by JECFA and a full safety assessment may be warranted to facilitate the interpretation of the analytical results. CCCF08 (2014) agreed to add a full risk assessment of STC in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA. (REP14/CF, paras. 125-130 and Appendix XIII)

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated STC at the request of CCCF. The Committee concluded that STC is genotoxic and carcinogenic, and the critical effect was determined to be carcinogenicity. The Committee selected the BMDL₁₀ of 0.16 mg/kg bw per day for hepatic haemangiosarcoma in male rats from the restricted log-logistic model as the point of departure for use in the risk assessment. The Committee calculated MOEs for mean and high estimates of dietary exposure to STC. The MOEs for adults range from 9400 to more than 530 000 for mean estimates based on UB and LB assumptions. For high estimates, MOEs for adults range from 4700 to 270 000. The lowest MOEs are observed for the African Region (from 4700 to 5000 for the high exposure UB–LB range, and from 9400 to 10 000 for the mean exposure UB–LB range). The Committee noted that these estimates, which are based only on adult populations and for which only one food commodity (sorghum) was considered, may indicate a human health concern. Margins of exposure were not calculated for Europe or Japan, as STC was not detected in any samples. For all other regions, the Committee considered that the MOEs were not of human health concern even at the high UB exposure. Overall, the Committee concluded that the data used for calculating the margins of exposure had considerable limitations, and that consequently, the derived margins of exposure should be considered only as crude estimates.

The Committee also noted that STC and AFB₁ have the same main target organ (the liver). The comparative animal data on carcinogenicity are very limited, but indicate that STC is less potent than AFB₁ (JECFA/83/SC).

Following the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish an EWG, led by Brazil, to prepare a discussion paper on AFs and STC in cereals (in particular maize, rice, sorghum and wheat) to take at CCCF12 an informed decision on the appropriate follow-up as regards possible risk management options for AFs and STC in cereals. (REP17/CF, para. 151)

In CCCF12 (2018), Brazil as Chair of the EWG introduced the recommendation that it was premature to set MLs for STC due to the lack of an internationally validated analytical method and reference material for this mycotoxin. The Committee agreed to inform the Standards development organizations of the need for an internationally validated method of analysis for STC through CCMAS (REP18/CF, paras 132 and 139).

CCMAS41 (2018) encouraged standards development organizations to develop an international validated method for STC in cereals (REP18/MAS, para. 21).

Code of practice for mycotoxins in cereals

Mycotoxins**Sterigmatocystin**

In CCCF12 (2018), the Committee noted the recommendation that consideration could be given to development of an annex to Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) if there are specific management practices available for STC in cereals. The Committee agreed that there was insufficient information for the development of an annex and that no action was needed at this stage (REP18/CF, paras 132 and 140).

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Ochratoxin A.

Sterigmatocystin (STC) is a polyketide mycotoxin that is produced by more than 50 fungal species, including *Aspergillus flavus*, *A. parasiticus*, *A. versicolor* and *A. nidulans*, of which *A. versicolor* is the most common source. STC shares its biosynthetic pathway with aflatoxins. *A. nidulans* and *A. versicolor* are apparently unable to biotransform STC into O-methylsterigmatocystin, the direct precursor of aflatoxin B₁ and G₁. Consequently, substrates colonised by these fungi can contain high amounts of STC, while substrates invaded by *A. flavus* and *A. parasiticus* contain only low amounts of STC as most is converted into aflatoxins. STC can occur in grains and grain-based products due to fungal infestation at the post-harvest stage.

The IARC (1976 and 1978) has assessed the carcinogenic potential of STC and concluded that STC produced lung tumours in mice and liver tumours in rats following oral administration. The IARC noted that in rats, STC induced skin and liver tumours following its administration to the skin and sarcomas at the site of its subcutaneous injection. No case reports or epidemiological studies were available for evaluation by IARC and it was concluded that STC is possibly carcinogenic to humans (group 2B).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**T-2 and HT-2 toxin**

Reference to JECFA:	56 (2001), 83 (2016), 90 (2020), 93(2022)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group ARfD 320 ng/kg bw (2022, for T-2, HT-2 and 4, 15-DAS) Group TDI of 25 ng/kg bw (2022, for T-2, HT-2 and 4, 15-DAS, alone or in combination)
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	-
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

JECFA56 (2001) evaluated T2 and HT2 toxin. The Committee established the PMTDI of 0.06 µg/kg bw based on a 3-week dietary study with pigs, applying a safety factor of 500 to a LOEL for changes in white and red cell counts. The average intake of T-2 and HT-2 toxin via the human diet was estimated by JECFA as 8 resp. 9 ng/kg bw, which is lower than the group PMTDI. An intake at the level of the PMTDI was not expected to result in effects of T-2 and HT-2 toxin on the immune system and to haematotoxicity, which are considered critical effects after short-term intake. JECFA recommended that toxic equivalency factors relative to DON be developed for the other trichothecenes commonly occurring in cereal grains, if sufficient data become available.

No further action on T-2 and HT-2 toxin has been recommended by CCFAC33 (2001), probably based on the understanding that the (limited) information available suggested that intakes would not exceed the PMTDI (ALINORM 01/12A, para. 16).

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated DAS in response to a request from CCCF and noted that 4,15-DAS and T-2/HT-2 toxin are structurally similar, and there is evidence that they cause similar effects at the biochemical and cellular levels, have similarities in toxic effects in vivo and have an additive dose effect when co-exposure occurs. Therefore, the evidence was considered sufficient by the Committee to support including 4,15-DAS in the group PMTDI for T-2 and HT-2 toxin established at JECFA56. The PMTDI of 0.06 µg/kg bw for T-2 and HT-2 toxin, alone or in combination, was established based on a LOAEL of 0.03 mg/kg bw per day associated with changes in white blood cell counts following 3 weeks of dietary exposure in pigs and the application of an uncertainty factor of 500. The inclusion of 4,15-DAS in the group PMTDI of 0.06 µg/kg bw was considered to be a conservative approach when taking into consideration the observation that T-2 toxin was consistently more potent than 4,15-DAS when comparing similar in vitro and in vivo end-points.

The Committee noted that only LB dietary exposure estimates for Europe were available for the sum of T-2, HT-2 and 4,15-DAS. From these estimates, the sum of the LB dietary exposure estimates for 4,15-DAS of up to 0.0028 µg/kg bw per day and the total dietary exposures estimated for T-2 plus HT-2 of 0.016 µg/kg bw per day results in a LB mean dietary exposure of 0.019 and in a LB high dietary exposure estimated at 0.038 µg/kg bw per day (twice the mean). The Committee concluded that these LB estimates for Europe do not exceed the group PMTDI for T-2, HT-2 and 4,15-DAS (JECFA/83/SC).

CCCF11 (2017) agreed to request JECFA to update the 2001 JECFA evaluation of T-2/HT-2 toxin taking into account new toxicity studies (i.e. inclusion in the priority list). Furthermore, the exposure assessment should be based upon more recent occurrence data on the presence of T-2 and HT-2 toxin and 4,15-1 Diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS) in food. Member countries are requested to provide recent occurrence data on the presence of T-2, HT-2 toxin and 4,15-DAS to the GEMS/Food contaminants database. For the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**T-2 and HT-2 toxin**

generation of these occurrence data it is necessary to use methods of analysis with appropriate sensitivity (REP17/CF, para. 151). The Committee therefore listed T-2/HT-2 in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 17/CF, appendix XII).

CCCF12 (2018) listed T-2 and HT-2 in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 18/CF, appendix X).

CCCF13 (2019) kept T-2 and HT-2 in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 19/CF, appendix X).

JECFA90 (2020) evaluated tricothecenes including DAS. The Committee reviewed the information regarding analytical methods, sampling, effect of processing, prevention and control, occurrence in food commodities and dietary exposure since the last evaluation of T-2 and HT-2 at the fifty-sixth meeting in 2001. Analytical methods have been improved in the last two decades with multi mycotoxin HPLC-MS methods allowing the quantification of T-2 and HT-2 below or close to 1 µg/kg. There were a large number of occurrence data for T-2 and HT-2 submitted to the GEMS/Food contaminants database in the last two decades, but these were largely from Europe with a paucity of data from other regions. This may be due to the generally low incidence and low concentrations of T-2 and HT-2 found outside Europe. In Europe T-2 and HT-2 occur frequently in cereal crops, particularly in oats. There was also evidence of co-occurrence of several other type A tricothecenes and their metabolites in cereals. It was concluded that dietary exposure to T-2 and HT-2 covering the known geographical distribution of T-2 and HT-2 was suitably covered by existing European estimates of chronic and acute dietary exposure. No additional international or national estimates of chronic or acute dietary exposure were derived by the Committee. The Committee derived chronic dietary exposure estimates of 6.0 to 18 ng/kg bw per day for T-2, HT-2 and DAS combined. The Committee noted the toxicological evaluation and overall risk assessment will follow at a future meeting (Summary and conclusions JECFA90).

CCCF14 (2021) kept T-2 and HT-2 in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA (REP 21/CF, appendix VIII).

JECFA93 (2022) reviewed the toxicological data on the T-2, HT-2 and DAS and conducted a safety evaluation and a re-evaluation of the combined dietary exposure. The Committee established a group ARfD for T-2, HT-2 and DAS using the lower 95% confidence limit on the benchmark dose for a 10% response (BMDL₁₀) of 2.6 µg/kg bw for emesis in mink following acute gavage exposure to T-2 or HT-2 as the point of departure. As DAS induces emesis in mink and reduced feed intake in mice via similar modes of action, the Committee established a group ARfD for T-2, HT-2 and DAS of 320 ng/kg bw and recommended a relative potency factor of 0.2 for acute exposure to DAS. The committee noted that there is insufficient information available to estimate combined acute exposure to T-2, HT-2 and DAS.

The Committee concluded that the most sensitive, reliable and reproducible effects observed following repeated dietary exposure were reported in the 3-week toxicity study in juvenile pigs. Dose–response analysis of body weights, daily body weight gain and daily feed intake was conducted and a BMDL₁₀ of 1.8 µg/kg bw per day based on reduced daily body weight gain was selected as point of departure. The Committee established a group TDI of 25 ng/kg bw for T-2, HT-2 and DAS, alone or in combination. The previous group provisional maximum tolerable daily intake (PMTDI1) of 60 ng/kg bw for T-2 and HT-2, established at the fifty-sixth meeting and amended at the eighty-third meeting to include DAS, was withdrawn. The relative potency factor of 0.2 should be applied in comparing dietary exposure to DAS with the group TDI (Summary and conclusions JECFA93).

At CCCF15 (2022), The EU, as Chair of the WG, presented the recommendations made at the virtual meeting of the WG held prior to CCCF15 focusing on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations, which were on pyrrolizidine alkaloids, ciguatoxins, tropane alkaloids and ergot alkaloids, T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol (REP22/CF, para. 219).

The WG Chair reported that the full reports of the JECFA evaluations were not yet available and the JECFA summary report indicated a lack of geographically representative data and it was therefore premature to consider follow-up actions at this time (REP22/CF, para. 223).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**T-2 and HT-2 toxin**

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to request JECFA to issue a call for data on the occurrence of ergot alkaloids, T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol to be submitted to the GEMS/Food database; and re-convene the in-session WG at CCCF16 (2023) chaired by EU (REP22/CF, para. 224 iv and v).

CCCF16 (2023), The VWG Chair noted that the JECFA full report was now available, and the toxicological monograph would be available shortly for consultation. There would be a need to issue a call for data on the occurrence of these trichothecenes and to define the minimum requirements for submission of data in food and feed to GEMS/Food that could support work on these toxins in future (REP23/CF, para. 110).

CCCF agreed to (REP23/CF, para. 113):

(ii) reconsider the elaboration of a discussion paper on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on ergot alkaloids and trichothecenes (T-2, HT-2, and DAS) at CCCF17; and

(iii) reconvene, as necessary, the in-session WG at CCCF17, chaired by the European Union.

At CCCF17 (2024), the chair of the VWG, introduced the item and summarized the key points of discussions in the VWG held prior to the Session, as contained in CRD05. The VWG Chair presented recommendations on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of JECFA evaluations and a re-iteration on the follow-up to JECFA evaluations on T-2, HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS) (REP24/CF, para. 154).

At the VWG, it was brought to the attention of Members that while the WG in the previous year agreed to follow-up on the JECFA evaluation on T-2, HT-toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol, no member country volunteered to take up the work at CCCF16. No objection was raised at the WG this year to forward the recommendation, which was agreed at the WG in the previous year with slight updates, for consideration by CCCF (REP24/CF, para. 157):

- As regards T-2, HT-2, and diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS), to establish an EWG, working in English, to prepare a discussion paper on T-2, HT-2, and DAS to look into the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF18. In this discussion paper, analytical performance characteristics as guidance for generation and submission of data to the GEMS/Food database should be considered in view of issuing a call for data on the presence of T-2, HT-2 and diacetoxyscirpenol (DAS) in food and feed.

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Aflatoxins, total or Ochratoxin A.

T-2 and HT-2 toxin are closely related compounds belonging to a group of chemically related mycotoxins called type A trichothecenes (which are epoxy-sesquiterpenoid compounds) and are produced by certain *Fusarium* species, which are pathogens of several cereal grains. The most important producer is *F. sporotrichioides*, a saprophyte which only will grow at high water activities. As a consequence, T-2 and HT-2 toxins are not normally found in grain at harvest, but result from water damage when it remains wet for longer periods in the field or after harvest. T-2 and HT-2 toxin undergo rapid metabolism and elimination in livestock species and the transfer from feed to animal products is probably negligible. Maximum levels in feed are not needed to protect public health, but are useful for the protection of animal health and productivity. Especially pigs are vulnerable. In animals, decreased feed consumption, diarrhea and vomiting have been observed as acute effects.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**T-2 and HT-2 toxin**

T-2 toxin is a potent inhibitor of protein synthesis, both in vivo and in vitro. T-2 toxin is linked to outbreaks of acute poisoning of humans, in which the adverse effects reported include nausea, vomiting, pharyngeal irritation, abdominal pain, diarrhea, bloody stool, dizziness and chills. Co-occurrence of T-2 toxin with other trichothecenes in these cases is likely. T-2 toxin is also associated with food-related poisoning incidents in 1931- 1947 referred to as alimentary toxic aleukia, in the former Soviet Union.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Mycotoxins**Zearalenone**

Reference to JECFA:	53 (1999)
Toxicological guidance value:	PMTDI 0.0005 mg/kg bw (1999, The total intake of zearalenone and its metabolites (including alpha-zearalenol (zeranol)) should not exceed the PMTDI.)
Synonyms:	(Zearalenone is the most important of a group of related mycotoxins and relevant metabolites. Abbreviation: ZEN. Its metabolite, alpha-zearalenol (zeranol) is used as veterinary drug.)
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals (CXC 51-2003) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxins in Spices (CXC 78-2017)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

The situation regarding ZEN has been reviewed in a position paper (last version CX/FAC 00/19).

Preliminary intake calculations indicate values well below the PMTDI. It is mentioned however that further action seems required to reduce the levels of ZEN in risk products (especially maize containing products) for especially children with a high intake of these products.

CCFAC31 (1999) agreed that, recognizing that there were no identified trade problems with ZEN, Codex MLs were not necessary for the time being. The MRLs for zearalenol (ZAL) in cattle liver and muscle have been established by Codex (CCRVDF) because of recognized use of zeranol in cattle; they are relevant for CCFAC in so far that feed contamination with ZEN can lead to residues of both ZEN and ZAL (and other metabolites) in cattle liver and muscle.

Code of practice for mycotoxins in spices

See the section on Aflatoxins, total or Ochratoxin A.

Zearalenone (ZEN) is the most important of a group of resorcylic acid lactone mycotoxins, produced by several species of *Fusarium* moulds. It is found worldwide in a number of cereal crops and also in derived products like beer. It has been implicated in numerous incidents of mycotoxicosis in farm animals, especially pigs. ZEN is rapidly metabolized in and excreted from animals; residues of this mycotoxin in animal products are probably not significant from a health point of view. A metabolite of ZEN, alpha-zearalenol (zeranol, abbreviated here as ZAL) is, however, relevant relating to its potential use as a veterinary drug. Also beta-zearalenol (taleranol) has hormonal activity. Besides these substances which can be used as anabolic growth promoters, also alpha- and beta-zearalenol (ZAL) and zearalenone (ZEN) are mentioned as possibly occurring metabolites of or co-occurring substances with ZEN.

The PMTDI for ZEN was set by applying a safety factor of 100 from the lowest NOAEL, related to the estrogenic effect in pigs. ZAL has an ADI of 0.5 µg/kg bw (ref. JECFA 26, 27 and 32).

Residues of ZEN and ZAL together in an animal product may be regarded as evidence that the animal feed was contaminated with ZEN. In order to distinguish between contamination of the feed with mycotoxins of the ZEN group or use of ZAL as veterinary drug, it may be necessary to determine the relative proportions of the different residues, e.g. as ZEN + alpha- and beta-ZAL against ZAL. A ratio of 5 or more probably indicates only contamination by mycotoxins.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Saxitoxin group**

Reference to JECFA: -

Toxicological guidance value: ARfD 0.7 µg/kg bw (2004; FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation)

Synonyms: Abbreviation, STX

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg mollusc flesh)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Live and raw bivalve molluscs	0.8	Adopted	CXS 292-2008	FFP, CF	Edible parts of bivalve molluscs (the whole part or any part intended to be eaten separately)	Relevant Codex commodity standards are CXS 292-2008 and CXS 315-2014.	(2HCL) of saxitoxin equivalent. 2)
Live abalone, raw fresh chilled or frozen abalone 1)	No ML	Adopted	CXS 312-2013	FFP		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 312-2013.	2)

- 1) Abalone from some geographical areas have been found to accumulate certain marine biotoxins. It is up to the Competent Authority (using a Risk Assessment) to determine whether a risk exists in any geographical areas under its control and if so, put in the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the part of the abalone to be consumed, meets with the marine biotoxins level in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008).
- 2) These MLs are not listed in the current GSCTFF (rev. 2023).

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation on Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (2004) was asked to perform risk assessments for a number of biotoxins that are present in bivalve molluscs. Since exposure to biotoxins generally involves only occasional consumption, and because most of the available toxicological data involve only acute and short-term studies, priority was given to the establishment of an acute reference dose, and generally insufficient data were available to establish a tolerable daily intake. It must be pointed out that the Expert Consultation did not have enough time to fully evaluate epidemiological data or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for several toxin groups (especially the AZA and STX groups). The Consultation agreed that there is a need for a further in-depth review of these data to better derive the guidance levels/maximum levels.

CCFFP29 (2008) agreed that at this stage it was not necessary to ask for additional scientific advice from FAO/WHO and that this issue would be kept under review and may be reconsidered when further scientific advice became available.

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to provisionally endorse the proposed levels, with the recommendation that the levels would require complete review in the coming few years with the view to revising these levels where necessary, when more data became available (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 31).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Draft Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs at Step 8 with a correction to the scope of the Spanish version by replacing “desbullados” with “abiertos” (ALINORM 08/31/REP. para. 36).

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO reported on the development of TEFs for marine biotoxins associated with bivalve molluscs. The Representative recalled that the CCFFP has developed the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008) which includes provisions for several marine biotoxins (eg Saxitoxin (STX) group; Domoic

Marine biotoxins**Saxitoxin group**

acid (DA) group; Brevetoxin (BTX) group; etc). As each of these biotoxin groups includes several analogues with different toxic potencies, in order to be able to assess the total toxicity in the shellfish extract and thus implement the standard, there was the need to derive TEF for each of the biotoxin groups.

At CCFFP's request FAO/WHO organized an expert meeting in 2016 to discuss the issues associated with development of TEFs for marine biotoxins, and to develop a technical paper on the state of science on the subject, including guidance for food safety managers to implement the provisions for biotoxins in the standard at national level. The technical paper has been published and also resulted in an article in an international scientific journal (REP17/CF, para 23).

Saxitoxin-group toxins are a group of closely related tetrahydropurines occurring in bivalve molluscs, such as oysters, mussels, scallops and clams. STX-group toxins are neurotoxic and cause paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) in humans. PSP can be characterized by symptoms ranging from a slight tingling sensation or numbness around the lips, tongue and mouth to fatal respiratory paralysis. From the different STX analogues that have been identified seem STX, NeoSTX, GTX1 and dc-STX to be the most toxic ones. A provisional ARfD was calculated by the FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation based on a dose of 2 µg STX eq/kg bw derived from epidemiological data as LOAEL. Because mild illness at lower doses is readily reversible and the data on PSP represent a range of individuals with varying susceptibilities, a safety factor of 3 was considered appropriate to derive a provisional ARfD. The provisional ARfD is therefore calculated to be 0.7 µg STX eq/kg bw. An additional note was however made that further effort is needed to evaluate epidemiological data fully or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the ARfD and provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for the STX group.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Okadaic acid group**

Reference to JECFA: -

Toxicological guidance value: ARfD 0.33 µg/kg bw (2004; FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation)

Synonyms: Abbreviation, OA

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Live and raw bivalve molluscs	0.16	Adopted	CXS 292-2008	FFP, CF	Edible parts of bivalve molluscs (the whole part or any part intended to be eaten separately)	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 292-2008.	Okadaic acid equivalent. 2)
Live abalone, raw fresh chilled or frozen abalone 1)	No ML	Adopted	CXS 312-2013	FFP		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 312-2013.	2)

- 1) Abalone from some geographical areas have been found to accumulate certain marine biotoxins. It is up to the Competent Authority (using a Risk Assessment) to determine whether a risk exists in any geographical areas under its control and if so, put in the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the part of the abalone to be consumed, meets with the marine biotoxins level in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008).
- 2) These MLs are not listed in the current GSCTFF (ver. 2023).

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation on Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (2004) was asked to perform risk assessments for a number of biotoxins that are present in bivalve molluscs. Since exposure to biotoxins generally involves only occasional consumption, and because most of the available toxicological data involve only acute and short-term studies, priority was given to the establishment of an acute reference dose, and generally insufficient data were available to establish a tolerable daily intake. It must be pointed out that the Expert Consultation did not have enough time to fully evaluate epidemiological data or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for several toxin groups (especially the AZA and STX groups). The Consultation agreed that there is a need for a further in-depth review of these data to better derive the guidance levels/maximum levels.

CCFFP29 (2008) agreed that at this stage it was not necessary to ask for additional scientific advice from FAO/WHO and that this issue would be kept under review and may be reconsidered when further scientific advice became available.

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to provisionally endorse the proposed levels, with the recommendation that the levels would require complete review in the coming few years with the view to revising these levels where necessary, when more data became available (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 31).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Draft Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs at Step 8 with a correction to the scope of the Spanish version by replacing “desbullados” with “abiertos” (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 36).]

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO reported on the development of TEFs for marine biotoxins associated with bivalve molluscs. The Representative recalled that the CCFFP has developed the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008) which includes provisions for several marine biotoxins (e.g. Saxitoxin (STX) group; Domoic acid (DA) group; Brevetoxin (BTX) group; etc). As each of these biotoxin groups includes several analogues with different toxic potencies, in order to be able to assess the total toxicity in the shellfish extract and thus implement the standard, there was the need to derive TEF for each of the biotoxin groups.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Okadaic acid group**

At CCFFP's request FAO/WHO organized an expert meeting in 2016 to discuss the issues associated with development of TEFs for marine biotoxins, and to develop a technical paper on the state of science on the subject, including guidance for food safety managers to implement the provisions for biotoxins in the standard at national level. The technical paper has been published and also resulted in an article in an international scientific journal (REP17/CF, para 23)

Okadaic acid (OA) forms together with its analogues the dinophysins toxins (DTX), the group of OA toxins. OA toxins can be found in microalgae and various species of shellfish, mainly in filter-feeding bivalve molluscs such as oysters, mussels, scallops and clams and can cause diarrhoeic shellfish poisoning (DSP). DSP is characterized by symptoms such as diarrhea, nausea, vomiting and abdominal pain. The onset of DSP in humans is shortly after consumption. OA toxins possess tumour promoting activity, and okadaic acid itself also shows genotoxic and immunotoxic activity. It is unlikely that a substantial risk of cancer exists in consumers of shellfish because of these toxins, but still the question may be raised what the human health risks are of (sub)chronic exposure to low levels.

A provisional ARfD of 0.33 µg OA eq/kg bw could be established. This value is based on a LOAEL of 1.0 µg OA eq/kg bw and a safety factor of 3 because of documentation of human cases including more than 40 persons and because DSP symptoms are readily reversible.

More studies on pharmacokinetics, data on long-term/carcinogenicity and further studies on genotoxicity and reproductive toxicity are needed for establishing a TDI.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Domoic acid group**

Reference to JECFA: -

Toxicological guidance value: ARfD 100 µg/kg bw (2004; FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation)

Synonyms: Abbreviation, DA

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Live and raw bivalve molluscs	20	Adopted	CXS 292-2008	FFP, CF	Edible parts of bivalve molluscs (the whole part or any part intended to be eaten separately)	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 292-2008.	Domoic acid. 2)
Live abalone, raw fresh chilled or frozen abalone 1)	No ML	Adopted	CXS 312-2013	FFP		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 312-2013.	2)

- 1) Abalone from some geographical areas have been found to accumulate certain marine biotoxins. It is up to the Competent Authority (using a Risk Assessment) to determine whether a risk exists in any geographical areas under its control and if so, put in the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the part of the abalone to be consumed, meets with the marine biotoxins level in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008).
- 2) These MLs are not listed in the current GSCTFF (ver. 2023).

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation on Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (2004) was asked to perform risk assessments for a number of biotoxins that are present in bivalve molluscs. Since exposure to biotoxins generally involves only occasional consumption, and because most of the available toxicological data involve only acute and short-term studies, priority was given to the establishment of an acute reference dose, and generally insufficient data were available to establish a tolerable daily intake. It must be pointed out that the Expert Consultation did not have enough time to fully evaluate epidemiological data or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for several toxin groups (especially the AZA and STX groups). The Consultation agreed that there is a need for a further in-depth review of these data to better derive the guidance levels/maximum levels.

CCFFP29 (2008) agreed that at this stage it was not necessary to ask for additional scientific advice from FAO/WHO and that this issue would be kept under review and may be reconsidered when further scientific advice became available.

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to provisionally endorse the proposed levels, with the recommendation that the levels would require complete review in the coming few years with the view to revising these levels where necessary, when more data became available (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 31).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Draft Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs at Step 8 with a correction to the scope of the Spanish version by replacing “desbullados” with “abiertos” (ALINORM 08/31/REP. para. 36).

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO reported on the development of TEFs for marine biotoxins associated with bivalve molluscs. The Representative recalled that the CCFFP has developed the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008) which includes provisions for several marine biotoxins (eg Saxitoxin (STX) group; Domoic acid (DA) group; Brevetoxin (BTX) group; etc). As each of these biotoxin groups includes several analogues with different toxic potencies, in order to be able to assess the total toxicity in the shellfish extract and thus implement the standard, there was the need to derive TEF for each of the biotoxin groups.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Domoic acid group**

At CCFFP's request FAO/WHO organized an expert meeting in 2016 to discuss the issues associated with development of TEFs for marine biotoxins, and to develop a technical paper on the state of science on the subject, including guidance for food safety managers to implement the provisions for biotoxins in the standard at national level. The technical paper has been published and also resulted in an article in an international scientific journal (REP17/CF, para 23)

Domoic acid (DA) and its isomers may cause amnesic shellfish poisoning (ASP) in humans. Symptoms include gastrointestinal symptoms such as vomiting, diarrhoea or abdominal cramps, and/or neurological symptoms such as confusion, loss of memory or other serious signs such as seizure or coma. These symptoms generally occur within 24-48 hours after consuming contaminated shellfish or other types of seafood.

The toxicological database for DA is limited. Neurotoxicity is the critical toxicological effect identified in experimental animals as well as in humans. Based on the results of the first outbreak of ASP in Canada in 1987, an ARfD could be established. In this outbreak, a dose-related increase in severity of the signs and symptoms was observed in patients consuming between 1 mg/kg bw and 5 mg/kg bw. These findings are supported by studies in rodents and monkeys. The LOAEL of 1 mg/kg bw was divided by a safety factor of 10 to cover intrahuman susceptibility and account for the fact that the starting point was a LOAEL, to derive a provisional ARfD of 100 µg/kg bw.

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation noted that although very few animal studies have been conducted on the subchronic and chronic toxicity of DA, these limited data suggest that cumulative effects of low doses of DA are unlikely. Hence, there conclusion was that the ARfD may also be considered as a provisional chronic TDI.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Brevetoxin group**

Reference to JECFA: -

Toxicological guidance value: -

Synonyms: Abbreviation, BTX

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mouse units/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Live and raw bivalve molluscs	200	Adopted	CXS 292-2008	FFP, CF	Edible parts of bivalve molluscs (the whole part or any part intended to be eaten separately)	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 292-2008.	Mouse units or equivalent. 2)
Live abalone, raw fresh chilled or frozen abalone 1)	No ML	Adopted	CXS 312-2013	FFP		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 312-2013.	2)

1) Abalone from some geographical areas have been found to accumulate certain marine biotoxins. It is up to the Competent Authority (using a Risk Assessment) to determine whether a risk exists in any geographical areas under its control and if so, put in the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the part of the abalone to be consumed, meets with the marine biotoxins level in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008).

2) These MLs are not listed in the current GSCTFF (ver. 2023).

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation on Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (2004) was asked to perform risk assessments for a number of biotoxins that are present in bivalve molluscs. Since exposure to biotoxins generally involves only occasional consumption, and because most of the available toxicological data involve only acute and short-term studies, priority was given to the establishment of an acute reference dose, and generally insufficient data were available to establish a tolerable daily intake. It must be pointed out that the Expert Consultation did not have enough time to fully evaluate epidemiological data or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for several toxin groups (especially the AZA and STX groups). The Consultation agreed that there is a need for a further in-depth review of these data to better derive the guidance levels/maximum levels.

CCFFP29 (2008) agreed that at this stage it was not necessary to ask for additional scientific advice from FAO/WHO and that this issue would be kept under review and may be reconsidered when further scientific advice became available.

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to provisionally endorse the proposed levels, with the recommendation that the levels would require complete review in the coming few years with the view to revising these levels where necessary, when more data became available (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 31).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Draft Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs at Step 8 with a correction to the scope of the Spanish version by replacing “desbullados” with “abiertos” (ALINORM 08/31/REP. para. 36).

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO reported on the development of TEFs for marine biotoxins associated with bivalve molluscs. The Representative recalled that the CCFFP has developed the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008) which includes provisions for several marine biotoxins (eg Saxitoxin (STX) group; Domoic acid (DA) group; Brevetoxin (BTX) group; etc). As each of these biotoxin groups includes several analogues with different toxic potencies, in order to be able to assess the total toxicity in the shellfish extract and thus implement the standard, there was the need to derive TEF for each of the biotoxin groups. At CCFFP's request FAO/WHO organized an expert meeting in 2016 to discuss the issues associated with development of TEFs for marine biotoxins, and to develop a technical paper on the state of science on the subject,

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Brevetoxin group**

including guidance for food safety managers to implement the provisions for biotoxins in the standard at national level. The technical paper has been published and also resulted in an article in an international scientific journal (REP17/CF, para 23)

Brevetoxins (BTX) can accumulate in shellfish and fish. BTX-toxins can cause neurologic shellfish poisoning (NSP) which is characterized by symptoms and signs such as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, parasthesia, cramps, bronchoconstriction, paralysis, seizures and coma.

The toxicological database for BTX-toxins is limited, comprising mostly acute toxicity studies. Quantitative data of human poisonings are also very limited. There is some evidence that BTX-2 forms DNA adducts raising concerns about possible carcinogenicity and consequential long term effects. In view of the lack of data, the Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation concluded that there is a need for further investigations into the mechanisms of action of BTXs and its analogues, and an accurate assessment of long term effects because of low-dose and/or repeated ingestion of BTXs and its analogues in animal experiments. In particular, studies of the possible health effects of chronic low-level exposure are needed in humans and animals.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Azaspiracid group**

Reference to JECFA: -

Toxicological guidance value: ARfD 0.04 µg/kg bw (2004; FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation)

Synonyms: Abbreviation, AZP

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Live and raw bivalve molluscs	0.16	Adopted	CXS 292-2008	FFP, CF	Edible parts of bivalve molluscs (the whole part or any part intended to be eaten separately)	Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 292-2008.	2)
Live abalone, raw fresh chilled or frozen abalone 1)	No ML	Adopted	CXS 312-2013	FFP			2)

1) Abalone from some geographical areas have been found to accumulate certain marine biotoxins. It is up to the Competent Authority (using a Risk Assessment) to determine whether a risk exists in any geographical areas under its control and if so, put in the necessary mechanisms to ensure that the part of the abalone to be consumed, meets with the marine biotoxins level in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008).

2) These MLs are not listed in the current GSCTFF (ver. 2023).

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation on Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (2004) was asked to perform risk assessments for a number of biotoxins that are present in bivalve molluscs. Since exposure to biotoxins generally involves only occasional consumption, and because most of the available toxicological data involve only acute and short-term studies, priority was given to the establishment of an acute reference dose, and generally insufficient data were available to establish a tolerable daily intake. It must be pointed out that the Expert Consultation did not have enough time to fully evaluate epidemiological data or to assess the effects of cooking or processing for deriving the provisional guidance levels/maximum levels for several toxin groups (especially the AZA and STX groups). The Consultation agreed that there is a need for a further in-depth review of these data to better derive the guidance levels/maximum levels.

CCFFP29 (2008) agreed that at this stage it was not necessary to ask for additional scientific advice from FAO/WHO and that this issue would be kept under review and may be reconsidered when further scientific advice became available.

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to provisionally endorse the proposed levels, with the recommendation that the levels would require complete review in the coming few years with the view to revising these levels where necessary, when more data became available (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 31).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Draft Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs at Step 8 with a correction to the scope of the Spanish version by replacing “desbullados” with “abiertos” (ALINORM 08/31/REP. para. 36).

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO reported on the development of TEFs for marine biotoxins associated with bivalve molluscs. The Representative recalled that the CCFFP has developed the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CXS 292-2008) which includes provisions for several marine biotoxins (eg Saxitoxin (STX) group; Domoic acid (DA) group; Brevetoxin (BTX) group; etc). As each of these biotoxin groups includes several analogues with different toxic potencies, in order to be able to assess the total toxicity in the shellfish extract and thus implement the standard, there was the need to derive TEF for each of the biotoxin groups. At CCFFP's request FAO/WHO organized an expert meeting in 2016 to discuss the issues associated with development of TEFs for marine biotoxins, and to develop a technical paper on the state of science on the subject,

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Azaspiracid group**

including guidance for food safety managers to implement the provisions for biotoxins in the standard at national level. The technical paper has been published and also resulted in an article in an international scientific journal (REP17/CF, para 23)

Azaspiracids (AZAs) are a group of shellfish toxins causing AZA poisoning (AZP). AZP is characterized by symptoms such as nausea, vomiting, diarrhea and stomach cramps. AZAs can be found in various species of filter-feeding bivalve molluscs such as oysters, mussels, scallops and clams. Monitoring data shows that mussels are the most affected species for this group of toxins.

The toxicological database for AZAs is limited and comprises mostly studies on the acute toxicity of AZAs. Limited data in humans indicate an LOAEL between 23 and 86 µg/person for acute gastrointestinal effects. The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation established a provisional ARfD of 0.04 µg/kg bw, based on the LOAEL of 23 µg/person and a bodyweight of 60 kg, using a tenfold safety factor to take into consideration the small number of people involved. Because of insufficient data on the chronic effects of AZA, no TDI could be established.

The Joint FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc Expert Consultation further noted that some preliminary studies indicate the possibility of severe and prolonged toxic effects at low doses. Repeated studies involving administration of AZA by feeding are therefore required. In addition, information on absorption, excretion and metabolism, on long-term carcinogenicity and genotoxicity and reproductive toxicity are needed.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Ciguatoxins**

Reference to JECFA:	Joint FAO/WHO Expert meeting on Ciguatera fish poisoning (CFP) (2018)
Toxicological guidance value:	-
Synonyms:	Ciguatera toxins, Abbreviation, CTX

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML Applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

At CCCF11 (2017), the Representative of FAO introduced FAO's and WHO's work on ciguatera fish poisoning (CFP) and current challenges. He noted that CFP was one of the most common food-borne illnesses related to finfish consumption. While its true incidence was not known, it was estimated that 10,000–50,000 people per year suffer from this food borne illness, making it one of the most common types of marine food-borne poisoning worldwide. He highlighted that analytical methods for detection and quantification of ciguatera to-date are not harmonized and it was unclear which, if any, of the available methods of detection would be suitable as routine methods of analysis.

The Representative invited the Committee to consider requesting FAO/WHO for scientific advice, in particular to carry out a risk assessment of ciguatera toxins and based on this provide guidance for the development of risk management options; and to review existing analytical methods for ciguatoxin detection and quantification, with a view to recommending those useful for routine analysis and surveillance.

There was general support for the proposal to request scientific advice from FAO/WHO to allow the Committee to develop appropriate risk management options. Delegations pointed out the importance of this matter to their countries, noting that due to climate change the traditional occurrence areas were changing and that consideration of ciguatoxins should not be limited to C-CTX-1 and P-CTX-1, but also to I-CTX. A delegation noted that their country does not currently recommend routine surveillance and sampling to meet specified MLs as risk management measure, but uses guidelines for outbreak management.

The Committee:

- agreed to request scientific advice from FAO/WHO to allow the Committee to develop appropriate risk management options;
- noted that the in-session WG on the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for evaluation by JECFA would consider this matter further (REP17/CF, paras. 33- 38, Appendix XII).

At CCCF12 (2018), JECFA Secretariat highlighted the upcoming meeting of the FAO/WHO joint scientific advice program on Ciguatera Fish Poisoning scheduled for November 2018 and urged countries to explore all opportunities to submit suitable responses to the call for data and call for experts (REP18/CF, para. 16).

The FAO/WHO Expert meeting on Ciguatera Food Poisoning (2018) concluded that, considering the currently existing scientific gaps, it was not possible to complete a full risk assessment. None of the studies were considered suitable to establish a health-based guidance value (acute or chronic). Available data did not provide a suitable basis for nationally or internationally applicable dietary exposure assessment. To date, none of the available CTX monitoring studies was suitable for exposure assessment.

However, the Expert Meeting noted that, by drawing on existing knowledge as well as traditional practices from CP endemic areas, some risk management considerations could be given to inform regional interventions. The Expert Meeting noted that effective and integrated risk management options would require definition of toxin profiles in each region, both in algal strains and in seafood to define risk evaluation protocols. Recognizing the strong influence of the regional and local circumstances on the occurrence of the organisms as well as the production of the toxins, any conclusions should be considered as of local or regional significance only, and care must be taken when transferring these

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Marine biotoxins**Ciguatoxins**

to other areas. While the link between algal CTXs and those observed in fish has been established in the Pacific, evidence from the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean is still needed and warrants ongoing investigation.

The following considerations can provide assistance in the identification and management of CP:

- Establishing and/or strengthening surveillance programmes
- Establishing a careful sampling design
- Monitoring ciguatera transmission in the food web
- Definition of key target species
- Good practices for preparation of fish
- Awareness raising and communication

At CCCF13 (2019), JECFA Secretariat informed that the Ad-hoc FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Ciguatera Food Poisoning, which was held in 2018 in responding to a request by CCCF11 (2017), evaluated known Ciguatoxins (CTXs) (toxicological and exposure assessments) including geographic distribution, rate of illness and guidance for the development of risk management options and the report would be available by third quarter of 2019 (REP19/CF, para. 19).

The report of the FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Ciguatera Fish Poisoning (2018) was published in 2020. The Expert Meeting concluded that there are many gaps in the available information about ciguatera poisoning, and there were some needs that require urgent attention regarding both risk management and research and drew attention to the FAO/IAEA/IOC-UNESCO initiatives as highlighted in CX/CF 21/14/3 (REP21/CF, para. 233).

CCCF14 (2021) noted that, due to the virtual nature of CCCF14, the in-session WG on the Follow-Up to JECFA Evaluations and FAO/WHO Expert Consultations led by the EU could not be held and that instead, the Secretariat prepare a working document CX/CF 21/14/18 highlighting the recently concluded JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations relevant to the work of CCCF. The EU provided further information on the report of the FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Ciguatera Fish Poisoning (2018) was published in 2020. He noted that the expert meeting was convened at the request of CCCF11 (2017) to request scientific advice from FAO and WHO to allow CCCF to develop appropriate risk management options to address this matter. The Expert Meeting concluded that there are many gaps in the available information about ciguatera poisoning, and there were some needs that require urgent attention regarding both risk management and research and drew attention to the FAO/IAEA/IOC-UNESCO initiatives as highlighted in CX/CF 21/14/3 (REP21/CF, paras. 232-233).

The committee agreed to:

- i) establish an EWG chaired by EU to prepare a discussion paper on pyrrolizidine alkaloids to look into the feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF15;
- ii) issue a CL requesting comments on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations in particular those for which the full report was already available, such as ciguatera poisoning and tropane alkaloids, for consideration by the in-session WG to be convened at CCCF15 and
- iii) re-convene the in-session WG at CCCF15 chaired by EU. (REP21/CF, para. 235).

Marine biotoxins**Ciguatoxins**

At CCCF15 (2022), the EU, as Chair of the WG, presented the recommendations made at the virtual meeting of the WG held prior to CCCF15 focusing on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations, which were on pyrrolizidine alkaloids, ciguatoxins, tropane alkaloids and ergot alkaloids, T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol (REP22/CF, para. 219).

The WG Chair stated that, while no member countries supported starting work on setting regulatory levels on ciguatoxins, the development of risk management guidance to prevent or reduce ciguatera poisoning could be considered thereby building upon the work already undertaken by FAO in collaboration with IAEA and IOC-UNESCO (REP22/CF, para. 221).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to establish an EWG chaired by USA and co-chaired by the EU to prepare a discussion paper on the development of a code of practice or guidelines to prevent or avoid ciguatera poisoning building upon the work already undertaken by FAO in collaboration with IAEA and IOC-UNESCO (REP22/CF, para. 224 ii).

CCCF16 (2023) noted there was general support to start work on a CoP as ciguatera poisoning was of major public health concern even though there were still some knowledge gaps/challenges. It was noted that these knowledge gaps/challenges could be addressed during further discussion in the CoP development process, or the CoP could always be updated in future as more information would become available, and that this approach had been taken in the past for the development of a CoP to prevent and reduce arsenic contamination in rice (REP23/CF, para. 73).

A Member questioned the appropriateness of a CoP noting the knowledge gaps and whether it would be more appropriate to work on Guidelines in view of these knowledge gaps (REP23/CF, para. 74).

The EWG Chair explained that there was wide support and preference for a CoP, but that Guidelines, which are normally higher-level principles and less prescriptive, could be considered. But that further clarity was needed on the difference between a CoP and Guidelines (REP23/CF, para. 75).

The Codex Secretariat explained that while there was reference to CoPs as texts developed by Committees in the Procedural Manual, there was no definition nor other guidance on what constitutes a CoP, and neither was there mention of Guidelines or what constitutes a Guideline and the difference with a CoP. However, it had become common practice that CoPs were developed to provide more practical guidance/measures to reduce or prevent a particular hazard in food, whereas a guideline is developed to provide higher level principles and approaches/frameworks to address a particular issue. Generally, in CCCF, the approach has been to develop CoPs. The Secretariat proposed that, for the moment, the project document could refer to either a CoP/Guidelines and to leave it open for further discussion in the EWG. What needed to be clear was what would be addressed in the work, i.e., reduction and prevention of ciguatera poisoning and the main aspects to be covered by the text (REP23/CF, para. 76).

Noting the explanation from the Codex Secretariat, CCCF agreed to be flexible on this matter for developing either a CoP or Guidelines (REP23/CF, para. 77).

CCCF agreed to (REP23/CF, para. 81):

- (i) start new work on a CoP/Guidelines for the prevention or reduction of ciguatera poisoning;
- (ii) forward the project document (Appendix VI) to CAC46 for approval; and
- (iii) establish an EWG, chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by France, Spain, and Panama, working in English, to prepare a proposed CoP/Guidelines for comments and consideration by CCCF17.

CAC46 approved new work on a Code of Practice/Guidelines for the prevention or reduction of ciguatera poisoning (REP23/CAC, para. 77).

Marine biotoxins**Ciguatoxins**

At CCCF17 (2024), the Chair of the EWG and PWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chairs, introduced the item and provided a background to the discussions in the EWG and PWG. Referring to CRD29, the PWG Chair explained the key changes made at the PWG held prior to the Session and explained that based on comments submitted after the PWG definitions had been included, and the term “prevalence” replaced by “incidence”. She noted that the PWG had not identified any outstanding issues to be addressed and proposed that CCCF consider advancing the Code of Practice (CoP) to Step 5/8 (REP24/CF, para. 93).

The Codex Secretariat proposed removing Annex 2 from the CoP and publishing it as an information document on the Codex website, with inclusion of the relevant links. She clarified that it was not appropriate to publish references to national/regional authorities in a Codex text. Acknowledging the importance and usefulness of the information, publication as an information document would still make the information available to the user; and would allow easier update of the information without having to go through the Codex step process. With the migration to a new Codex website, there will be a function to indicate to users of Codex texts any associated documents such as information documents and year of publication, thereby facilitating use of such information documents (REP24/CF, para. 95).

CCCF agreed with the proposal to remove Annex 2 from the CoP and to publish the information in Annex 2 as an information document on the Codex website and as a consequence agreed to amend paragraphs 16 and 39 by removing reference to the annex (REP24/CF, para. 96).

CCCF17 agreed to:

- (i) forward the code of practice for the prevention and reduction of ciguatera poisoning (Appendix V) to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8; and
- (ii) request the Codex Secretariat to publish the information on resources (examples of monitoring programmes and training and guidance resources) with the relevant links, as an information document (REP24/CF, para. 97 and Appendix VI).

CAC47 (2024) adopted the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of ciguatera poisoning in foods, at Step 5/8, and congratulated CCCF on the expeditious work on this text, noting that the work was finalized ahead of schedule and only a year after CAC46 approved the new work (REP24/CAC, para. 63 iii and Appendix II).

Ciguatera fish poisoning (CFP) is caused by the consumption of herbivorous fish that have become toxic from feeding on toxic benthic dinoflagellates (*Gambierdinus toxicus*) or from carnivorous fish that have consumed toxic herbivorous fish that have fed on the dinoflagellate. *Gambierdinus toxicus* is found primarily in the tropics in association with macro algae usually attached to dead corals. More than 400 species of fish are known to be vectors of ciguatera (FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 80, 2004).

Gastrointestinal symptoms involving vomiting, diarrhoea, nausea and abdominal pain (>~50% of cases) typically occur early in the course of the disease and often, but not always, accompany the neurological disturbances. Neurological disturbances invariably occur in ciguatera and include tingling of the lips, hands and feet, unusual temperature perception disturbances where cold objects give a dry-ice sensation, and a severe localized itch of the skin (>~70 percent of cases). These symptoms and a profound feeling of fatigue (90 percent of cases) can occur throughout the illness. Muscle (>80 percent), joint (>70 percent) and teeth aches (>30 percent) occur to varying extents, and mood disorders including depression and anxiety (50 percent) occur less frequently. Severe cases can involve hypotension with bradycardia, respiratory difficulties and paralysis but deaths are uncommon (less than 1 percent according to Lehane, 2000, cited by FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 80, 2004). The low fatality rate (2 percent) appears to arise because fish rarely accumulate sufficient levels of ciguatoxin to be lethal at a single meal, perhaps because fish succumb to the lethal effects of higher ciguatoxin levels (Lewis, 2001, cited by FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 80, 2004).

The mechanism of action of ciguatoxins is related to its direct effect on excitable membranes. Such membranes are critical to the function of nerve and muscle, mainly in their ability to generate and propagate action potentials. Ciguatoxins are characterized by their affinity binding to voltage sensitive sodium channels, causing them to open at normal

Marine biotoxins**Ciguatoxins**

cell resting membrane potentials. This results in an influx of Na⁺ ions, cell depolarization and the appearance of spontaneous action potentials in excitable cells. Ciguatoxin acts at the same receptor site (site 5) of the Na⁺ channel as brevetoxin, but the affinity of CTX-1 for voltage-dependent Na⁺ channels was around 30 times higher than that of brevetoxin, while CTX-4B had about the same affinity as brevetoxin. (Lehane and Lewis, 2000 and De Fouw et al., 2001, cited by FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 80, 2004)

Ciguatoxins are fat soluble and absorption from the gut is rapid and substantial, although an early onset of vomiting and diarrhoea may exist in expelling some of the toxins before they are absorbed. Since cleaning ciguateric fish can cause tingling of the hands and eating them can cause altered sensation in the oral cavity and dysphagia, it would appear that ciguatoxins can penetrate the skin and mucous membranes. The related brevetoxins also have this property. Ciguatoxins are carried in the blood bound to human serum albumin and moderate (unspecified) levels of ciguatoxin in serum of a patient were reported 22 weeks after consuming ciguatoxic fish. Ciguatoxins are also transmitted in breast milk and are able to cross the placenta and affect the foetus. Because of their similar structure, ciguatoxins are supposed to behave in a similar pharmacokinetic manner to brevetoxins. This means that the biliary/faecal route is the major route of elimination for ciguatoxins as was demonstrated for brevetoxins (Lehane and Lewis, 2000, cited by FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 80, 2004).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Hydrocyanic acid**

Reference to JECFA:	39 (1992), 74 (2011)
Toxicological guidance value:	ARfD 0.09 mg/kg bw as cyanide (2011, this cyanide-equivalent ARfD applies only to foods containing cyanogenic glycosides as the main source of cyanide PMTDI 0.02 mg/kg bw as cyanide (2011)
Contaminant definition:	See explanatory notes in the column "Notes/Remarks"
Synonyms:	HCN
Related code of practice:	Code of practice for the reduction of hydrocyanic acid (HCN) in cassava and cassava products (CXC 73-2013)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Cassava flour	10	Adopted	CXS 176-1989 2013	CPL CF		The ML is expressed as total hydrocyanic acid. Relevant Codex commodity standards include CXS 176-1989.	
Gari	2	Adopted	CXS 151-1989 2013	CPL CF	Whole commodity	The ML is expressed as free hydrocyanic acid. Relevant Codex commodity standards include CXS 151-1989.	
Sweet cassava		Adopted	CXS 238-2003	FFV		1)	
Bitter cassava		Adopted	CXS 300-2010	FFV		1)	
Natural mineral waters	0.07 mg/l	Adopted	CXS 108-1981	NMW		2)	

- 1) In the absence of a Codex maximum level for hydrogen cyanide, an acceptable maximum level shall be set on a safety basis by the national legislation of the importing country.
- 2) The Standard for Natural Mineral Waters contains the level in the Section 3.2 "Health-related limits for certain substances". CCCF2 (2008) temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41 para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4, CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 89-90).

Excessive dietary exposure to cyanogenic glycosides has been assessed at JECFA39 (1992). Due to the lack of quantitative toxicological and epidemiological information no safe level of dietary exposure could be determined. However, it was concluded that a level up to 10 mg/kg HCN in the Standard for Edible Cassava Flour (CXS 176-1989) was not associated with acute toxicity.

CAC31 (2008) agreed with the recommendation of CCEXEC59 (2007) to adopt the Draft Standard for Bitter Cassava (a cyanogenic glycoside food) as elaborated by CCFFV). In the Draft Standard the proposed levels for HCN (a breakdown product of cyanogenic glycosides) are indicated as follow: 'bitter varieties of cassava are those that contain more than 50 mg/kg but less than 200 mg/kg HCN (fresh weight basis). In any case, cassava must be peeled and fully cooked before being consumed'. However, CAC31 recognized safety

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Hydrocyanic acid**

concerns if cassava is consumed without adequate processing; CCCF should consider the safety levels of hydrogen cyanide (HCN) as proposed in the standard with a view to a re-evaluation of cyanogenic glycosides by JECFA (ALINORM 08/31/REP).

CCCF2 (2008) considered the need for a re-evaluation of cyanogenic glycosides by JECFA and agreed to establish an electronic working group to prepare a discussion paper which should include an overview of available data on cyanogenic glycosides with a view to possible re-evaluation by JECFA. (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 180)

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to request JECFA to review data available on occurrence of cyanogenic glycosides in foods and feeds, the mechanisms of releasing hydrogen cyanide in the human body, the effects of processing on reducing levels of hydrogen cyanide in the final product, and report back to the Committee in future. (ALINORM 09/32/41, para 108).

JECFA74 re-evaluated cyanogenic glycosides in 2011. The Committee recognized that human exposure to HCN from cyanogenic glycosides in food commodities would be from a combination of intact glycoside and totally degraded glycoside. The Committee concluded that there were no appropriate studies on which a long-term health-based guidance value could be based. However, as the potential toxicity of ingested cyanogenic glycosides was considered to be directly related to the *in situ* generation of HCN, the Committee concluded that animal studies with cyanide compounds could serve as the basis for establishing a PMTDI. Also, an ARfD could be determined.

The Committee established a cyanide-equivalent ARfD of 0.09 mg/kg bw. This ARfD is based on a BMDL₁₀ for linamarin of 85 mg/kg bw for increased skeletal defects in developing hamster fetuses following acute exposure of maternal animals. Following application of a 100-fold uncertainty factor, the Committee established an ARfD for linamarin of 0.9 mg/kg bw (equivalent to 0.09 mg/kg bw as cyanide). This cyanide-equivalent ARfD applies only to foods containing cyanogenic glycosides as the main source of cyanide.

The Committee noted that the ARfD was exceeded 3-fold for cassava for adults, less than 2-fold for apple juice for children, between 2- and 5-fold for bitter apricot kernels and up to 10-fold for ready-to-eat cassava chips/crisps, depending on the population group. The available occurrence data for cyanogenic glycosides were deemed not to be appropriate to determine international estimates of dietary exposure to total HCN.

A PMTDI of 20 µg/kg bw was recommended by applying a 100-fold uncertainty factor for interspecies and intraspecies differences to a BMDL_{15D} of 1.9 mg/kg bw per day. This BMDL_{15D} was derived from a 13-week NTP study in which male rats displayed decreased cauda epididymis weights after exposure to sodium cyanide via drinking-water. The Committee decided that it was not necessary to apply an additional uncertainty factor to account for the absence of a long-term study, considering the acute nature of cyanide toxicity and the sensitivity of the effect (i.e. the reduction of absolute cauda epididymis weight).

It was noted that, based on national estimates of chronic dietary exposure to total HCN, there is potential to exceed the PMTDI for populations reliant on cassava as a staple food: between 1- and 3-fold in children and between 1- and 2-fold in adults. This would also be possible for populations not reliant on cassava: between 1- and 5-fold for children and between 1- and 3-fold for adults.

Application of the ML of 50 mg/kg as HCN for sweet cassava could result in dietary exposures that exceed the ARfD by less than 2-fold for the general population and up to 4-fold for children, and exceed the PMTDI by between 2- and 10-fold, depending on the population group assessed. These estimates did not take into consideration any reduction in concentration of total HCN as a result of food preparation or processing. For the ML of 10 mg/kg as HCN for cassava flour, there were no estimates of dietary exposure available that exceed the ARfD or PMTDI. This was supported by the maximum amount of food that could be consumed based on existing Codex MLs before the health-based guidance values would be exceeded, which is as low as 25 g/day for cassava for chronic exposure. More detailed estimates of cassava and cassava flour consumption and concentrations in food for cassava-eating communities would help in supporting the conclusion that dietary exposures to total HCN could exceed health-based guidance values.

Plant toxins**Hydrocyanic acid**

The Committee recommended that further research is needed to quantify how nutritional factors ultimately contribute to the human diseases observed in populations whose diets consist mainly of improperly processed cassava. There is also need for more extensive occurrence data for cyanogenic glycosides including data showing the ratio of cyanogenic glycosides to cyanohydrins to HCN in raw and processed foods containing cyanogenic glycosides. Distributions of occurrence data could then be used for probabilistic dietary exposure assessments. More consumption data for cassava and cassava products from a broader range of countries would enable more detailed estimates of dietary exposure to be conducted or refined.

CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to establish an electronic Working Group led by Australia and co-chaired by Nigeria to start new work on a COP and MLs for hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products for comment at Step 3 and consideration by the next session. The Committee agreed that the electronic Working Group would:

- undertake a review of the MLs for hydrocyanic acid in existing Codex commodity standards for bitter cassava and sweet cassava with a view of the possible revision of these MLs and the establishment of new MLs for additional commodities, such as ready-to-eat cassava chips;
- develop a code of practice to reduce the presence of hydrocyanic acid in cassava in which the agricultural aspects and the methods of processing are addressed; and
- identify methods of analysis suitable for analysis of hydrocyanic acid in foods (REP12/CF, paras. 165-167).

CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to discontinue work on the revision or establishment of MLs for cassava and cassava products and to inform CAC36 accordingly. The Committee agreed to transfer the MLs for HCN for cassava flour and gari to the GSCTFF with the current descriptors for the content of HCN in these products. In taking this decision, the Committee agreed to introduce consequential amendments to the standards for edible cassava flour and gari to remove these MLs from the standard and to include a general reference to the GSCTFF in the section on contaminants. Along these lines, the Committee also agreed to make a consequential amendment in the section on contaminants in the Standard for Sweet Cassava to refer the ML for HCN to the national legislation of the importing country (REP13/CF, paras. 87-88 and Appendix V).

CAC36 (2013) approved discontinuation of work on proposed draft maximum levels hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products and adopted consequential amendments to the Standard for Edible Cassava Flour, Gari and Sweet Cassava.

CCCCF7 agreed to forward the proposed draft Code of practice for the reduction of hydrocyanic acid (HCN) in cassava and cassava products to CAC36 for adoption at Step 5/8 (REP13/CF, para. 92).

CAC36 adopted the Code of practice for the reduction of hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products.

CCCCF11 (2017) considered the proposal by CCAFRICA on an ML for HCN in fermented cooked cassava-based products and noted the following comments:

- It is inappropriate to apply the ML for gari to other fermented cooked cassava based-products without considering more information on occurrence of HCN in fermented cassava products, influence of processing such as fermentation and cooking on the level of HCN in the final product. Different types Fermented cooked cassava-based products and consumption patterns have to be considered to represent all fermentation processes worldwide.
- There is a need to harmonize the expression of HCN, noting that it is expressed as free HCN in the case of gari, but as total HCN in the case of cassava flour.
- The GSCTFF states that MLs should only be established if there is a health concern and/or a trade issue;
- The COP provides guidance on how to produce cassava products with safe concentrations of HCN.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Hydrocyanic acid**

The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by Nigeria to prepare a discussion paper to advise on the need and feasibility to establish an ML for HCN in all fermented cassava products and address the issue of harmonizing the expression of HCN levels, i.e. free or total HCN. The Codex Secretariat would issue a circular letter (CL) requesting data on occurrence of HCN and other relevant information in fermented cassava products. The Committee also agreed that the EWG would consolidate information on mycotoxin occurrence in these products, and other relevant information, to allow CCCF to determine if mycotoxin contamination in these products would be a health concern in order to provide a more informed reply to CCAFRICA (REP17/CF, paras. 10-15)

CCCF12 (2018) recalled that CCCF11 agreed to establish an EWG chaired by Nigeria to address HCN and mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based products and deferred the discussion until next year in the absence of the EWG Chair to present the item at the current session and encouraged Codex members to continue submitting data to GEMS/Food (REP18/CF, para. 125).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to:

(i) establish an EWG, chaired by Nigeria and co-chaired by Ghana, to prepare discussion papers for consideration at CCCF14 as follows:

- background information paper to provide a global picture of fermented cassava products taking into account the issues raised in written comments and the points raised in CCCF13; and
- discussion paper identifying mitigation measures to support development of a COP for prevention and reduction of mycotoxins in cassava and cassava products taking into account the points raised in this session.

(ii) inform CCAFRICA of the discussions on MLs of HCN in fermented cassava products and the possible development of COP for prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava products. (REP19/CF, para144)

At CCCF14 (2021), Nigeria, as Chair of the EWG, stated that data and information on HCN in cassava and cassava-based products as reported in Appendix III to CX/CF 21/14/12 indicated that it would be advisable to await new/additional data/ information to become available in future, especially from ongoing studies in this field, to reassess the need and feasibility to establish MLs for these products.

The committee concurred with this recommendation and recalled that the MLs for HCN in gari and cassava flour as contained in the GSCTFF remain unchanged.

The committee agreed to discontinue the discussion on the establishment of MLs for HCN in cassava/cassava-based products and to await new/additional data to become available in the future, especially from ongoing studies in this field, to reassess the need and feasibility to establish new MLs for HCN in cassava and cassava-based products. (REP21/CF, paras. 170-172)

Cyanogenic glycosides (CG) may be defined chemically as glycosides of the beta-hydroxy nitriles and are secondary metabolites produced by plants. CG occur in at least 2000 plant species of which many are used as food, such as cassava, lima beans, sorghum, almonds, stone fruits, bamboo shoots, flax seed and elderberries. CG can be broken down to hydrogen cyanide (HCN) as a result of enzymatic hydrolysis by beta-glucosidases following structure disruption of plant cells or by the action of gut microflora. The cyanogenic glycoside content of foods is often reported as mg/kg of HCN in the food. Levels of HCN in a respective food may vary depending on variety, growing conditions (altitude, geographical location, seasonal condition) and production conditions. Acute toxicity results when the rate of HCN is such that the metabolic detoxification capacity of the body is exceeded.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Hydrocyanic acid**

The toxicity of a cyanogenic plant depends on the potential that its consumption will produce a toxic concentration of HCN, HCN causing the inhibition of mitochondrial oxidation. This will cause energy deprivation and result in non-specific symptoms that reflect oxygen deprivation of the brain and heart, such as headache, nausea, vomiting, dizziness, palpitations, hyperpnoea then dyspnoea, bradycardia, unconsciousness and convulsions, followed by death. Chronic uptake of HCN in sub-acutely toxic doses, may be involved in disturbance of thyroid function and neuropathies. However, suitable long-term toxicity studies are lacking. No ADI or ARfD has been established yet, however, as HCN clearance is rapid and its half life is short, cumulative toxicity is not expected and the appropriate toxicological reference value must reflect acute rather than cumulative toxicity.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Pyrrolizidine alkaloids**

Reference to JECFA:	80 (2015)
Toxicological guidance value:	BMDL ₁₀ (for riddelliine) 182 µg/kg bw/day; MOE for high adult consumers of tea and honey and for average tea consumption by children indicated a concern
Contaminant definition:	Pyrrolizidine alkaloids
Synonyms:	PA
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Weed Control to prevent and reduce Pyrrolizidine Alkaloid Contamination in Food and Feed (CXC 74-2014)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to initiate new work on the development of a Code of practice for weed control to prevent and reduce pyrrolizidine alkaloid contamination in food and feed. Subject to approval by the Commission, the Committee agreed that the proposed COP would be developed by an electronic Working Group led by the Netherlands for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next session.

The Committee also agreed that this electronic Working Group would prepare a discussion paper for consideration by the next session on the topics 'Management practices to reduce exposure of animals to PAs', 'Management practices to reduce exposure of food-producing animals to PA-containing plants – livestock and bees' and 'Management practices to reduce presence of PAs in commodities – raw and processed' to explore their possible inclusion in the proposed COP (REP12/CF, paras. 114-115 and Appendix VII). CAC35 (2012) approved the new work (REP12/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCF7 (2013) agreed to return the Code to Step 2/3 for redrafting, circulation for comments and consideration at the 8th session of the Committee. The Committee also agreed to resume the consideration on management practices to reduce exposure of food-producing animals (livestock and bees) to PAs; and to reduce presence of PAs in commodities (raw and processed) if more information would become available e.g. in 2 or 3 years time (REP13/CF, para. 96 and 112).

The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for Evaluation by JECFA to maintain Pyrrolizidine alkaloids in the Priority List (REP13/CF, para 142 and APPENDIX VII).

CCCF8 (2014) agreed to forward the proposed draft COP to Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) for adoption by CAC37. The Committee agreed that for the time-being it would keep the reference to the non-exhaustive list of PA-containing plants (Annex I of CX/CF 11/15/14) in the report for further consultation noting that reports of Codex committee meetings' are available to Codex members and the general public on the Codex website (REP14/CF, paras. 78-82, Appendix VI). CAC37 adopted the COP at Step 5/8 (REP14/CAC, para. 47, Appendix III).

JECFA80 (2015) evaluated PAs. A systematic review approach was used to gather data. As the approach proved to be very labour intensive and there was insufficient time left before the JECFA meeting, stages of the systematic review subsequent to the title/abstract selection were not performed according to the systematic review protocol, and full text selection was done using the critical appraisal method regularly used in the preparation of JECFA monographs. Because of the narrow time frame between the work on the selection of references and the JECFA meeting, the evaluation could not be completed at the meeting, but the Committee considered the information sufficient to determine an approach for the evaluation and to agree upon preliminary results, which will need confirmation later when all studies have been quality assessed and described in detail.

Plant toxins**Pyrrolizidine alkaloids**

The Committee considered that the genotoxic mode of action does not allow derivation of a health-based guidance value for chronic toxicity and a lower limit on the benchmark dose for a 10% response (BMDL₁₀) of 182 µg/kg bw per day for liver haemangiosarcoma in female rats treated with riddelliine was used as the point of departure in an MOE approach. Based on limited occurrence data, the Committee noted that the calculated MOEs for honey (high consumers: MOEs 6900 to 36000 for adults and 2200 to 30000 for children) and tea (mean consumers: MOEs 1400 to 140000 for adults and 10000 to 36000 for children, and high consumers: MOEs 700 to 18000 for adults and 2400 to 6700 for children) indicated a potential concern. The Committee noted that PAs measured in these commodities might not be representative for all food groups and all regions. However, it provided a conservative risk estimate as it was compared to the BMDL₁₀ for the potent PA riddelliine, and most of the PAs commonly found in food are likely to be less potent than riddelliine.

The Committee considered it of concern that exposure to a single food product could result in such low MOEs. The Committee noted that exposure to PAs resulted from other food items as well, and animal products such as milk might contribute to the total exposure as a result of the presence of PAs in feed. A first indication of total exposure could be obtained from a small duplicate-diet study, from which an MOE of 140 000 could be derived, but it was unclear how representative these data were.

The comparison of estimates of acute dietary exposure to PAs from honey and tea with the lowest reported dose causing human disease did not indicate a concern. There was insufficient information to reach conclusions on food or beverages other than honey and tea. Available data were not sufficient to identify relative potency factors for different 1,2-unsaturated PAs in order to evaluate the possible effects of combined exposure.

CCCF10 (2016) agreed to discuss PAs at CCCF11 once the full JECFA evaluation becomes available. (REP16/CF, paras. 169 and 173)

At CCCF11 (2017), the JECFA Secretariat committed that the monograph on PAs would be published before the CCCF12 and further work on PAs could be considered at the next session (REP17/CF, para. 150)

CCCF12 (2018) did not consider a work on PAs following the JECFA80 evaluation due to unavailability of the monograph.

At CCCF13 (2019), the JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that the monograph on pyrrolizidine alkaloids, evaluated at JECFA80, would be available by June 2019 (REP 19/CF, para 18).

CCCF14 (2021) noted that, due to the virtual nature of CCCF14, the in-session WG on the Follow-Up to JECFA Evaluations and FAO/WHO Expert Consultations led by the EU could not be held and that instead, the Secretariat prepare a working document CX/CF 21/14/18 highlighting the recently concluded JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations relevant to the work of CCCF. The EU drew attention to the key outcomes of the JECFA evaluation on pyrrolizidine alkaloids and noted that now that the report had been published CCCF should consider follow-up actions which could include possible revisions to the Code of Practice for Weed Control to Prevent and Reduce Pyrrolizidine Alkaloid Contamination in Food and Feed (CXC 74-2014) or consider the feasibility of other risk management measures (i.e. MLs) (REP21/CF, para. 233).

The committee agreed to:

- i) establish an EWG chaired by EU to prepare a discussion paper on pyrrolizidine alkaloids to look into the feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF15;
- ii) issue a CL requesting comments on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations in particular those for which the full report was already available, such as ciguatera poisoning and tropane alkaloids, for consideration by the in-session WG to be convened at CCCF15 and
- iii) re-convene the in-session WG at CCCF15 chaired by EU. (REP21/CF, para. 235)

Plant toxins**Pyrrolizidine alkaloids**

At CCCF15 (2022), the EU, as Chair of the WG, presented the recommendations made at the virtual meeting of the WG held prior to CCCF15 focusing on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations, which were on pyrrolizidine alkaloids, ciguatoxins, tropane alkaloids and ergot alkaloids, T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol (REP22/CF, para. 219).

The WG Chair recalled that CCCF14 agreed to establish an EWG chaired by EU to prepare a discussion paper on pyrrolizidine alkaloids to look into the feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF15. However, the paper was not presented to CCCF15 (REP22/CF, para. 220).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to: re-convene the EWG, chaired by the EU to prepare a discussion paper on pyrrolizidine alkaloids to look into the feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF16 (REP22/CF, para. 224 i).

The Chairperson recalled that the discussion paper prepared by the EU had been submitted late, which did not allow delegates to review it, and requested CCCF to focus on the next steps to be taken on this work. The Chairperson therefore proposed to circulate the paper for comments and for the EWG to revise the paper for consideration by CCCF17 (REP23/CF, para. 82).

CCCF agreed to request that (REP23/CF, para. 84):

- (i) the Codex Secretariat issue a CL requesting comments on the recommendations in the discussion paper CX/CF 23/16/11; and
- (ii) the EWG chaired by the European Union prepare a revised paper based on the comments received in response to the CL for consideration by CCCF17.

At CCCF17 (2024), the EWG Chair stated that there was large agreement on initiating new work to update of the Code of Practice for Weed Control to Prevent and Reduce Pyrrolizidine Alkaloid Contamination in Food and Feed (CXC 74-2014), and that different views were expressed in the EWG on the need for a separate CoP for the prevention and reduction of the presence of pyrrolizidine alkaloids (PAs) in honey, and on the need for a guidance document for sampling analytical minimum requirements for occurrence data to be submitted to the GEMS/Food database (REP24/CF, para. 99).

In response to a request for clarification on whether the recommendation implied the establishment of different EWGs, the Chair of the EWG clarified that it was subject to the decision of CCCF on e.g. having a separate CoP for honey, in which case the work would be taken into consideration by a separate EWG, as it would become a different CoP (REP24/CF, para. 100).

As for the need for a separate CoP for honey, the EWG Chair further clarified that the measures for weed control as mentioned in CXC 74 might not be all appropriate for the prevention and reduction of presence of PAs in honey but be limited to the foraging range of bees. The EWG Chair further stated that processing of honey might have a different influence on the presence of PAs than for the presence in other foods affected by contamination with PAs. However, in his view, practices for prevention and reduction of PAs in honey could also be addressed through an annex to the existing CoP (REP24/CF, para. 101).

In response to a question regarding the aim of the guidance document, the EWG Chair explained that the aim was to draft a supporting document to be used for a call for data, which would provide information on sampling and analytical performance criteria for gathering data. Data collection could help to evaluate the effect of implementation of the CoP, could give further indication of which foods to monitor but would also be needed in case of future establishment of MLs, however for these purposes there were different requirements for data collection. It was clarified that there would not be a guidance document, but the EWG would consider what guidance could be considered for analytical data submission and then provide that guidance in a future call for data. The purpose of a call for data would need to be clearly defined, noting that such a call for data would be issued post CCCF18 (REP24/CF, para. 102).

Plant toxins**Pyrrolizidine alkaloids**

A Member sought clarification on the measures that needed to be added to the CoP beside those already included in the text. The EWG Chair clarified that while the weed control measures contained in CXC 74 would be widely applicable, it could benefit from the inclusion of specific measures for the commodities identified by JECFA as of potential concern for public health, i.e. herbal infusions, tea, and honey, and for commodities for which since the JECFA evaluation significant levels of pyrrolizidine alkaloids were found such as food supplements and certain spices (REP24/CF, para. 103).

CCCCF17 agreed (REP24/CF, para. 104) :

- (i) to further develop the discussion paper on the revision of the Code of Practice to Prevent and Reduce Pyrrolizidine Alkaloid Contamination in Food and Feed (CXC 74-2014) which would address also practices for honey; provide a proposal for the revised CoP as well as a project document;
- (ii) to develop guidance on sampling and analysis performance characteristics for the collection of data to be submitted to the GEMS/Food database, which would be incorporated in a call for data drafted at CCCF18; and
- (iii) to establish an EWG chaired by Türkiye, co-chaired by the United Kingdom and The Netherlands to develop the discussion paper.

Pyrrolizidine alkaloids (PAs) are toxins found naturally in a wide variety of plant species. PAs are heterocyclic compounds and most of them are derived from four necine bases: retronecine, heliotridine, otonecine and platynecine; the platynecine type PAs are considered non-toxic. Over 350 different tertiary amine PA structures are known, most of the naturally occurring PAs in plants are esterified necines or alkaloid N-oxides (except for the otonecine-type alkaloids), whereas non-esterified PAs occur less frequently in plants.

PAs are widely distributed natural toxins and affect wildlife, livestock and humans. Human cases of poisoning can result from the direct and deliberate use of toxic plant species as herbal teas or traditional medicines, or direct contamination of foods with PA-containing plants. Animal mediated contamination of food includes transfer of PAs from feed to animal products like milk, and contamination of honey by PA-containing pollen.

PAs have a common toxicity profile; liver is the main target organ of toxicity. Major signs of toxicity in all animal species include various degrees of progressive liver damage (centrolobular hepatocellular necrosis), and veno-occlusive disease. Furthermore, bile duct proliferation, hepatic megalocytosis, and liver fibrosis are reported. Also effects on other organs such as lungs (pulmonary hypertension), the cardiovascular system (cardiac right ventricular hypertrophy) and degenerative injury in the kidneys are seen. IPCS evaluated PAs in 1988. IPCS concluded that a daily intake of PAs as low as the equivalent of 0.01 mg/kg heliotrine may cause disease in humans and that humans might be more sensitive to PA toxicity than rats; however, they stated also that these estimates were of uncertain reliability. Still, it was recommended to minimize exposure if possible. IARC has classified three PAs, lasiocarpine, monocrotaline and riddelliine, as 'possibly carcinogenic to humans' (Group 2B).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Scopoletin**

Reference to JECFA:	-
Toxicological guidance value:	-
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	Gelseminic acid
Related code of practice:	-

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

CCNASWP13 (2014) considered the request for determination of safe intake levels for scopoletin in fermented noni juice. The Coordinating Committee agreed to request advice from CCCF on a safe maximum level for scopoletin as well as a method of analysis.

CCCF9 (2015) considered the above request and agreed with an inclusion of scopoletin for a full risk assessment in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA. (REP15/CF, paras. 145-152, Appendix X).

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to request the Codex Secretariat to ask CCNASWP whether (a) they wish to retain scopoletin on the priority list and, if so, (b) when suitable data would be forthcoming (REP19/CF, para. 168).

CCCF14 (2021) noted the request of CCNASWP15 to retain scopoletin on the priority list and to call upon Codex members to generate and submit data to support the conduct of the safety evaluation by JECFA. CCNASWP15 also requested FAO and WHO to organize a new call for data for the safety evaluation of scopoletin. FAO reminded that a full dataset including exposure and toxicity is required. A consultant was hired by the Codex Secretaries to undertake a toxicological review of scopoletin as presented in the Annex to CX/CF 21/14/2-Add.1 (REP21/CF, Appendix VIII).

The committee agreed to keep scopoletin in the priority list awaiting feedback from CCNASWP16 on the provision of necessary data and studies to perform evaluation of scopoletin and to encourage Codex members to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food (REP21/CF, para. 231).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to endorse the priority list which includes scopoletin (REP22/CF, paras. 225-228 and Appendix IX).

CCNASWP16 finalized the regional standard for fermented noni juice and agreed to request CCCF to retain scopoletin on the priority list and to call upon Codex members to generate and submit data to support the conduct of the safety evaluation by JECFA. CCNASWP15 has also requested FAO and WHO to organize a new call for data for the safety evaluation of scopoletin. FAO reminded that a full dataset including exposure and toxicity is required. A consultant was hired by the Codex Secretariat to undertake a toxicological review of scopoletin as presented in the Annex to CX/CF 21/14/2-Add.1 (REP23/CF, Appendix VII).

A Member noted that scopoletin had been retained in the priority list at the request of CCNASWP16 (2023) (see Agenda Item 2) and questioned whether the final adoption of the Regional Standard for Fermented Noni Fruit Juice developed by CCNASWP could be delayed until JECFA performed the safety evaluation of scopoletin. The Delegation further referred to the possibility of using historic data on the safe use of the product to assist speeding up the evaluation of this compound. The Delegation also noted that it would not be appropriate to adopt a standard with a pending risk assessment by JECFA (REP23/CF, para. 128).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Scopoletin**

The JECFA Secretariat indicated that CCNASWP continued to be very interested in having a standard for fermented noni fruit juice. However, it had not yet been possible for the members of CCNASWP to fully develop all the toxicological data that would be necessary for a JECFA evaluation. The Secretariat further noted that the toxicological profile of scopoletin was not known yet and that scopoletin was used as an identity marker in noni products (REP23/CF, para. 129).

The Codex Secretariat noted that this was a regional standard and adoption of such a standard was discretionary to Members of that region present at CAC. The Secretariat further noted that if there were members concerned with the adoption of this standard, they had to convey their concerns to CCEXEC, under the Critical Review, through their regional coordinators or express their concerns at CAC when this standard would be considered for adoption. She further noted that there were several Codex commodity standards which refer to CXS 193-1995 but did not necessarily have corresponding MLs for the products covered by the scope of these standards in CXS 193. In addition, some Codex quality standards did have specific provisions under the contaminants section to cover situations where an ML for a contaminant was not available in CXS 193 such as the standards for bitter and sweet cassava vis-à-vis MLs for cyanogenic glycosides/hydrocyanic acid (HCN) and that the Regional Standard for Fermented Noni Fruit Juice had a similar caveat to cover the concern on the potential toxicity of scopoletin (REP23/CF, para. 130).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed to retain scopoletin in the priority list and to call upon Codex members concerned to generate and submit data to support the conduct of the safety evaluation by JECFA (REP23/CF, para. 133v).

CCCF17 (2024) kept scopoletin in a priority list for future JECFA evaluation (REP24/CF, Appendix X).

Scopoletin is a coumarin found in the root of plants in the genus *Scopolia* such as *Scopolia carniolica* and *Scopolia japonica*, in chicory, in *Artemisia scoparia*, in the roots and leaves of Stinging Nettle (*Urtica dioica*), in the passion flower, in Brunfelsia, in *Viburnum prunifolium*, in *Solanum nigrum*, in *Mallotus resinousus*, or and in *Kleinhovia hospita*.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Tropane alkaloids**

Reference to JECFA:	JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT MEETING ON TROPANE ALKALOIDS (2020)
Toxicological guidance value:	-
Contaminant definition:	Tropane alkaloids (sum of hyoscyamine and scopolamine)
Synonyms:	TAs, atropine
Related code of practice:	Guidance document on <i>physical Datura</i> stramonium seed contamination (FAO, WHO)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (µg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

FAO and WHO convened a joint expert meeting on Tropane alkaloids, from 30 March – 3 April 2020, to provide scientific advice in response to a request from the World Food Programme (WFP), after intoxication incidents related to contamination of distributed foods with tropane alkaloids, specifically (-)-scopolamine and (±)-hyoscyamine, from the toxic weed *Datura stramonium*. WFP requested FAO and WHO for scientific advice on tropane alkaloids in both processed and unprocessed food, to allow the development of appropriate risk management options.

The scope of the meeting was to 1) provide a risk assessment for (-)-scopolamine, (-)-hyoscyamine and (+)-hyoscyamine: 2) based on the risk assessment, provide guidance for the development of operational limits for hyoscyamine and scopolamine in the relevant WFP products, taking into consideration both food safety for WFP's beneficiaries as well as food security, which is an essential component of the WFP mandate. In light of the lack of data on other tropane alkaloids (both for the toxicological and exposure assessment), the evaluation was focused on hyoscyamine and scopolamine.

For the general diet, compared to a clinically significant minimal acute effect dose of 1.54 µg/kg bw, MOEs for the general population (children and women of reproductive age) ranged from 3080 to 3850 (mean) and 440-616 (95th percentile) for combined exposures to hyoscyamine and scopolamine. These MOEs were not considered to be of concern by the expert meeting. For doses required to produce potentially adverse effects (e.g. increased heart rate, decreased saliva, dry mouth and sweat secretions and pupil dilation at 4.62 µg/kg bw), the MOEs would be three times greater.

Based on the recommended intake of various WFP products of 100 g/day, the expert meeting recommended that a combined hyoscyamine/scopolamine concentration in dry food of less than approximately 30 µg/kg (in Super Cereal) or 10 µg/kg (in Super Cereal Plus and Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements) should be health protective for adults and children respectively. These concentrations are proposed as operational limits that may be extended to other cereal and grain products when consumed in comparable quantities. If higher quantities are consumed, appropriate adjustment of the values would be necessary.

For emergency situations where food security needs to be taken into consideration it would be expected that guidance levels of 90 µg/kg (Super Cereal) and 30 µg/kg (Super Cereal Plus and Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements) should still be protective against severe toxicity for adults and children respectively. These emergency guidance levels were derived from a clinically significant minimal acute effect dose (i.e. based on increasing heart rate, decreased salivation, and decreased sweat secretion). It was further considered by the expert meeting that it would be difficult to define these proposed operational limits/guidance levels based on numbers of *Datura* seeds in grain used in the production of WFP products mainly due to the large variability in TA concentrations in *Datura* species.

Plant toxins**Tropane alkaloids**

The report of the expert meeting was and a guidance document with specific recommendations on the limits for physical toxic *Datura stramonium* seed contamination in cereals and grains were published in 2020. (CX/CF 21/14/3, paras. 6-8)

CCCF14 (2021) noted that, due to the virtual nature of CCCF14, the in-session WG on the Follow-Up to JECFA Evaluations and FAO/WHO Expert Consultations led by the EU could not be held and that instead, the Secretariat prepare a working document CX/CF 21/14/18 highlighting the recently concluded JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations relevant to the work of CCCF. The EU provided further information on (-) scopolamine and (±) hyoscyamine (tropane alkaloids): The FAO/WHO Expert Meeting (2020) was convened to respond to a request for scientific advice from the World Food Program (WFP) after poisoning incidents from the distributed food aids. The Expert Meeting had proposed operational limits that should be health protective for adults and children for WFP products, but that these limits could be extended also to other cereals and grain products when consumed in comparable quantities (REP21/CF, paras. 232-233).

The committee agreed to:

- i) establish an EWG chaired by EU to prepare a discussion paper on pyrrolizidine alkaloids to look into the feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF15;
- ii) issue a CL requesting comments on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations in particular those for which the full report was already available, such as ciguatera poisoning and tropane alkaloids, for consideration by the in-session WG to be convened at CCCF15 and
- iii) re-convene the in-session WG at CCCF15 chaired by EU.

At CCCF15 (2022), the EU, as Chair of the WG, presented the recommendations made at the virtual meeting of the WG held prior to CCCF15 focusing on possible follow-up actions to the outcomes of the JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert consultations, which were on pyrrolizidine alkaloids, ciguatoxins, tropane alkaloids and ergot alkaloids, T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol (REP22/CF, para. 219).

The WG Chair noted divergent views expressed by Members and that CCCF15 should consider the most appropriate follow-up action. He recommended that an EWG be established to prepare a discussion paper on tropane alkaloids to look into the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF16 (REP22/CF, para. 222).

CCCF15 (2022) agreed to reconsider follow-up actions on tropane alkaloids at CCCF16 (2023) (REP22/CF, para. 224 iii).

CCCF16 (2023) agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by China and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia, working in English, to prepare a discussion paper on tropane alkaloids to look into the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions for consideration by CCCF17 (REP23/CF, para. 113i).

At CCCF17 (2024), the EWG Chair provided a summary of the discussion at the EWG highlighting that there was general support in EWG to initiate work on a CoP, noting that a CoP including all steps of agricultural practices and processing would be more useful for decreasing TAs in food than establishing MLs at this time. The EWG also recommended to consider issuing a call for data and to request JECFA to do a full risk assessment to determine the necessity for developing MLs in the future (REP24/CF, para. 106).

CCCF17 noted the general support for the development of a CoP to prevent and reduce the presence of TAs in food. The following points were also noted (REP24/CF, para. 107):

- The current discussion paper was on TAs in food, but a revised discussion paper should also look into management of TAs in feed as there is evidence of the transfer of TAs into milk that can be relevant for public health.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Plant toxins**Tropane alkaloids**

- More occurrence data on TAs related to the harvested crops in the post-harvest and preprocessing stages, could contribute to a better understanding of the efficacy of mitigation measures and application of good agricultural practices (GAPs) and therefore it was important, in a call for data or in the submission of occurrence data, to mention the stage at which the sample had been taken as, for example, cleaning and sorting processes could remove seeds containing TAs.
- A call for data would therefore be helpful and appropriate, but it was premature to request a full JECFA evaluation.

In response to the request for a call for data for TAs in food and feed, the FAO JECFA Secretariat confirmed their availability to prepare such a call (REP24/CF, para. 108).

CCCCF17 agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 109):

- (i) re-establish the EWG chaired by China and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia to prepare a revised discussion paper including proposal for a new code of practice and project document for consideration by CCCC18; and
- (ii) request the JECFA Secretariat to issue a call for data on tropane alkaloid contamination in food and feed, with guidance to indicate the stage of sampling.

Tropane alkaloids are a class of bicyclic alkaloids and secondary metabolites that contain a tropane ring in their chemical structure. Tropane alkaloids are present in many Solanaceae genera including *Mandragora*, *Brugmansia*, *Duboisia*, *Hyoscyamus*, *Datura*, *Atropa*, and *Scopolia*. Tropane alkaloid content of plant tissue varies according to the plant tissue and species but typically ranges from 0.01–3%. Growing season conditions, geographical growing location, plant maturity, plant species and variety, and type of plant tissue affect the concentration and proportion of hyoscyamine and scopolamine in samples.

Although more than 200 different TAs were so far identified in various plants, the most studied TAs are (-)-hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine, which in contrast to the (+)-enantiomers are formed naturally. Cocaine is also a prominent member of the group of TAs. The concentration of hyoscyamine in the analysed food samples is usually expressed as “atropine”. Atropine is defined as the racemic mixture (1:1) of (-)-hyoscyamine and (+)-hyoscyamine.

Atropine/(-)-hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine are readily absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract, quickly and extensively distributed into tissues, and excreted predominantly in the urine. N-demethylation and Phase II conjugation of atropine, (-)-hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine are known metabolic pathways in humans. The toxicological effects of (-)-hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine relate to their pharmacological effects, which are mediated by inhibition of muscarinic acetylcholine receptors in the central nervous system (CNS) and the autonomic nervous system (ANS). Inhibition of these receptors in the ANS results in decreased secretions from the salivary, bronchial and sweat glands, dilation of the pupils, paralysis of accommodation, change in heart rate, inhibition of micturition, reduction in gastrointestinal tone and inhibition of gastric acid secretion. (-)-Hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine differ in their ability to affect the CNS, with (-)-scopolamine having more prominent depressing central effects at therapeutic doses. The pharmacological effects of (-)-hyoscyamine and (-)-scopolamine occur within a short time after administration.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Acrylamide**

Reference to JECFA:	64 (2005), 72 (2010)
Toxicological guidance value:	(Intake estimates: mean 0.001 mg/kg bw/day; high 0.004 mg/kg bw/day)
Margin of exposure (MOE):	morphological changes in nerves (NOEL 0.2 mg/kg bw/day), mean intake 200, high intake 50; MOE mammary tumours in rats (BMDL ₁₀ 0.31 mg/kg bw/day), mean intake 310, high intake 78 MOE Harderian gland tumours in mice (BMDL ₁₀ 0.18 mg/kg bw/day), mean intake 180, high intake 45.)
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Reduction of Acrylamide in Foods (CXC 67-2009)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

JECFA was asked by CCFAC36 (2004) to evaluate acrylamide.

JECFA64 (2005) concluded that a dietary intake of 1 µg/kg/day of acrylamide represents the average for the general population and an intake of 4 µg/kg bw/day represents the high consumers; this includes children. Comparison of these intakes with the NOEL of 0.2 mg/kg bw/day for morphological changes in nerves would provide MOEs of 200 and 50, respectively. Comparison with the NOEL of 2 mg/kg bw/day for reproductive, developmental and other non-neoplastic effects would provide MOEs of 2000 and 500, respectively. For the induction of tumors, the MOE is calculated by comparing those intakes with the BMDL of 0.3 mg/kg bw/day for mammary tumours in rats to be 300 and 75, respectively.

The Committee concluded that adverse effects on morphological changes in nerves and on reproductive, developmental and other non-neoplastic effects are unlikely at the estimated average intakes, but that morphological changes in nerves cannot be excluded for some individuals with very high intakes. It considered the MOEs (induction of tumors - mean and high intakes) to be low for a compound that is genotoxic and carcinogenic and that they may indicate a human health concern. Therefore, appropriate efforts to reduce acrylamide concentrations in food stuffs should continue.

Recommendations by JECFA64:

- Acrylamide be re-evaluated when results of ongoing carcinogenicity and long-term neurotoxicity studies become available.
- Work should be continued on using PBPK modeling to better link human biomarker data with exposure assessments and toxicological effects in experimental animals.
- Appropriate efforts to reduce acrylamide concentrations in food should continue.
- In addition, the Committee noted that it would be useful to have occurrence data on acrylamide in foods as consumed in developing countries. This information will be useful in conducting intake assessments as well as considering mitigation approaches to reduce human exposure (Sixty-fourth Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, pages 8-26).

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to revise the discussion paper which would include an outline of a COP and a project document for starting new work on the elaboration of the COP, taking into account the JECFA64 evaluation of acrylamide; national mitigation strategies; and the role of food processors, catering services, and consumers (ALINORM 05/28/12, paras. 193- 196).

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to forward to CAC for approval as new work the project document on the elaboration of a Code of practice for the reduction of acrylamide in food, and agreed that, subject to the approval of CAC, an electronic working group would elaborate an initial draft COP for comment at Step 3 (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 184 & 185).

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Acrylamide**

CCCF1 (2007) decided to maintain recommendations to national authorities on consumer practices since consumer practices were considered to add significantly to acrylamide exposure and similar recommendations had already been incorporated in other codes of practice.

The Committee, noting the opinion of the ad hoc physical working group that the document was not yet ready for advancement in the Codex Procedure, agreed that a revised proposed draft should be prepared, taking account of additional data and information which would become available in the coming year from ongoing studies. The Committee agreed to return the proposed draft COP to Step 2 for redrafting by an electronic working group chaired by the USA and the UK on the basis of the written comments received and the discussion in the ad hoc Working Group and the in CCCF1, with a view to circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at Step 4 at the next session of the Committee (ALINORM 07/30/41, paras. 95, 96, 97).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the proposed draft COP, which focus mainly on foods produced from potatoes and cereals reflecting their importance in terms of dietary exposure to acrylamide, to CAC31 for adoption at Step 5 (ALINORM 08/31/41, paras. 75 and 95).

CAC31 adopted the proposed draft COP and advanced it to Step 6 (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 65).

JECFA72 (2010) noted that neither the estimated average acrylamide exposure for the general population (0.001 mg/kg bw per day) nor the exposure for consumers with high dietary exposure (0.004 mg/kg bw per day) had changed since the sixty-fourth meeting. The MOE calculated relative to the no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL) of 0.2 mg/kg bw per day for morphological changes in nerves in rats therefore remains unchanged. For the general population and consumers with high dietary exposure, the MOE values are 200 and 50, respectively. Consistent with the conclusion made at the 64th meeting, the Committee noted that while adverse neurological effects are unlikely at the estimated average exposure, morphological changes in nerves cannot be excluded for individuals with a high dietary exposure to acrylamide.

When average and high dietary exposures are compared with the BMDL₁₀ (the BMDL for a 10% response) of 0.31 mg/kg bw per day for the induction of mammary tumours in rats, the MOE values are 310 and 78, respectively. For Harderian gland tumours in mice, the BMDL₁₀ is 0.18 mg/kg bw per day, and the MOE values are 180 and 45 for average and high exposures, respectively. The Committee considered that for a compound that is both genotoxic and carcinogenic, these MOEs indicate a human health concern. The Committee recognized that these MOE values were similar to those determined at the 64th meeting and that the extensive new data from cancer bioassays in rats and mice, physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling of internal dosimetry, a large number of epidemiological studies and updated dietary exposure assessments support the previous evaluation.

To better estimate the cancer risk from acrylamide in food for humans, the Committee recommended that longitudinal studies on intra-individual levels of acrylamide and glycidamide hemoglobin adducts be measured over time in relation to concurrent dietary. Such data would provide a better estimate of acrylamide exposure for epidemiological studies designed to assess the risk associated with consumption of certain foods.

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the draft Code of practice for the reduction of acrylamide in foods to CAC32 for adoption at Step 8 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 64 and Appendix IV). CAC32 (2009) adopted the Code of practice for the reduction of acrylamide in foods (ALINORM 09/32/REP, Appendix III).

CCCF4 (2010) discussed Part 2 of the report of the in-session Working Group on Priorities: Follow-up on results of JECFA evaluations for CCCF, and agreed with the recommendations:

- To encourage the use of the COP to reduce acrylamide formation;
- To stimulate research on the mitigation measures and their impact on acrylamide production;
- To reconsider work on acrylamide in future to allow sufficient time for the implementation of the COP.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Acrylamide**

CCCF16 (2023) noted that India requested the inclusion of acrylamide in the priority list and noted that excessive consumption of food containing acrylamides, particularly fried foods, as well as bakery and confectionery products, could cause human health concerns. The Delegation indicated they could submit data to GEMS/Food within a year. They also indicated that, as the last evaluation took place more than 10 years ago, it might help if JECFA could re-evaluate this compound in a future evaluation (REP23/CF, para. 115).

The JECFA Secretariat indicated that acrylamide was evaluated by JECFA twice, in 2005 and 2011, and was identified as a genotoxic carcinogen therefore a health-based guidance value could not be established, and it was unlikely that new data that might have become available since the last evaluation could change this outcome. The Secretariat further noted that as a result of these evaluations, CCCF did not establish any MLs but developed a Code of practice for the reduction of acrylamide in foods (CXC 67-2009). In view of this, there might not be sufficient rationale to spend the limited JECFA resources on evaluating acrylamide for the third time (REP23/CF, para. 116).

Based on the above considerations, India expressed its interest in developing a discussion paper on acrylamide in foods for consideration by CCCF (REP23/CF, para. 117).

CCCF16 agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia, working in English, to develop a discussion paper on acrylamide in foods taking into account the most recent JECFA evaluations, to look into the feasibility of risk management measure(s) for consideration by CCCF17 (REP23/CF, para. 133 iv).

At CCCF17 (2024), the chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chair, introduced the item, presenting a summary of the discussion paper which included an analysis on the formation in foods of acrylamide, toxicology and epidemiology information, analytical methods, and relevant data. The EWG Chair further presented the recommendation of the EWG, which included revising the Code of Practice for the Reduction of Acrylamide in Foods (CXC 67-2009) and consider issuing a call for data (REP24/CF, para. 110).

CCCF noted the general support for the revision of CXC 67 if supported by further work to assess the availability of additional or new available mitigation measures which could be included in a revised discussion paper for consideration by CCCF18 (REP24/CF, para. 111).

CCCF considered that it was premature for a call for occurrence and other data and that this could be considered in future, but that a CL to gather information on mitigation measures/practices would be more appropriate to support the EWG to develop the discussion paper and proposal for a revised CoP (REP24/CF, para. 112).

A Member suggested that this proposal would be due for review in the coming year based on the framework established within the review of Codex standards (REP24/CF, para. 113).

CCCF17 agreed to (REP24/CF, para. 114):

- (i) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia to develop a discussion paper with a proposal for a draft revised Code of Practice and a project document; and
- (ii) issue a CL to collect information on new risk management measures for the reduction of acrylamide.

Acrylamide is an important industrial chemical used since the mid-1950s as a chemical intermediate in the production of polyacrylamides, which are used as flocculants for clarifying drinking water and other industrial applications. Recently, attention was drawn to the formation of acrylamide at high temperatures during frying, baking or other thermal processing of a variety of foods, typically plant commodities high in carbohydrates and low in protein. In this Maillard reaction, the most important precursor amino acid asparagine reacts with reducing sugars. After its formation acrylamide seems to be stable in a large majority of the affected foods. Acrylamide levels in commodities are

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Acrylamide**

highly variable because its formation is dependent on the exact conditions of time and temperature used to heat process the food and the composition of the food. Research on acrylamide formation is ongoing; mitigation could be accomplished by adjustments in existing production procedures.

In experimental animals, acrylamide is rapidly and extensively absorbed following oral administration and widely distributed to the tissues, as well as the fetus. It has also been found in breast milk. The major metabolite is glycidamide, formed by a CYP2E1-mediated oxidation, which is much more reactive with DNA than acrylamide itself. Acrylamide and metabolites are rapidly eliminated via urine.

The neurotoxicity of acrylamide in humans is well-known from occupational and accidental exposures. In addition, experimental studies in animals have shown reproductive, genotoxic and carcinogenic properties. The nervous system is the principal site of toxic actions of acrylamide, which is expressed by morphological changes. Degenerative changes in nerves (NOEL 0.2 mg/kg/day, based on a study in rats). Reproduction studies showed reduced fertility, adverse effects on sperm-count and -morphology in male rodents, however, no adverse effects have been observed in female rodents (NOEL 2 mg/kg/day). Furthermore, acrylamide was not teratogenic in mice or rats. Acrylamide is genotoxic, however, metabolism to glycidamide appears to be a prerequisite.

Acrylamide was evaluated by IARC in 1994 and classified as probably carcinogenic to humans on the basis of a positive cancer bioassay and evidence that acrylamide is efficiently biotransformed to the genotoxic metabolite glycidamide. BMDL for 10% extra risk of tumors was established by JECFA to be 0.3 mg/kg/day.

A wide range of commodities may be contaminated with acrylamide, such as cereals and cereals-based products, fish and seafood, meat and offals, milk and milk products, nuts and oilseeds, pulses, potato and potato products, coffee, sugars and honey, vegetables.

Studies conducted in Sweden in 2002 showed the formation of high levels of acrylamide during frying or baking of a variety of food.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Acrylonitrile**

Reference to JECFA:	28 (1984)
Toxicological guidance value:	Provisional Acceptance (1984, the use of food-contact materials from which acrylonitrile may migrate is provisionally accepted on condition that the amount of the substance migrating into food is reduced to the lowest level technologically attainable.)
Contaminant definition:	acrylonitrile (monomer)
Synonyms:	2-Propenenitrile; vinyl cyanide (VCN); cyanoethylene; abbreviations, AN, CAN.
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Guideline Level (GL) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Food	0.02	Adopted	2006	FAC			

Guideline Levels for Acrylonitrile in Food and Vinyl Chloride Monomer in Food and Food Packaging Materials were adopted by CAC19 (1991) with the understanding that the AOAC and the ISO would be requested to elaborate appropriate sampling plans and methods of analysis. (ALINORM 91/40, paras. 203-204)

CAC29 (2006) adopted the GSCTF, including Schedule 1 and revoked Guideline Levels for Vinyl Chloride Monomer and Acrylonitrile in Food and Packaging Material (CXG 6-1991) (ALINORM 06/29/41).

Acrylonitrile monomer is the starting substance for the manufacture of polymers which are used as fibres, resins, rubbers and also as packaging material for foods. Acrylonitrile is not known to occur as a natural product. Acrylonitrile is classified by IARC as possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B). Polymers derived from acrylonitrile may still contain small amounts of free monomer. Migration of possibly harmful substances from food contact materials has been discussed in the CCFA/CCFAC in the period 1986-1991. (IARC Vol. 71, 43- 108)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Benzene**

Reference to JECFA: This compound has not been evaluated by JECFA

Toxicological guidance value: -

Contaminant definition: -

Synonyms: -

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Guideline Level (GL) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

In the first edition of the WHO Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality, published in 1984, a health-based guideline value of 0.01 mg/liter was recommended for benzene based on human leukaemia data from inhalation exposure applied to a linear multistage extrapolation model. The 1993 Guidelines estimated the range of benzene concentrations in drinking- water corresponding to an upper-bound excess lifetime cancer risk of 10⁻⁵ to be 0.01–0.08 mg/liter based on carcinogenicity in female mice and male rats. As the lower end of this estimate corresponds to the estimate derived from epidemiological data, which formed the basis for the previous guideline value of 0.01 mg/liter associated with a 10⁻⁵ upper-bound excess lifetime cancer risk, the guideline value of 0.01 mg/liter was retained.

CCCF3 (2009) noted that benzene in soft drinks was not a major contributor to overall benzene exposure and in view of the considerable guidance available to industry to limit formation of benzene in soft drinks, in particular, the guidance by the International Council of Beverages Associations (ICBA) which is available in various languages, a COP was not necessary at this time. The Committee, however, agreed to encourage member countries, especially those in the tropics to continue data collection on the occurrence of benzene in soft drinks (ALINORM 09/32/41, para 104).

Benzene is colourless liquid at room temperature, which evaporates rapidly. It is slightly soluble in water and miscible with most organic solvents. Benzene is a naturally occurring chemical found in crude petroleum, but it is also produced in large quantities. Emissions arise during the processing of petroleum products, in the coking of coal, during the production of industrial solvents (toluene, xylene and other aromatic compounds) and from its use in consumer products as a chemical intermediate and as a component of gasoline (petrol). Human exposure occurs mainly by outdoor environmental levels of benzene (gasoline, industrial solvents), cigarette smoke, and occupationally when not protected.

In EHC 150 (1993) it is reported that benzene appears to be of low acute toxicity after oral exposure in various animal species. There are only a limited number of oral studies available on benzene. Exposure to benzene at high levels (by inhalation at the working place) is dose-dependently associated with bone marrow depression resulting in anemia. Benzene can easily cross the placental barrier, however, numerous animal experiments show no evidence of benzene being teratogenic even at maternally toxic doses, though in inhalation studies fetal toxicity has been demonstrated in mice and rats. Neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity of benzene has not been well studied in experimental animals or humans. IARC (1987) classified benzene in Group 1 (human carcinogenic).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Chloropropanols**

Reference to JECFA:	41 (1993; for 1,3-dichloro-2-propanol only), 57 (2001), 67 (2006), 83 (2016; for 3-MCPD esters)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group PMTDI 4 µg/kg bw (2016, for 3-MCPD and 3-MCPD esters singly or in combination (expressed as 3-MCPD equivalents)) Establishment of tolerable intake was considered to be inappropriate for 1,3-dichloro-2-propanol because of the nature of the toxicity (tumorigenic in various organs in rats and the contaminant can interact with chromosomes and/or DNA.) BMDL ₁₀ cancer, 3.3 mg/kg bw/day (for 1,3-dichloro-2-propanol); MOE, 65 000 (general population), 24 000 (high level intake, including young children))
Contaminant definition:	3-MCPD
Synonyms:	Two substances are the most important members of this group: 3-monochloropropane-1,2-diol (3-MCPD, also referred to as 3-monochloro-1,2-propanediol) and 1,3-dichloro-2-propanol (1,3-DCP)
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Reduction of 3-Monochloropropane-1,2-diol (3-MCPD) during the Production of Acid-Hydrolyzed Vegetable Protein (Acid-HVPs) and Products that Contain Acid-HVPs (CXC 64-2008)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Liquid condiments containing acid-hydrolyzed vegetable protein	0.4	Adopted	2008	CF		The ML does not apply to naturally fermented soy sauces.	

JECFA57 (2001) noted that the dose that caused tumours in rats (19 mg/kg bw/day) was about 20,000 times the highest estimated intake of 1,3-DCP by consumers of soya sauce (1 mg/kg bw/day). The available evidence suggests that 1,3-DCP is associated with high concentrations of 3-MCPD in food. Regulatory control of the latter would therefore obviate the need for specific controls on 1,3-DCP. (57th Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, pages 118-121)

High levels of chloropropanols (up to 100 mg/kg and more) have especially been found in products like non-traditionally fermented soy sauces and hydrolyzed vegetable proteins (HVP). There is an obvious connection with the conditions of the production method; levels of chloropropanols in these products are shown to be declining in the last decade since the problem was noticed and measures have been taken to reduce the formation of chloropropanols. These compounds have also been found, however, in many other foods, including baked goods, bread, cooked/cured meat/fish and malt ingredients. There are (inconclusive) indications that cooking/grilling (high temperature treatment) could result in some formation of 3-MCPD. Also the resins in packaging materials and paper used for processing of food may contain 3-MCPD and could contribute to exposure via food, this has led to the development of resins with significantly lower levels of 3-MCPD. The available evidence suggests that 1,3-DCP occurs at lower levels than 3-MCPD in soy sauce (and related products) and in acid-HVP food ingredients. However, in meat products the concentrations of 1,3-DCP are generally higher than the levels of 3-MCPD as concluded at the JECFA57. Further information is required on the levels of chloropropanols in foods and food ingredients, on the dietary exposure to these compounds, on the origin and formation and on production methods which can be utilized to avoid chloropropanol contamination of foodstuffs.

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to request JECFA to conduct an exposure assessment for chloropropanols from all sources (ALINORM 05/28/12, para. 189).

JECFA67 (2006) estimated the average exposure to 3-MCPD (at the national level in a wide range of foods including soya-sauce and soya-sauce related products) to be 1% to 35% of the PMTDI in the general population. For consumers at the 95th percentile the estimated intakes ranged from 3% to 85%, and for young children up to 115% of the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Chloropropanols**

PMTDI. The Committee noted that a reduction in the concentration of 3-MCPD in soya sauce and related products made with acid-HVP could substantially reduce the intake of this contaminant by certain consumers.

The Committee concluded that the critical effect of 1,3-DCP is carcinogenicity. Negative results were found in two new studies on genotoxicity in vivo. However, limitations in these studies, positive findings in in vitro test for genotoxicity as well as lack of knowledge on the modes of action operative at the various tumor locations led the Committee to the conclusion that a genotoxic mode of action could not be excluded.

The estimated intake of 1,3-DCP was calculated at 0.051 µg/kg bw/day and 0.136 µg/kg bw/day, respectively for the general population and the high-level intake (including young children). Comparison of these intakes with the lowest BMDL₁₀ of 3.3 mg/kg bw/day (incidence data on tumour-bearing animals for all treatment-affected locations) resulted in a margin of exposure (MOE) of approximately 65,000 and 24,000, respectively. Based on these MOEs the Committee concluded that the estimated intakes of 1,3-DCP were of low concern for human health.

The Committee recommended that studies should be undertaken to evaluate the intake or toxicological significance of fatty acid esters of 3-MCPD, which have been reported to be present in foods.

CCCF8 (2014) agreed with the recommendations of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for Evaluation by JECFA to maintain 3-MCPD esters in the Priority List (REP14/CF, paras. 126 and 130 and APPENDIX XIII).

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated 3-MCPD esters in response to a request from CCCF8. (JECFA/83/SC) (see 3-MCPD esters)

Discussions on MLs

A position paper was written; CCFAC35 (2003) agreed that the paper should be revised on the basis of the discussions and of submitted comments and data (ALINORM 03/12A, para. 179). The setting of MLs for 3-MCPD in foodstuffs was asked to be considered at CCFAC35. CCFAC could not reach a consensus on a ML of 1 mg/kg for acid-HVP soy sauce as proposed, and deferred the elaboration of MLs in different foodstuffs until its next session; the revised position paper should include proposals for the elaboration of MLs for chloropropanols in relevant foods (ALINORM 03/12A, paras. 173-179).

CCFAC36 (2004) agreed to commence work on the establishment of a maximum level for 3-MCPD in acid-HVPs and acid-HVP containing products subject to approval as new work. In addition, CCFAC agreed that a working group would prepare an updated discussion paper (ALINORM 04/27/12, paras. 193-194).

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to use as a starting point a maximum level of 0.4 mg/kg for 3-MCPD in liquid condiments containing acid-HVP (excluding naturally fermented soya sauce). Due to the need to better define the products for which maximum levels should be set, the Committee agreed to prepare a discussion paper that will define the different acid HVP containing products and collect information on other products that contain 3-MCPD (ALINORM 05/28/12, paras. 188 and 189).

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to update the discussion paper in view of the results of the JECFA evaluation and other information relevant for discussions on the Maximum Levels and to maintain the proposed draft Maximum Level at Step 4 (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 176 and 177).

CCCF1 agreed to forward the proposed draft ML of 0.4 mg/kg to CAC30 for adoption at Step 5. It was agreed that the draft ML should be further considered in light of finalization and implementation of the Codex of Practice for the Reduction of 3-MCPD during the Production of Acid-Hydrolyzed Vegetable Proteins (acid-HVPs) and Products that Contain Acid-HVPs (ALINORM 07/30/41).

Discussions on COP

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Chloropropanols**

CCFA37 (2005) agreed to forward to the Commission for approval as new work the project document on the elaboration of a Code of practice for the reduction of chloropropanols during the production of acid HVPs and products that contain acid HVPs and pending the approval of the Commission, to elaborate the proposed draft COP (ALINORM 05/28/12, para. 183).

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to urge professional organisations and governments to provide additional data on measures to reduce the presence of chloropropanols in acid HVP produced under industrial conditions, thereby considering, in particular, that which was feasible from an organoleptic point-of-view and the Committee also agreed to revise the proposed draft. In revising the COP, the electronic Working Group should consider revision of the title to specifically refer to 3-MCPD, on account of the co-occurrence of 3-MCPD and other chloropropanols (ALINORM 06/29/12, paras. 172 and 173).

CCCF1 (2007) agreed to most of the amendments proposed by the ad hoc physical working group and two additional changes and forwarded the proposed draft COP, as amended at the session, to CAC30 for adoption at Step 5 (ALINORM 07/30/41, paras. 92-93).

CAC30 (2007) adopted the proposed draft Code and ML at Step 5 (ALINORM 07/30/REP, paras. 80 and 94).

CAC31 (2008) adopted the Code of practice for the reduction of 3-MCPD during the production of acid-HVPs and products that contain acid- HVPs The Committee also adopted the draft Maximum Level of 0.4 mg/kg for 3-MCPD in Liquid Condiments containing acid-HVPs (Excluding Naturally Fermented Soy Sauce) at Step 8 (ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 24 and APPENDIX XII).

Chloropropanols can be formed in foods as a result of specific processing and storage conditions. The main source is acid hydrolyzation of vegetable proteins for the production of savoury food ingredients (e.g. soy sauce). In this process the use of hydrochloric acid at high temperatures can result in chlorination of lipids present in the protein starting materials. 3- MCPD has been shown to be a precursor for 1,3-DCP-formation and control of the levels of 3-MCPD is expected to obviate the need for specific control on 1,3-DCP.

Toxicity of 3-MCPD:

3-MCPD crosses the blood-testis barrier and the blood-brain barrier and is widely distributed in the body fluids. The parent compound is partly detoxified by conjugation with glutathione, resulting in excretion of the corresponding mercapturic acid, and is partly oxidized further to oxalic acid. Intermediate formation of an epoxide has been postulated but not proven. The incidence of tubule hyperplasia in the kidneys of treated rats was the most sensitive end-point for deriving a tolerable intake. This effect was seen in the long-term study of toxicity and carcinogenicity in rats in a dose-related manner. 3-MCPD is neither genotoxic in vitro at concentrations at which other toxic effects are observed, nor genotoxic in vivo. (Fifty-seventh Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, pages 114-118)

Toxicity of 1,3-DCP:

Although only a few studies of kinetics, metabolism, short- and long-term toxicity and reproductive toxicity were available for evaluation, the results clearly indicated that 1,3-dichloro-2- propanol was genotoxic in vitro, was hepatotoxic and induced a variety of tumours in various organs in rats. JECFA concluded that it would be inappropriate to estimate a tolerable intake because of the nature of the toxicity observed:

- The results of the long-term study of toxicity and carcinogenicity showed significant increases in the incidences of both benign and malignant neoplasms in at least three different tissues.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Chloropropanols**

- It has been shown unequivocally that this contaminant can interact with chromosomes and/or DNA; however, the tests were confined to bacterial and mammalian test systems in vitro, and there were no data on intact mammalian organisms or humans (57th Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, pages 118-121).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**3-MCPD esters**

Reference to JECFA:	83 (2016) (see also Chloropropanols)
Toxicological guidance value:	Group PMTDI 4 µg/kg bw (2016, for for 3-MCPD and 3-MCPD esters singly or in combination (expressed as 3-MCPD equivalents))
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	abbreviation, MCPDE
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001) Code of Practice for the Reduction of 3-Monochloropropane-1,2-diol (3-MCPD) during the Production of Acid-Hydrolyzed Vegetable Protein (Acid-HVPs) and Products that Contain Acid-HVPs (CXC 64-2008) Code of Practice for the Reduction of 3-Monochloropropane-1,2-Diol Esters (3-MCPDEs) and Glycidyl Esters (GEs) in Refined Oils and Food Products Made with Refined Oils (CXC 79-2019)

Commodity / Product Name	Guideline Level (GL) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
	No ML						

JECFA67 (2006) evaluated 3-MCPD and noted that it has been reported that fatty acid esters of 3-MCPD are present in foods, but there were insufficient data to enable either their intake or toxicological significance to be evaluated. The Expert Committee recommended that studies be undertaken to address this question.

At CCCF2 (2008), Germany reported that recent data show levels of MCPD esters in refined vegetable oils that may lead to exceeding of the PMTDI for 3-MCPD, if assuming full hydrolysis and uptake. The Committee agreed to include 3-MCPD ester in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA, but not to assign a high priority, due to the fact that there were currently only limited data available and kinetic studies and collection of exposure data were still ongoing.

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated 3-MCPD esters in response to a request from CCCF. The main target organs for 3-MCPD and its esters in rats and for 3-MCPD in mice are the kidneys and the male reproductive organs. 3-MCPD was carcinogenic in two rat strains, but not in mice. No genotoxic potential has been demonstrated in vivo for 3-MCPD. Two long-term carcinogenicity studies with 3-MCPD in rats were identified as pivotal studies, and renal tubular hyperplasia was identified as the most sensitive end-point. The lowest BMDL₁₀ (restricted log-logistic model) for renal tubular hyperplasia was calculated to be 0.87 mg/kg bw per day for male rats. After application of a 200-fold uncertainty factor, the Committee established a group PMTDI of 4 µg/kg bw for 3-MCPD and 3-MCPD esters singly or in combination (expressed as 3-MCPD equivalents). The overall uncertainty factor of 200 incorporates a factor of 2 related to the inadequacies in the studies of reproductive toxicity. The previous PMTDI of 2 µg/kg bw for 3-MCPD, established at the 57th meeting and retained at the 67th meeting, was withdrawn.

Experimental evidence indicates that 3-MCPD esters are substantially hydrolysed to 3-MCPD in the gastrointestinal tract and elicit toxicity as free 3-MCPD. The Committee therefore based its evaluation on the conservative assumption of complete hydrolysis of 3-MCPD esters to 3-MCPD, also for neonates. The Committee noted that estimated dietary exposures to 3-MCPD for the general population, even for high consumers (up to 3.8 µg/kg bw per day), did not exceed the new PMTDI. Estimates of mean dietary exposure to 3-MCPD for formula-fed infants, however, could exceed the PMTDI by up to 2.5-fold for certain countries (e.g. 10 µg/kg bw per day in the first month of life) (JECFA/83/SC).

Following up the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) agreed to endorse the proposal for new work for adoption by CAC on a Code of practice for the reduction of 3-MCPD esters and glycidyl esters in refined oils and products made with refined oils, especially infant formula and to establish an EWG, chaired by USA and co-chaired by EU and Malaysia to follow-up on this new work (REP17/CF, paras. 150-151 and Appendix X).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**3-MCPD esters**

CAC40 (2017) approved the new work. (REP17/CAC, Appendix VI).

CCCF12 (2018) agreed:

- that the scope of the COP covers refined oils and food products made with refined oils;
- to forward the COP (with the sections in square brackets related to the points on specific practices on matters such as: low lipase activity, irrigation water, polar solvents, degumming, bleaching clay, or the inclusion of specific references to fish oils) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix VI); and
- to establish an EWG chaired by the United States of America, co-chaired by EU and Malaysia, to revise the COP based on the comments and information submitted by Codex members and observers and to resolve all outstanding issues in order to submit a new draft for consideration by CCCF13 (REP18/CF, paras. 99-102).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the COP at Step 5 with note of comment that some provisions in the COP were based on inappropriate experimental measures while others were not practical, increased production costs and incurred excessive waste water with potential environmental impacts, and risk-management measures to reduce contamination with these chemicals should be science-based, proven to be effective at large scale, and widely applicable (REP18/CAC, paras. 63-64 and Appendix IV).

CCCF (2019) agreed to advance the Code of practice for the reduction of 3-MCPDEs and GEIs in refined oils and food products made with refined oils to Step 8 for adoption by CAC42 (REP19/CF, Appendix IV).

CAC42 (2019) adopted the draft Code of practice for the reduction of 3- monochloropropane-1,2-diol esters (3- MCPDEs) and glycidyl esters (GEs) in refined oils and food products made with refined oils at Step 8 (REP19/CAC, para. 68).

3-Chloro-1,2-propanediol is formed when chloride ions react with lipid components in foods under a variety of conditions, including food processing, cooking, and storage. The compound has been found as a contaminant in various foods and food ingredients, most notably in acid-hydrolysed vegetable protein and soy sauces.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Dioxins**

Reference to JECFA:	57 (2001)
Toxicological guidance value:	PTMI 70 pg TEQ/kg bw (2001, Including coplanar PCBs)
Synonyms:	Polychlorinated dibenzo-dioxins and –furans
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001) Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Dioxin, Dioxins-like PCBs and non-Dioxin-like PCBs in Food and Feed (CXC 62-2006)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

The situation regarding dioxins has been reviewed in a discussion paper (last version CX/FAC 00/26). CCFAC32 (2000) requested an additional position paper in which recent intake assessments and national regulations regarding dioxins are assembled. This was presented to CCFAC33 (2001). A revision of this document was requested, with also data on dioxin levels in food and feedingstuffs and breast-milk; the latest version is CX/FAC 03/32. CCFAC34 (2002) agreed that it should not draft MLs for dioxins at the time. CCFAC35 (2003) requested a revision of the position paper, including the insertion of a new section to cover ranges of data on background levels of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in food and feed.

CCFAC36 (2004) encouraged Codex members to submit data on dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in foods, and it agreed to request WHO to report in a detailed way to the Committee on the data submitted within three years time. In view of this, CCFAC agreed to discontinue the consideration of the position paper (ALINORM 04/27/12, paras. 188-189).

CAC29 (2006) agreed to invite CCMAS to review the sections on sampling and analytical methods and assess the need for future revisions of the Code, taking into account the comments made at CAC29 (ALINORM 06/29/41, paras. 60-62).

CCMAS29 (2008) agreed that the Germany would lead an EWG in order to update document CX/MAS 06/27/8 in the light of the remarks made by CCCF; answer the questions on the applicability of the methods for the indicated ranges and commodities concerned; review the validation data for the methods; and set criteria for dioxin analysis. (ALINORM 08/31/23 para. 128). CCMAS30 agreed to forward this discussion paper for consideration by CCCF (ALINORM 09/32/23 para.140).

CCCF3 (2009) considered the discussion paper prepared by CCMAS on methods of analysis for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs, following the earlier request of the Committee in relation to the development of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs and further clarification provided on the ranges for the determination of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs. The document considered the methods currently used and the criteria for the methods, as well as information provided by governments and organizations which participated in the preparation of the discussion paper. The Committee noted that the document provided useful information that could be used by governments at the national level as a reference for the purpose of monitoring contamination by dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs. The Committee recalled its earlier decision not to establish MLs for dioxins in foods and discussed how to proceed further, in view of the lack of new data since 2004 on dioxin and dioxin-like PCB contamination in the GEMS/Foods database at this moment. Several delegations informed the Committee that they had collected data on the occurrence of dioxins in foods and feeds or had initiated surveys for that purpose and indicated that they could send their data to GEMS/Foods. The JECFA Secretary pointed out that very limited data submitted since 2004 in GEMS/Foods and that there was a need for more data originating from different regions in order to consider exposure to dioxins. The Committee invited all countries to submit relevant data to GEMS/Foods and agreed that the question of dioxins and PCBs would not be discussed further in the Committee, with the understanding that it could be reconsidered when relevant data became available (ALINORM 09/32/41 para. 9-13).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Dioxins**

CCCCF6 (2012) discussed the report of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for evaluation by JECFA. With regard to the request for re-evaluation of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs, the JECFA Secretariat stated that dioxins were a known public health problem and that it might not be the best use of JECFA resources to perform a re-evaluation, but that it would be important for countries to implement source directed measures to reduce formation and release of dioxins into the environment, thereby reducing human exposure. The Committee agreed to not request a re-evaluation of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs at this point (REP12/CF, para. 160 and 162).

CCCCF9 (2015) discussed the report of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for evaluation by JECFA and agreed to include dioxins for update of the risk assessment. The Committee noted that this would not be a high priority, considering that extensive re-assessment was being undertaken by national and regional agencies, and as such the JECFA assessment could build on this work once completed (REP15/CF, para. 147-148).

CCCCF13 (2019) revised the priority list based on comments provided by Codex members for accuracy. The Committee agreed to the prioritization exercise performed by the in-session WG, which identified ergot alkaloids, arsenic (inorganic and organic) and dioxin and dioxin-like PCBs as top priorities for future JECFA evaluations (REP 19/CF, para. 167-168, Appendix X).

At CCCC14 (2021), the Representative of WHO introduced progress of the work on dioxin and dioxin-like compounds, aiming to provide refined TEFs later in 2022 (REP21/CF, para. 11).

The committee kept dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in a priority list for future JECFA evaluations (REP21/CF, Appendix VIII).

CCCCF15 (2022) updates the priority list about dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs and agreed to endorse the priority list. CCCC was informed that an expert consultation aimed at re-evaluating the TEFs for dioxin and dioxin-like compounds is being organized for October 2022 (REP22/CF, paras. 225-228 and Appendix IX).

CCCCF16 (2023) kept dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in a priority list for future JECFA evaluation (REP23/CF, Appendix IX).

In October 2022, the World Health Organization (WHO) convened an expert panel in which the 2005 WHO TEFs for chlorinated dioxin-like compounds were reevaluated, the outcome, details, and the updated WHO 2022 TEF values for dioxin and dioxin-like compounds coming out of this expert consultation was published in Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology in January 2024. In contrast to earlier panels that employed expert judgement and consensus-based assignment of TEF values, the present effort employed an update to the 2006 REP database, a consensus-based weighting scheme, a Bayesian dose response modeling and meta-analysis to derive "Best-Estimate" TEFs. The updated database contains almost double the number of datasets from the earlier version and includes metadata that informs the weighting scheme. The Bayesian analysis of this dataset results in an unbiased quantitative assessment of the congener-specific potencies with uncertainty estimates. The "Best-Estimate" TEF derived from the model was used to assign 2022 WHO-TEFs for almost all congeners and these values were not rounded to half-logs as was done previously. The exception was for the mono-ortho PCBs, for which the panel agreed to retain their 2005 WHO-TEFs due to limited and heterogenous data available for these compounds. Applying these new TEFs to a limited set of dioxin-like chemical concentrations measured in human milk and seafood indicates that the total toxic equivalents will tend to be lower than when using the 2005 TEFs (DeVito et al., 2024).

At CCCC17 (2024), the WHO JECFA Secretariat, reporting on the activities of WHO, informed CCCC that WHO had devised a novel, transparent, and systematic approach for establishing Toxic Equivalency Factor (TEF) values for dioxins and dioxin-like-PCBs. The scientific paper detailing the methodology was now accessible and provided a comprehensive description of the entire process, encompassing data collection to the final determination of the new values. The upcoming JECFA 2025 meeting would utilize the newly determined TEF values to re-evaluate dietary exposure (REP24/CF, para. 15).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Dioxins**

CCCCF17 kept dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in a priority list for future JECFA evaluation (REP24/CF, Appendix X).

The term dioxins refers to a group of polychlorinated planar aromatic compounds. The group consists of 75 dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) and 135 dibenzofurans (PCDF). The most studied and toxic dioxins are 17 congeners with a 2,3,7,8-chlorosubstitution pattern, of which 2,3,7,8-tetra-CDD (TCDD) is the most toxic and most studied congener. Dioxins are ubiquitously present as contaminants in the environment and in food, be it in minute amounts. Dioxins are lipophilic compounds which bind to sediment and organic matter in the environment and tend to be absorbed in animal and human fatty tissue. They are extremely resistant towards chemical and biological transformation processes and are consequently persistent in the environment and accumulate in the food chain. Dioxins are formed as unwanted by-products in combustion processes or industrial processes. Most of the dioxins enter the environment by emission to air. The Ah receptor is an important factor in the toxicological effects of dioxins. Activation of this receptor can result in endocrine and paracrine disturbances and alterations in cell functions including growth and differentiation.

Developmental neurobehavioral (cognitive) and reproductive effects and immunotoxic effects belong to the most sensitive endpoints of dioxin toxicology. TCDD is classified by IARC as Group 1 human carcinogen. It has been shown to be carcinogenic in several animal species at multiple sites, but TCDD is not an initiator of carcinogenesis and the tumour promotion in animal studies indicated a non-genotoxic mechanism.

The toxic equivalency concept has been developed for application to dioxins in order to assess the toxicity of a mixture of congeners as it exists in practice. Toxic Equivalency Factors (TEFs) have been established in relation to TCDD and the total toxicity of a mixture can thus be calculated as total toxic equivalents (TEQs). It has been shown that also some PCB- congeners (those with a planar dioxin-like structure) have effects on the Ah receptor and thus they are given TEFs and can be combined with the dioxins for the calculation of total TEQ of a sample.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Ethyl carbamate**

Reference to JECFA:	64 (2005)
Toxicological guidance value:	(Intake estimates: from food (=mean) 15 ng/kg bw/day; from food and alcoholic beverages (=high) 80 ng/kg bw/day Margin of Exposure (MOE): cancer (BMDL 0.3 mg/kg bw/day), mean intake 20 000, high intake 3 800.)
Synonyms:	Urethane; abbreviation, EC
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Ethyl Carbamate Contamination in Stone Fruit Distillates (CXC 70-2011)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

When ethyl carbamate was discussed in CCFAC in 1991, a Danish national TDI of 0.2 µg/kg bw was reported. The intake of a person consuming some of the higher contaminated food products was estimated to be more than 50% of this TDI. Therefore, measures aimed at reducing the EC formation were seen as necessary. No specific health effects by ethyl carbamate in humans related to dietary exposure are reported however.

Some countries mentioned national GLs for EC. No trade problems are reported however. CCFAC27 (1995) decided that no further action was needed at present.

JECFA64 (2005) evaluated the national estimates of intake submitted to the Committee by Denmark, Switzerland, USA (assessments conducted in the early 1990s) and South Korea, Australia, New Zealand (assessments conducted more recently). The committee noted that mitigation measures have been effective in reducing residual concentrations of ethyl carbamate, and that, consequently the older data published in the early 1990s and used to make the initial estimates of intake of ethyl carbamate no longer accurately reflect current intake from alcoholic beverages. The committee estimated the mean intake of ethyl carbamate from food to be approximately 15 ng/kg bw/day, this was based on the relevant foods, including bread, fermented milk products and soy sauce; alcoholic beverages were not included. With the inclusion of alcohol beverages, the estimated intake is 80 ng/kg bw/day. High consumption of stone-fruit brandies could lead to higher intakes of ethyl carbamate.

The Committee concluded that intake of ethyl carbamate from foods excluding alcoholic beverages would be of low concern (MOE: 20 000). However, the MOE from all intakes, food and alcoholic beverages combined (MOE: 3800), is of concern and therefore mitigation measures to reduce concentrations of ethyl carbamate in some alcoholic beverages should be continued. The Committee had concluded that health risks for the general population were low and that only sub-populations consuming a high quantity of specific alcoholic beverages might be exposed to certain health risks (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 137).

CCFAC37 (2005) observed the matter of ethyl carbamate was relevant but not of a high priority and that, due to the limited resources, it should be taken up at a later stage (ALINORM 05/28/12, para. 41).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed that the Germany would prepare a discussion paper on ethyl carbamate in alcoholic beverages for consideration by the next session of CCCF with a view to determining how and to what extent this matter could be approached within CCCF (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 191).

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to start new work on a proposed draft Code of practice for the reduction of ethyl carbamate in stone fruit distillates which will not include a signal value subject to approval by the Commission. It further agreed that the Germany would prepare a proposed the draft COP for comments at Step 3 and consideration by the next session of the Committee. (ALINORM 09/32/41, paras. 115 and 116). The proposal for new work was subsequently approved by CAC32 (ALINORM 09/32/REP, Appendix VI).

CCCF5 (2011) agreed to forward the proposed draft COP to CAC34 for adoption at Step 5/8 with omission of Steps 6 and 7 (REP11/CF, para. 26 and Appendix II).

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Ethyl carbamate**

CAC34 (2011) adopted the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of ethyl carbamate contamination in stone fruit distillates at Step 5/8 (REP11/CAC, Appendix III).

Ethyl carbamate can be formed from various substances derived from food and beverages, including hydrogen cyanide, urea, citrulline and other N-carbamyl compounds. Cyanate is probably the ultimate precursor, reacting with ethanol to form the carbamate ester. Over the past years, major reductions in concentrations of EC have been achieved using two approaches: first, by reducing the concentration of the main precursor substances in the food and beverages; second, by reducing the tendency for these precursor substances to react to form cyanate, e.g. by the exclusion of light from bottled spirits. Also, diethylpyrocarbonate, an inhibitor of fermentation, and azodicarbonamide, a blowing agent for sealing gaskets, can form ethyl carbamate. Diethylpyrocarbonate was revoked by JECFA17, azodicarbonamide is not recommended for bottling alcoholic beverages.

Ethyl carbamate is well absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract and is rapidly distributed throughout the body. Elimination is also rapid, with most being excreted as carbon dioxide as studied in mice. CYP2E1 activity is responsible for most of the metabolism of EC to carbon dioxide. EC may also undergo metabolic activation to vinyl carbamate epoxide, which binds covalently to nucleic acids and proteins. Moreover, hydrolysis to ethanol and ammonia may occur.

The acute oral toxicity of EC is low; however, high doses caused anesthesia in rodents. Effects on lung, liver, kidney, heart, spleen, lymph nodes, thymus, bone marrow and ovaries were seen during chronic exposure to EC, as studied in mice and rats. Reproduction studies showed high rates of embryonic/fetal mortality and malformations. Ethyl carbamate is genotoxic and carcinogenic. Single doses, short-term and long-term oral dosing of ethyl carbamate have been shown to induce tumors in all species tested (BMDL 0.3 mg/kg bw/day). IARC classified ethyl carbamate in Group 2B, possibly carcinogenic to humans (1974). No quality data for humans are available.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Furan**

Reference to JECFA:	72 (2010)
Toxicological guidance value:	(Intake estimates: mean 0.001 mg/kg bw/day; high 0.002 mg/kg bw/day, Margin of exposure (MOE): hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas in female mice (BMDL ₁₀ 0.96 mg/kg bw/day), mean intake 960, high intake 480.)
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	furfuran
Related code of practice:	-

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

Information available to JECFA72 (2010) suggested that the major route of exposure to furan in the human population is through consumption of heat-treated foods and beverages.

MOEs were calculated at dietary exposures of 0.001 mg/kg bw per day, to represent the average dietary exposure to furan for the general population, and 0.002 mg/kg bw per day, to represent the dietary exposure to furan for consumers with high dietary exposure. This estimate will also cover dietary exposure of children. Comparison of these dietary exposures with the BMDL₁₀ of 1.3 mg/kg bw, corresponding to 0.96 mg/kg bw per day when adjusted from a 5 day/week dosing schedule to an average daily dose, for induction of hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas in female mice gives MOEs of 960 and 480 for average and high dietary exposures, respectively. The Committee considered that these MOEs indicate a human health concern for a carcinogenic compound that might act via a DNA-reactive genotoxic metabolite.

The furan levels can be reduced in some foods through volatilization (e.g. by heating and stirring canned or jarred foods in an open saucepan). However, there is currently a lack of quantitative data for all foods, and no information is available on other mitigation methods.

CCCF4 (2010) agreed that a discussion paper prepared by an electronic Working Group, led by USA would be presented to the next session of the Committee for consideration (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 116).

CCCF5 (2011) agreed that this work could be taken up in the future when more adequate data became available and that at that time the re-establishment of the electronic Working Group to further develop the discussion paper could be considered (REP11/CF, para. 79).

Furan (C₄H₄O) (CAS No. 110-00-9) is a highly volatile cyclic ether that can be formed unintentionally in foods during processing from precursors that are natural food components. Furan is hepatotoxic and hepatocarcinogenic in rats & mice; JECFA considered carcinogenicity the critical endpoint for use in human health risk assessment.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Glycidyl ester**

Reference to JECFA:	83 (2016)
Toxicological guidance value:	BMDL ₁₀ : 2.4 mg/kg bw/day (mesotheliomas in the tunica vaginalis/peritoneum in male rats) MOE (adults): mean 8000-24000, high 3000-12000 MOE (Children): mean 2400-12000, high 1100-6000 MOE (Infants): mean 670-24000, high 490-8000
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	glycidol ester; abbreviation, GE
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001) Code of Practice for the Reduction of 3-Monochloropropane-1,2- Diol Esters (3-MCPDEs) and Glycidyl Esters (GEs) in Refined Oils and Food Products Made with Refined Oils (CXC 79-2019)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

CCCF5 (2011), Germany requested to include glycidyl esters in the 3-MCPD ester evaluation by JECFA. The Committee agreed to include glycidol esters in the priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA, but separate from the 3-MCPD esters. (REP11/CF, paras. 91-93)

JECFA83 (2016) evaluated glycidol esters in response to a request from CCCF.

The Committee concluded that glycidol is a genotoxic compound and considered its carcinogenicity as the most sensitive end-point on which to base a point of departure. The lowest BMDL₁₀ was 2.4 mg/kg bw per day for mesotheliomas in the tunica vaginalis/peritoneum in male rats observed in the NTP (1990) carcinogenicity study. Experimental evidence indicated that glycidyl esters are substantially hydrolysed to glycidol in the gastrointestinal tract and elicit toxicity as glycidol. The Committee therefore based its evaluation on the conservative assumption of complete hydrolysis of glycidyl esters to glycidol, also for neonates. National estimates of dietary exposure were used for determining the margins of exposure. The national dietary exposures were considered to be reliable estimates, as they were based on consumption data from national dietary surveys of which the majority include 2 or more days of data, and the estimates were based on a range of foods in the diet and included the key foods in which glycidol contamination is known to occur – namely, fats and oils. The Committee considered that the lower ends of the ranges of the MOEs for infants, children and adults (670, 2400, 8000) were low for a compound that is genotoxic and carcinogenic and that they may indicate a human health concern. (JECFA/83/SC)

Following up the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) agreed to endorse the proposal for new work for adoption by CAC on a Code of practice for the reduction of 3-MCPD esters and glycidyl esters in refined oils and products made with refined oils, especially infant formula and to establish an EWG, chaired by USA and co-chaired by EU and Malaysia to follow-up on this new work (REP17/CF, paras. 150-151 and Appendix X)

CAC40 (2017) approved the new work. (REP17/CAC, Appendix VI)

CCCF12 (2018) agreed:

- that the scope of the COP covers refined oils and food products made with refined oils;

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Glycidyl ester**

- to forward the COP (with the sections in square brackets related to the points on specific practices on matters such as: low lipase activity, irrigation water, polar solvents, degumming, bleaching clay, or the inclusion of specific references to fish oils) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix VI); and
- to establish an EWG chaired by the United States of America, co-chaired by EU and Malaysia, to revise the COP based on the comments and information submitted by Codex members and observers and to resolve all outstanding issues in order to submit a new draft for consideration by CCCF13 (REP18/CF, paras. 99-102).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the COP at Step 5 with note of comment that some provisions in the COP were based on inappropriate experimental measures while others were not practical, increased production costs and incurred excessive waste water with potential environmental impacts, and risk-management measures to reduce contamination with these chemicals should be science-based, proven to be effective at large scale, and widely applicable (REP18/CAC, paras. 63-64 and Appendix IV).

CCCF (2019) agreed to advance the Code of practice for the reduction of 3-MCPDEs and GE in refined oils and food products made with refined oils to Step 8 for adoption by CAC42 (REP19/CF, Appendix IV).

CAC42 (2019) adopted the draft Code of practice for the reduction of 3- monochloropropane-1,2-diol esters (3- MCPDEs) and glycidyl esters (GEs) in refined oils and food products made with refined oils at Step 8 (REP19/CAC, para. 68).

Glycidol is an epoxide used as a chemical intermediate in the production of functional epoxides, glycidyl urethanes, pharmaceuticals and other products. The IARC (2000) has assessed the carcinogenic potential of glycidol and concluded that glycidol is probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A).

Glycidyl esters are compounds formed independently from 3-MCPD esters during the processing of all oils and fats. They are likely formed from the diglycerides naturally present in all oils when heated to high temperatures. They are consequently found in foods that contain refined oils and fats.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Halogenated solvents**

Reference to JECFA:	39 (1992), 51 (1998) (dichloromethane)
Toxicological guidance value:	ADI "should be limited to current uses" (dichloromethane)
Contaminant definition:	halogenated solvent
Synonyms:	Methylene chloride, methylene dichloride
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Olive oils and pomace oils	0.1 (individual) 0.2 (sum)	Adopted	CXS 33-1981	FO		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 33-1981	1)

1) The ML does not listed in the current version of GSCTFF (ver. 2023)

CCCF7 (2013) considered a request from CCFO on the transfer of MLs for halogenated solvents from the Standard for Olive Oils and Pomace Oils (CXS 33-1981) to the GSCTFF and agreed that EU would prepare a discussion paper on what substances were included under the term "halogenated solvents" and whether the MLs in section 5.8 of CXS 33-1981 related to food safety or food quality (REP13/CF, para. 11).

CCCF8 (2014) noted the work done by the EU and was informed that these MLs referred to the use of these substances as processing aids/extraction solvents when such substances were allowed in the production of these oils. It was further noted that JECFA had evaluated halogenated solvents and had limited their use to extraction solvent for spice oleoresins and decaffeination of coffee and tea and that there was no information on presence of halogenated solvents in olive oils or pomace oils from other uses than as extraction solvents, however their use as such was no longer allowed in the production of these oils. In addition, there was no information on potential public health implications resulting from exposure to halogenated solvents in olive oil and olive pomace oils nor information on environmental contamination resulting from the use of these substances in food products.

Following this presentation, the Committee noted that there was no support for the transfer of the levels for halogenated solvents from the Standard for Olive Oils and Pomace Oils (CXS 33-1981) to the GSCTFF, however it agreed to recommend CCFO to maintain these levels in CXS 33-1981 until such time more information on environmental contamination became available that would allow CCCF to make a decision on this matter. EU agreed to follow-up on this issue and report back to the Committee in the future (REP14/CF paras. 122-124).

A halogenated solvent refers to an organic solvent which contains halogenic atoms (chlorine, fluorine, bromine or iodine). Examples include compounds such as bromoform, chloroform and trichloroethylene. Halogenated solvents have been widely used in many industrial and commercial applications due to their excellent ability to dissolve oils, their fast evaporation rates and their chemical stability. Major uses were as dry cleaning fluids, degreasing solvents, electrical cleaning solvents, paint strippers, propellants and refrigerants. However, because halogenated organic solvents are often environmental and health hazards, their use in open applications has now been banned worldwide. They are still widely used by chemical and pharmaceutical industries in closed applications. Some halogenated solvents are naturally occurring, especially in marine environments.

Health effects from direct exposure to halogenated solvents are well known and include toxicity to the nervous system, reproductive damage, liver and kidney damage, respiratory impairment, cancer and dermatitis. Human health effects from low environmental exposures are unknown. Halogenated solvents generally do not persist in soil or

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Halogenated solvents**

water but some of the widely used substances, such as trichloroethene, can contaminate surface and ground water. Also chlorination can result in contamination of water with halogenated solvents, mainly trihalomethanes. For these reasons, maximum levels (ML) for certain halogenated solvents in drinking water have been set by many jurisdictions, including the WHO. (WHO Guidelines for drinking water quality 4th edition–Chapter 8 http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2011/9789241548151_eng.pdf).

JECFA evaluated dichloromethane in 1992 and specifications have been set and revised by JECFA in 1998. JECFA concluded in its evaluation in 1992 that “the use should be limited to current uses as an extraction solvent for spice oleoresins and the decaffeination of coffee and tea, and for food additives in which previous specifications drawn up by the Committee included residues of dichloromethane”

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Melamine**

Reference to JECFA: FAO/WHO Expert Meeting (2008)
 Toxicological guidance value: TDI 0.2 mg/kg bw (2008)
 Contaminant definition: melamine

Commodity / Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Foods (other than infant formula) and feed	2.5	Adopted	2010	CF		The ML applies to food other than infant formula. The ML applies to levels of melamine resulting from its non-intentional and unavoidable presence in feed and food. The ML does not apply to feed and food for which it can be proven that the level of melamine higher than 2.5 mg/kg is the consequence of - authorised use of cyromazine as insecticide. The melamine level shall not exceed the level of cyromazine - migration from food contact materials taking account of any nationally authorised migration limit. The ML does not apply to melamine that could be present in the following feed ingredients/additives: guanidino acetic acid (GAA), urea and biuret, as a result of normal production process.	
Liquid Infant formula	0.15	Adopted	2012	CF		The ML applies to liquid infant formula as consumed.	
Powdered Infant formula	1	Adopted	2010	CF		[Relevant Codex commodity standards includes CXS 72-1981 and CXS 156-1987]	

An FAO/WHO Expert Meeting in December 2008 established a tolerable daily intake (TDI) of 0.2 mg/kg body weight for melamine, based on dose–response assessment of subchronic rat studies, modelling of the incidence of bladder stones and application of a safety factor of 200 to account for extrapolation from rats to humans, variation within humans and uncertainties associated with the data. The TDI is applicable to the whole population, including infants, and applicable to exposure to melamine alone.

Available data indicated that simultaneous exposure to melamine and cyanuric acid is more toxic than exposures to each compound individually. Data were not adequate to allow the calculation of a health-based guidance value for this co-exposure. A TDI of 1.5 mg/kg body weight for cyanuric acid had previously been derived by WHO.

Maximum Levels for Melamine in Food and Feed

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to start new work on MLs for Melamine in Food and Feed (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 126 and Appendix X). CAC32 approved this new work.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Melamine**

CCCF4 (2010) agreed to forward the proposed draft maximum levels for liquid infant formula to Step 3 for comments and consideration by the next session (ALINORM 10/33/41, para. 68).

CCCF5 (2011) agreed to forward the proposed draft maximum level for liquid infant formula to CAC34 for adoption at Step 5/8 with omission of Steps 6 and 7 (ALINORM 11/34/41, Appendix III). CAC34 (2011) agreed to adopt the ML at Step 5, to advance to Step 6 for comments and discussion in CCCF.

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to forward the proposed draft maximum level for liquid infant formula to CAC35 for adoption at Step 8 (REP12/CF, para58 and Appendix V). CAC35 (2012) adopted the ML at Step 8 (REP12/CAC, Appendix III).

Melamine is an industrially synthesized chemical used for a wide variety of applications, such as laminates, coatings and plastics. Commercially produced melamine may contain structural analogues, such as cyanuric acid, ammelide and ammeline.

Humans are exposed to melamine and its analogues from a number of different sources, including food and environmental sources. Sources range from breakdown of the pesticide cyromazine which is approved for use in many countries, to migration from approved food packaging material to the adulteration of specific foods from the (mostly non-approved) presence of melamine in animal feed or feed ingredients. Data have shown carry-over from feed to products of animal origin (e.g. milk, eggs, meat), including fish.

Melamine produces crystals in urine when its concentration exceeds a threshold. This results in renal failure from both intrarenal crystal-associated obstruction and an elevation in renal pressure that reduces renal blood flow and glomerular filtration.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Perchlorate**

Reference to JECFA: 72 (2010)

Toxicological guidance value: PMTDI 0.01 mg/kg bw

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

JECFA72 (2010) considered appropriate to derive a PMTDI as perchlorate has a very short half-life and is rapidly cleared from the body. The BMDL₅₀ of 0.11 mg/kg bw per day for inhibition of uptake of radiolabelled iodide by the thyroid in a clinical study in healthy adult volunteers was chosen as the POD for derivation of a PMTDI. As it was based on human data, there was no need to apply any interspecies uncertainty factor. The Committee concluded that it was not necessary to apply an uncertainty factor to account for the short duration of the pivotal study. The Committee concluded that an uncertainty factor of 10 would be appropriate to cover any differences in the general population, including those in potentially vulnerable subgroups. Applying this 10-fold factor to the BMDL₅₀ and rounding to one significant figure, a PMTDI of 0.01 mg/kg bw was established for perchlorate. The estimated dietary exposures of 0.7 µg/kg bw per day (highest) and 0.1 µg/kg bw per day (mean), including both food and drinking-water, are well below the PMTDI. The Committee considered that these estimated dietary exposures were not of health concern.

CCCF5 (2011) agreed that no follow-up was necessary since no health concern was identified at current estimated levels of exposure from food and drinking water (REP11/CF, para. 99).

The perchlorate ion (ClO₄⁻) is very stable in water, and its salts are highly soluble in water. Perchlorate occurs naturally in the environment, in deposits of nitrate and potash, and can be formed in the atmosphere and precipitate into soil and groundwater. It also occurs as an environmental contaminant arising from the use of nitrate fertilizers and from the manufacture, use and disposal of ammonium perchlorate (CAS No. 7790-98-9) used in rocket propellants, explosives, fireworks, flares and air-bag inflators and in other industrial processes. Perchlorate can also be formed during the degradation of sodium hypochlorite used to disinfect water and can contaminate the water supply. Water, soil and fertilizers are considered to be potential sources of perchlorate contamination in food. Potassium perchlorate (CAS No. 7778-74-7) has been used as a human therapeutic medicine to treat thyroid disease. The primary effect of perchlorate is its ability to competitively inhibit uptake of iodide by the thyroid gland.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polybrominated diphenyl ethers**

Reference to JECFA: 64 (2005)

Toxicological guidance value: (Intake estimates: mean approximately 4 ng/kg bw/day
Based on limited toxicity data, the 64th JECFA concluded that there appeared to be a large MOE for a non-genotoxic compound which, despite the inadequacy of the data on toxicity and intake, gave reassurance that intakes of PBDEs are not likely to be a significant health concern.)

Synonyms: PBDEs

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

In 1994, WHO published an Environmental Health Criteria document on PBDEs. Recent analysis of samples from environment and from human collected over the last 3-4 decades demonstrated significant increases in concentrations of PBDEs. CCFAC35 requested to evaluate the potential risks associated with the presence of PBDEs in food.

JECFA64 (2005) noted that the available data on PBDEs were not adequate to allocate a PTWI or PMTDI, because:

- PBDEs represent a complex group of related chemicals and the pattern of PBDE congeners in food is not clearly defined by a single commercial mixture;
- Data are inadequate to establish a common mechanism of action that would allow a single congener to be used as a surrogate for total exposure or, alternatively, as the basis for establishing toxic equivalence factors;
- There is no systematic database on toxicity including long-term studies on the main congeners present in diet, using standardized testing protocols that could be used to define a NOEL for individual PBDEs of importance;
- Several of the reported effects are biological outcomes for which the toxicological significance remains unclear;
- Studies with purified PBDE congeners in vitro have shown a lack of Ah receptor activation, however, many of the adverse effects reported are similar to those found with dioxin-like contaminants, suggesting that some toxicity data may be confounded by the presence of traces of impurities that are potent Ah receptor agonists.

The Committee recognized the preliminary nature of the data on concentrations of PBDEs in food and human milk and estimated the dietary intake for the sum of all measured PBDE congeners to be approximately 4 ng/kg bw/day, while intake by breastfeeding infants could be up to 100 ng/kg bw/day. Adverse effects for PBDE congeners would be unlikely to occur at doses of less than approximately 100 µg/kg bw/day.

Based on limited toxicity data, the Committee concluded that there appeared to be a large MOE for a non-genotoxic compound which, despite the inadequacy of the data on toxicity and intake, gave reassurance that intakes of PBDEs are not likely to be a significant health concern. The committee considered that continuing studies of PBDEs in samples from humans, including human milk, would be useful in assessing the overall exposures to PBDEs in foods and other possible sources.

CCFAC37 (2005) endorsed the recommendations of the ad hoc Working Group on the Contaminants and Toxins that no action was required for PBDEs (ALINORM 05/28/12, para. 41 and Appendix IV).

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polybrominated diphenyl ethers**

Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) are anthropogenic chemicals that are added to a wide variety of consumer/commercial products (e.g. plastics, polyurethane foam, textiles) in order to improve their fire resistance. Theoretically, 209 distinct PBDE isomers are possible, however, each commercial mixture usually only contains a limited number of congeners from each homologue group. PBDEs have been produced primarily as three main commercial products (mixtures): pentabromodiphenyl oxide or ether (PentaBDE), octabromodiphenyl oxide or ether (OctaBDE) and decabromodiphenyl oxide or ether (DecaBDE). Some variability in composition is known to exist between products from different manufacturers. The worldwide demand for PBDEs in 2001 was estimated to be almost 70 000 tonnes, with DecaBDE accounting for almost 80% of the total market.

Absorption of PBDEs is directly related to the extent of bromination of the parent diphenyl ether; as a general rule, greater substitution of bromine leads to a decrease in bioavailability. The metabolism of PBDEs consists of hydroxylation and methoxylation reactions and, in the case of congeners with a higher degree of bromination, oxidative debromination. Faecal excretion appears to be the dominant route of elimination, however, species differences exist. Limited data are available regarding the half-lives, however, preliminary values ranged from 30 to 90 days for the tetra- to hexa-substituted congeners. Moreover, limited pharmacokinetic data are available for humans, however, based on the observed increase in concentrations of PBDEs in tissue in time, PBDEs are absorbed and bioaccumulate.

The acute toxicity of mixtures of PBDEs is low in rodents, however, increased mortality, neurobehavioral effects, changes in gross pathology, induction of enzymes, changes in levels of hormones have been observed. In short-term studies the main effects of mixtures of PBDEs were seen in the liver (enlargement, 'round bodies', vacuolization, necrosis), kidney (hyaline degenerative cytoplasmic changes) and thyroid (hyperplasia). Embryo and fetus may be more sensitive to PBDEs than maternal animals; exposure to OctaBDE mixtures caused an increase in the incidence of developmental abnormalities. The results of the majority of tests for genotoxicity indicated that PBDE mixtures and single congeners are not genotoxic. The only long-term study was conducted with the DecaBDE mixture in mice and rat, however, evidence for the carcinogenicity of DecaBDE is limited. No information is available on the carcinogenic potential of other PBDE mixtures. Available studies in humans are not adequate to evaluate whether exposure to PBDEs is associated with adverse health effects. Some toxicity data may be confounded by the presence of traces of impurities that are Ah-receptor agonists (e.g. dioxin).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polychlorinated biphenyls**

Reference to JECFA: 35 (PCBs) (1989), 80 (NDL-PCBs) (2015)

Toxicological guidance value: MOEs for adults ranging from 4.5 to 5000, MOEs for breastfed infants, which may have a body burden up to 2-fold higher than that of adults, would be approximately half of the adult values. The MOEs for children would be expected to be intermediate between those for adults and those for breastfed infants, owing to the initial contribution from breastfeeding and the subsequent lower dietary contribution compared with human milk. (For coplanar PCBs (dioxin-like PCBs), see the toxicological guidance value of Dioxins)

Synonyms: Abbreviations, polychlorinated biphenyls: PCBs, non dioxin like polychlorinated biphenyls: NDL-PCBs

Related code of practice: Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)
Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Dioxin, Dioxins-like PCBs and non-Dioxin-like PCBs in Food and Feed (CXC 62-2006)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

PCBs were discussed by JECFA35 (1989); it was difficult to come to clear conclusions about the toxicity of PCBs as such because impurities such as dioxins and related compounds (e.g., PCDFs) probably were present in the PCB-mixtures used for the animal studies. The Committee concluded that 0.04 mg/kg bw was the NOEL in monkey studies. However, because of the limitations of the data and the ill-defined nature of the materials used in the study, no tolerable intake for humans could be established. One of the complications is that humans are exposed to biologically filtered mixtures of congeners, which are rather different from the industrial PCB-mixtures that were used for the studies. No toxicological monograph was prepared (see however EHC 140).

The major foods in which contamination with PCBs can be significant are fish, milk and dairy products, meat and eggs. Because PCBs bioaccumulate, the levels will usually be higher in animals which are higher in the food chain, but local pollution and feed composition may have major influence on the levels in animal products. Humans with a considerable intake of animal fats also may accumulate high levels of PCBs and as a consequence also PCB-levels in breast milk and in human adipose fat may be high. The Committee, however, considered that the advantages to the infant of breast-feeding outweigh any potential hazards due to the PCB-content of breast milk. The Committee recommended that PCB-levels in foods are monitored, preferably by quantifying the most important individual congeners. Safety studies should be carried out on the toxicological potential of the PCB-congeners which are predominantly present in foods. It is evident that in relation to the persistent nature of PCBs and ongoing environmental contamination, it is still valid to pay due attention to PCBs. The Committee pointed out that a long-term goal should be the reduction of PCBs in the diet to a minimum.

PCBs are related to other chlorinated hydrocarbons, such as polybrominated biphenyls (PBBs), polychlorinated terphenyls (PCTs), tetrachlorobenzyltoluenes, and polychlorinated dibenzodioxins and dibenzofurans. Coplanar PCBs were integrated included in the toxicological evaluation of dioxins (see the PTMI of 3.08 Dioxins), but it has to be borne in mind that the toxicological effects of PCBs are broader than the dioxin-related effects. CCFAC discussed PCBs from 1990 to 1994 on the basis of CX/FAC 90/20-Add.1 and further related documents. It was noted that several countries have established MLs for PCBs in food, so that trade issues might arise. Some of these countries have introduced MLs for the sum of some specific PCB-congeners, which is probably the best defined way of analyzing and reporting PCBs. The most important congeners for analysis of the general content of PCBs in foods are usually considered to be IUPAC numbers 28, 52, 101, 118, 138, 153 and 180.

CCFAC also acknowledged that source-directed measures were most important to reduce contamination with PCBs. The Committee agreed in 1992 that it was premature to set (maximum) levels for these contaminants at this stage. The discussions later were focused on dioxins and the dioxin-related PCBs.

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polychlorinated biphenyls**

FAO and WHO organized an expert consultation on the risks and benefits of fish consumption, taking into consideration the health risks associated with methylmercury (MeHg), dioxin and dioxin-like PCBs (DLC) and the nutritive and health benefits of eating fish, in response to the request of CAC29 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 24). The Expert Consultation was held in January 2010. It was concluded that consumption of fish provides energy, protein, and a range of other important nutrients, including the long-chain n-3 poly unsaturated fatty acids (LC n-3 PUFA), that eating fish was part of the cultural traditions of many peoples and that in some populations fish was a major source of food and essential nutrients.

The Consultation concluded that among the general adult population, consumption of fish, particularly oily fish, lowers the risk of coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality and that potential cancer risks of DLCs were well below established CHD benefits. At levels of maternal DLC intake (from fish and other dietary sources) that exceed the provisional tolerable monthly intake (PTMI) of 70 picograms/kg bodyweight/month established by JECFA, neurodevelopmental risk may not be negligible. Among infants, young children, and adolescents, the available data were insufficient to derive a quantitative framework of health risks and benefits of eating fish. However, the Consultation stated that healthy dietary patterns that include fish and are established early in life influence dietary habits and health during adult life. To minimize risks in target populations, the Consultation recommended a series of steps that member states should take to better assess and manage the risks and benefits of fish consumption and more effectively communicate with their citizens.

NDL-PCBs

CCCCF8 (2014) agreed with the recommendations of the in-session Working Group on the Priority List of Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxicants for Evaluation by JECFA to maintain Non-dioxin like PCBs in the Priority List (REP14/CF, paraa. 126 and 130 and APPENDIX XIII).

JECFA80 (2015) evaluated NDL-PCBs. For this evaluation, the Committee decided to focus on the six indicator PCBs (PCB 28, PCB 52, PCB 101, PCB 138, PCB 153 and PCB 180), as there were sufficient data (toxicological, biomonitoring, occurrence and dietary exposure) available for review. Other NDL-PCBs were also considered where adequate data were available to make a risk characterization, as was found in the case of PCB 128.

National estimates of dietary exposure to the sum of the six indicator PCBs ranged, for mean exposure, from <1 to 82 ng/kg bw per day and, for high percentile exposure, from <1 to 163 ng/kg bw per day. International estimates based on Global Environment Monitoring System – Food Contamination Monitoring and Assessment Programme (GEMS/Food) consumption cluster diets are in the same range. For the sum of the six indicator PCBs, the contribution of each of the individual congeners differs between countries and population groups. However, for both dietary exposure and body burden estimates (which also take into consideration kinetics and half-lives), the main contributor is PCB 153, followed by PCB 180, then PCB 101 and PCB 28, with the lowest contribution from PCB 52.

The Committee concluded that none of the available studies on the six indicator PCBs and PCB 128 was suitable for derivation of health-based guidance values or for assessment of the relative potency of the NDL-PCBs compared with a reference compound. Therefore, a comparative approach using the minimal effect doses was developed in order to estimate MOEs to provide guidance on human health risk. Based on the available toxicological data on individual congeners, subtle changes in liver and thyroid histopathology were evident from the lowest doses tested of 2.8–7 µg/kg bw per day and were similar across the short-term and long-term studies of toxicity. The Committee decided to take the lower end of the range of test doses used for each congener at which these subtle changes occurred as a conservative point of departure for estimating MOEs, after conversion of external doses to internal doses (body burdens), based on reported NDL-PCB congener concentrations in adipose tissue.

Owing to the long half-lives and to eliminate interspecies differences in toxicokinetics, the Committee considered it appropriate to estimate body burdens rather than using external dose (dietary exposure) for the risk characterization. From human biomonitoring studies, the Committee derived equivalent body burdens based on the reported range

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polychlorinated biphenyls**

of NDL-PCB concentrations in human milk for each congener. In addition, using a one-compartment kinetic dietary exposure model, body burdens were simulated for each congener using dietary exposure data from countries.

Comparison of the human body burden estimates (derived from human milk concentrations) with the body burden estimates from animal studies derived as points of departure for each congener resulted in MOEs for adults ranging from 4.5 to 5000. MOEs for breastfed infants, which may have a body burden up to 2-fold higher than that of adults, would be approximately half of the adult values. The MOEs for children would be expected to be intermediate between those for adults and those for breastfed infants, owing to the initial contribution from breastfeeding and the subsequent lower dietary contribution compared with human milk. Because the MOEs are based on minimal effect doses, they were considered to give some assurance that dietary exposures to NDL-PCBs are unlikely to be of health concern for adults and children, based on the available data. For breastfed infants, the MOEs would be expected to be lower. However, based on present knowledge, the benefits of breastfeeding are considered to outweigh the possible disadvantages that may be associated with the presence of NDL-PCBs in breast milk.

The Committee recognized that there are similarities in some of the reported effects for NDL-PCBs and therefore that risk estimates for combined exposure are desirable. The Committee concluded that this cannot be done on the basis of currently available data. The Committee also noted that the end-point selected for derivation of the MOEs was particularly conservative, as it was not of clear toxicological significance, it was a minimal change, and the lowest doses at which it was seen were used for the point of departure, combined with upper-bound estimates of body burden.

CCCF10 (2016) agreed that an EWG chaired by EU would prepare a discussion paper on the review of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of dioxin and dioxin-like PCB contamination in food and feeds (CXC 62-2006) to evaluate if recommendations from the JECFA assessment on non-dioxin like PCBs could be included. (REP16/CF, para. 168).

CCCF11 (2017) agreed to start a new work on the revision of the Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of dioxin and PCB contamination in food and feed (CXC 62-2006), to forward the project document (Appendix IX) to CAC for approval and to establish an EWG, chaired by the EU to revise the COP for comments and consideration at its next session. (REP17/CF, paras. 144-147)

CAC40 (2017) approved the new work. (REP17/CAC, Appendix VI)

CCCF12 (2018) agreed to advance the proposed draft COP for the Prevention and Reduction of dioxins, and dioxin-like PCBs and non dioxin-like PCB Contamination in Food and Feed to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8 (REP18/CF, para. 98 and Appendix V).

CAC41 (2018) adopted the Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of dioxins, dioxin-like PCBs and non-dioxin-like PCB contamination in food and feed (REP18/CAC, Appendix III).

PCBs in Natural Mineral Waters

CCCF2 (2008) considered the proposed draft amendments to Section 3.2 “Health-Related Limits for Certain Substances” of the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters, referred by CCNMW8. The Committee also considered whether the health-related provision in Section 3.2 should be included in Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was pointed out that iron, zinc and copper had been considered as quality factors rather than safety factors and therefore the levels for those substances had been currently not included in Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was noted that some delegations believed that the level for copper was based on both safety and quality parameters of mineral water.

The Committee temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4, CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polychlorinated biphenyls**

footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXs 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 89-90).

The Standard contains the following wording for Section 3.2 "Health-related limits for certain substances":

"The following substances shall be below the limit of quantification when tested, in accordance with the methods prescribed in Section 7: 3.2.18 Pesticides and PCBs"

PCBs are a class of stable chlorinated aromatic hydrocarbons which (mostly prior to the 1970s) have been produced since 1930 and used extensively in a wide range of industrial applications. One of the main uses which still persists is as dielectric and heat exchange fluids. Despite increasing withdrawal of the use and restrictions on the production, large amounts of PCBs continue to be present in the environment, either in use in existing industrial systems, or in waste materials, or dispersed as persistent pollutants. PCBs are mixtures of related chemicals which are formed by the chlorination of biphenyl. Theoretically, 209 congeners are possible; in practice about 130 are likely to occur in commercial products. Also related by-products are formed, such as polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs), and may be found in technical PCB-mixtures. Some of the trade names for technical PCB-mixtures as they were produced are Aroclor, Clophen, Kanechlor. The different congeners in PCB-mixtures can be designated by their IUPAC number, and different industrial PCB-mixtures can be characterized by their composition in terms of the relative percentages of the congeners.

Degradation of PCBs in the environment depends on the degree of chlorination (higher chlorinated compounds are generally more persistent against photolytic, microbial and animal metabolic degradation) and on the position of the chlorine atoms in the molecule. All congeners are lipophilic and accumulate in the food chain.

PCBs were evaluated by IARC in 1978 and 1987. The conclusion was that PCBs are carcinogenic for laboratory animals and are probably carcinogenic for humans (IARC, 1987). Extensive documentation about PCBs is gathered in EHC 140 (WHO, 1993).

The PCB-congeners that most easily adopt a co-planar configuration (the non-ortho substituted PCBs, numbers 77, 126 and 169) are potent Ah receptor agonists. Mono-ortho substituted PCBs are less potent but are included with a TEQ-factor for dioxin-like activity (nos 105, 114, 118, 123, 156, 157, 167, 189). Sometimes also PCB 81 and two di-ortho substituted PCBs (170 and 180) were included in the discussion about the TEF-approach for dioxins because of their ability to induce P4501A1 enzymes and their occurrence and persistence in the environment; they however were not incorporated in the WHO-recommendation about the TEF-approach for dioxin-related compounds (1998). The PCBs with a TEF form usually only a few percent of the total PCBs, but are relevant because of this specific toxicity, which can form an important contribution to the total TEQ for dioxins in a sample of food and in the human diet.

(NDL-PCBs)

Two linked benzene rings in which 1–10 chlorine atoms substitute the hydrogen atoms on the benzene rings comprise the class of chemicals known as PCBs. There are a total of 209 possible PCB congeners, based on the substitution positions along the phenyl rings. PCBs were intentionally produced in considerable amounts between the 1930s and 1970s and were used for a wide range of applications. Although there are 209 possible PCB congeners, of which 197 are NDL-PCBs, only about 130 have been reported in commercial mixtures. The congener profiles observed in commercial mixtures are not reflective of the congener profiles present in environmental compartments, food or human tissues. PCBs are thermally stable, persist in the environment and are found at large distances from their area of release. PCBs are lipophilic compounds and accumulate in the tissues of living organisms; they are taken up by humans primarily through the consumption of food, with foods of animal origin being the primary source of human exposure.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polychlorinated biphenyls**

PCBs exhibit different toxicological effects depending on the site of chlorine substitution on the phenyl rings. The position of chlorine substitution on the ring structure is important, because the receptor interaction profile is highly dependent on it. Congeners having chlorine substitution in both para and at least two meta positions and also having zero or one chlorine atom present in an ortho position have the highest binding affinity for the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR) and induce typical dioxin-like toxicity. These congeners, of which there are 12, are known as the DL-PCBs and have been assigned WHO toxic equivalency factors (TEFs). Congeners with two or more chlorine atoms in the ortho position are generally considered to be NDL-PCBs. The NDL-PCBs have a different spectrum of toxicological activity relative to DL-PCBs and PCDDs/ PCDFs. International bodies have identified seven PCBs that can be used to characterize the presence of PCB contamination. Six of these seven are NDLPCBs (PCB 28, PCB 52, PCB 101, PCB 138, PCB 153 and PCB 180), and one is a DL-PCB (PCB 118). The six NDL-PCBs are often called “indicator PCBs”

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons**

Reference to JECFA:	37 (1990), 64 (2005)
Toxicological guidance value:	(Intake estimates for benzo[a]pyrene as marker for PAHs: mean 4 ng/kg bw/day; high 10 ng/kg b/day Margin of exposure (MOE): Cancer (BMDL for benzo[a]pyrene as marker for mixtures of PAHs 100 000 ng/kg bw/day), mean intake 25 000; high intake 10 000.)
Synonyms:	PAHs, Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for the Reduction of Contamination of Food with Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) from Smoking and Direct Drying Processes. (CXC 68-2009) Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

JECFA37 (1990) evaluated benzo[a]pyrene and recognized that it was one member of a family of PAHs that should be considered as a class. The most significant toxicological effect was carcinogenicity and it was noted that the estimated average daily intake of benzo[a]pyrene by humans was about four orders of magnitude lower than that reported to be without effect on the incidence of tumors in rats. However, the committee was unable to establish a tolerable intake for benzo[a]pyrene, based on the available data.

JECFA64 (2005) evaluated 33 compounds. Some were found to be clearly genotoxic and carcinogenic (benz[a]anthracene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzo[a]pyrene, chrysene, dibenz[a,h]anthracene, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene, dibenzo[a,h]pyrene, dibenzo[a,l]pyrene, dibenzo[a,i]pyrene, indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene, 5- methylchrysene), whereas others were not. There is limited or no evidence on the reproductive toxicity of individual PAHs, other than benzo[a]pyrene, which showed impaired fertility in the offspring of female mice. Developmental toxicity after oral administration has been reported for benz[a]anthracene, benzo[a]pyrene, dibenz[a,h]anthracene and naphthalene. A NOEL for reproductive toxicity has not been established. Using parenteral administration, it was shown that PAHs exert immunosuppressive effects, probably via the Ah receptor. The NOEL for immunosuppressive effects of benzo[a]pyrene was 3 mg/kg bw/day. No quality data for humans are available.

To evaluate the combined toxicity of PAHs, JECFA64 decided to use a surrogate approach, with benzo[a]pyrene being used as a marker of exposure to, and effect of the 13 genotoxic and carcinogenic PAHs. A BMDL equivalent to 0.1 mg benzo[a]pyrene kg bw/day was derived for mixtures of PAHs in food. The committee concluded that a representative mean intake of benzo[a]pyrene of 0.004 µg/kg bw/day and high-level intake of 0.01 µg/kg bw/day could be used in the evaluation. Comparison of these mean and high-level intakes with the BMDL indicates MOEs of 25 000 and 10 000, respectively. Based on these MOEs, the committee concluded that the estimated intakes of PAHs were of low concern for human health. Measures to reduce intake of PAHs could include avoiding contact of foods with flames, and cooking with the heat source above rather than below the food. Efforts should be made to reduce contamination with PAHs during drying and smoking processes by replacing direct smoking (with smoke developed in the smoking chamber, traditionally in smokehouses) with indirect smoking. Washing or peeling fruit and vegetable before consumption would help to remove surface contaminants.

Recommendations by JECFA64:

- Future monitoring should include, but not be restricted to, analysis of the 13 PAHs identified as being genotoxic and carcinogenic.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons**

CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to revise the discussion paper with particular attention to JECFA64 evaluation (ALINORM 05/28/12, para.199). CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to the elaboration of a Code of practice for the reduction of PAH contamination in food and to limit its scope to smoking and direct drying process (ALINORM 06/29/12, para.187). An initial draft COP is to be considered at the 1st session of CCCF.

CCCF1 (2007) agreed to address smoke flavours in the introductory part only in the Code. CCCF agreed to return the proposed draft COP to Step 2 for redrafting by an electronic working group led by Denmark with a view to circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at Step 4 at its next session (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 102).

CCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the proposed draft COP to CAC31 for adoption at Step 5 (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 109). CAC31 adopted the proposed draft code and advanced it to Step 6 (ALINORM 08.31/REP, para. 65).

CCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the draft Code to CAC32 for adoption at Step 8 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 67 and Appendix V). CAC32 adopted the draft Code at Step 8 (ALINORM 09/32/REP, APPENDIX III).

PAHs in Natural Mineral Waters

CCCF2 (2008) considered the proposed draft amendments to Section 3.2 “Health-Related Limits for Certain Substances” of the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters, referred by the CCNMW08. The Committee also considered whether the health-related provision in Section 3.2 should be included in Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was pointed out that iron, zinc and copper had been considered as quality factors rather than safety factors and therefore the levels for those substances had been currently not included in Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was noted that some delegations believed that the level for copper was based on both safety and quality parameters of mineral water. CCCF2 temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4, CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, paras. 89-90).

The Standard contains the following wording for Section 3.2 “Health-related limits for certain substances”:

“The following substances shall be below the limit of quantification when tested, in accordance with the methods prescribed in Section 7: 3.2.20 Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons”.

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) constitute a large class of organic compounds containing two or more fused aromatic rings. Foods can be contaminated by two major routes: firstly, by environmental PAHs present in air, soil and water; secondly, PAHs can be formed during processing (drying, smoking) or cooking (grilling, roasting, frying) of foods.

Absorption of dietary PAH is determined by size and lipophilicity of the molecule and the lipid content of the food. PAHs are metabolized by oxidation of the aromatic rings, followed by formation of glutathione, glucuronide and sulfate conjugates. Oxidation can generate electrophilic metabolites that bind covalently to nucleic acids and proteins. Some PAH and PAH metabolites bind to the aryl hydrocarbon (Ah) receptor, resulting in upregulation of enzymes involved in PAH metabolism.

The major foods containing higher concentrations of PAHs are meat and fish products, particularly grilled and barbecued products, oils and fats, cereals and dry foods.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Other Chemical Contaminants (except radionuclides)**Vinyl chloride monomer**

Reference to JECFA:	28 (1984)
Toxicological guidance value:	Provisional Acceptance (1984, the use of food-contact materials from which vinyl chloride may migrate is provisionally accepted, on condition that the amount of the substance migrating into food is reduced to the lowest level technologically)
Contaminant definition:	Vinyl chloride monomer
Synonyms:	Monochloroethene, chloroethylene; abbreviation VC or VCM
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

Commodity / Product Name	Guideline Level (GL) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the GL applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Food	0.01	Adopted	2006	FAC		The GL in food packaging material is 1.0 mg/kg.	

Migration of possibly harmful substances from food contact materials has been discussed in the CCFA/CCFAC in the period 1986-1991. Guideline levels for vinyl chloride monomer and acrylonitrile in food and packaging material were adopted by CAC19 (1991) on the understanding that the AOAC International and the ISO would develop appropriate sampling plans and methods of analysis. CAC29 (2006) adopted the GSCTF, including Schedule 1 and revoked Guideline Levels for Vinyl Chloride Monomer and Acrylonitrile in Food and Packaging Material (CXG 6-1991) (ALINORM 06/29/41).

Vinyl chloride monomer is the main starting substance for the manufacture of polymers which are used as resins, as packaging material for foods. Vinyl chloride is not known to occur as a natural product. Residues of vinyl chloride monomer may be still present in the polymer. Vinyl chloride is considered by IARC to be a human carcinogen (as has been shown in occupational exposure situations). IARC Vol. 19, 377-438 (1979)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Radionuclides

Reference to JECFA:	-
Toxicological guidance value:	-
Contaminant definition:	-
Synonyms:	radioisotopes, radioactive nuclides, radioactive elements
Related code of practice:	Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)

TABLE 1

Commodity / Product Name	Guideline Level (GL) (Bq/kg)	Representative radionuclides	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the GL applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Infant foods	1	²³⁸ Pu, ²³⁹ Pu, ²⁴⁰ Pu, ²⁴¹ Am	Adopted	2006	FAC		The GL applies to foods intended for consumption by infants.	
Infant foods	100	⁹⁰ Sr, ¹⁰⁶ Ru, ¹²⁹ I, ¹³¹ I, ²³⁵ U	Adopted	2006	FAC		The GL applies to foods intended for consumption by infants.	
Infant foods	1000	³⁵ S (*), ⁶⁰ Co, ⁸⁹ Sr, ¹⁰³ Ru, ¹³⁴ Cs, ¹³⁷ Cs, ¹⁴⁴ Ce, ¹⁹² Ir	Adopted	2006	FAC		The GL applies to foods intended for consumption by infants.	
Infant foods	1000	³ H (**), ¹⁴ C, ⁹⁹ T	Adopted	2006	FAC		The GL applies to foods intended for consumption by infants.	
Foods other than infant foods	10	²³⁸ Pu, ²³⁹ Pu, ²⁴⁰ Pu, ²⁴¹ Am	Adopted	2006	FAC			
Foods other than infant foods	100	⁹⁰ Sr, ¹⁰⁶ Ru, ¹²⁹ I, ¹³¹ I, ²³⁵ U	Adopted	2006	FAC			
Foods other than infant foods	1000	³⁵ S (*), ⁶⁰ Co, ⁸⁹ Sr, ¹⁰³ Ru, ¹³⁴ Cs, ¹³⁷ Cs, ¹⁴⁴ Ce, ¹⁹² Ir	Adopted	2006	FAC			
Foods other than infant foods	10000	³ H (**), ¹⁴ C, ⁹⁹ T	Adopted	2006	FAC			

(*) This represents the value for organically bound sulphur.

(**) This represents the value for organically bound tritium.

Scope: The Guideline Levels apply to radionuclides contained in foods destined for human consumption and traded internationally, which have been contaminated following a nuclear or radiological emergency³³. These guideline levels apply to food after reconstitution or as prepared for consumption, i.e., not to dried or concentrated foods, and are based on an intervention exemption level of 1 mSv in a year.

³³ For the purposes of this document, the term "emergency" includes both accidents and malevolent actions.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Radionuclides

Application: As far as generic radiological protection of food consumers is concerned, when radionuclide levels in food do not exceed the corresponding Guideline Levels, the food should be considered as safe for human consumption. When the Guideline Levels are exceeded, national governments shall decide whether and under what circumstances the food should be distributed within their territory or jurisdiction. National governments may wish to adopt different values for internal use within their own territories where the assumptions concerning food distribution that have been made to derive the Guideline Levels may not apply, e.g., in the case of wide-spread radioactive contamination. For foods that are consumed in small quantities, such as spices, that represent a small percentage of total diet and hence a small addition to the total dose, the Guideline Levels may be increased by a factor of 10.

Radionuclides: The Guideline Levels do not include all radionuclides. Radionuclides included are those important for uptake into the food chain; are usually contained in nuclear installations or used as a radiation source in large enough quantities to be significant potential contributors to levels in foods, and; could be accidentally released into the environment from typical installations or might be employed in malevolent actions. Radionuclides of natural origin are generally excluded from consideration in this document.

In the Table, the radionuclides are grouped according to the guideline levels rounded logarithmically by orders of magnitude. Guideline levels are defined for two separate categories “infant foods” and “other foods”. This is because, for a number of radionuclides, the sensitivity of infants could pose a problem. The guideline levels have been checked against age-dependent ingestion dose coefficients defined as committed effective doses per unit intake for each radionuclide, which are taken from the “International Basic Safety Standards” (IAEA, 1996)³⁴.

Multiple radionuclides in foods: The guideline levels have been developed with the understanding that there is no need to add contributions from radionuclides in different groups. Each group should be treated independently. However, the activity concentrations of each radionuclide within the same group should be added together³⁵.

See the textual part of the Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods Contaminated Following A Nuclear or Radiological Emergency for Use in International Trade below.

CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to forward the newly-named proposed draft Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods Contaminated Following a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency for Use in International Trade to CAC29 for adoption at Step 5/8 (with the omission of Steps 6 and 7) and inclusion in the GSCTF (ALINORM 06/29/12, para. 198 and Appendix XXXI).

CAC29 (2006) adopted the GSCTF, including Schedule 1 and revoked the Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods following accidental Nuclear Contamination for use in International Trade (CXG 5-1989) Fact Sheet on Codex Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods Contaminated Following a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency was prepared by Codex Secretariat on 2 May, 2011.

CCCF6 (2012) agreed to establish an electronic Working Group led by the Netherlands and co-chaired by Japan to start new work on levels for radionuclides in food for comment at Step 3 and further consideration by the next session, subject to approval by CAC35. The Working Group would:

- review the current guideline levels for radionuclides in food; and
- develop in connection with the review of the guideline levels, a clear guidance on the interpretation and application of the guideline levels (REP12/CF, paras. 169-171).

CAC35 (2012) approved new work on the proposed draft levels for radionuclides in food (REP12/CAC, para.145 and Appendix VI).

³⁴ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Atomic Energy Agency, International Labour Office, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency, Pan American Health Organization, World Health Organization (1996) International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources, IAEA, Vienna.

³⁵ For example, if ¹³⁴Cs and ¹³⁷Cs are contaminants in food, the guideline level of 1 000 Bq/kg refers to the summed activity of both these radionuclides.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Radionuclides

CCCF7 (2013) agreed not to change the current GLs to MLs for radionuclides in the GSCTFF as GLs provide countries flexibility to determine whether and under what conditions food could be distributed within their territory or jurisdiction; not to change the present approach using GLs for groups of radionuclides to be assessed independently; and not to change the current GL values in the GSCTFF and therefore to discontinue work on the revision of the GLs for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF. Based on the information provided by the IAEA Representative on the ongoing work of the Inter-agency Working Group, CCCF7 further decided to discontinue work on the development of guidance to facilitate the interpretation and implementation of the GLs for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF. Along these lines, CCCF7 also agreed not to consider the appropriateness to develop additional GLs for drinking water for inclusion in the GSCTFF.

CCCF7 noted that after completion of the work carried out by the Inter-agency Working Group, CCCF could decide to start new work on radionuclides as necessary (REP12/CF, paras. 51-53).

CAC36 (2013) approved discontinuation of work as summarized in Appendix VII (REP13/CAC, para. 130 and Appendix VII).

CCCF8 (2014) agreed to establish an EWG led by the Netherlands and co-chaired by Japan to follow-up on the conclusions and recommendations of the Inter-Agency Working Group led by IAEA to determine the need and feasibility to pursue work on the following matters;

- (i) the stage of food production to which the Codex guideline levels apply,
- (ii) the period of time these GLs should apply in food trade following a nuclear or radiological emergency,
- (iii) the identification of internationally validated methods of analysis for radionuclides in foods and
- (iv) the development of sampling plans to enhance the implementation of the Codex GLs.

The Committee further agreed to request the EWG to look into the opportunity to develop guidance to facilitate the interpretation and implementation of the GLs for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF for consideration at its 9th session. If further work is identified, proposals e.g. analytical methods, sampling plans, guidance, should be presented for consideration by the Committee (REP14/CF, paras. 15-18).

CCCF9 (2015) welcomed the activities of IAEA in support of member countries to better deal with nuclear/radiological contamination at the national level and noted that the information contained in the TECDOC could be useful for future work on radionuclides within CCCF. The Committee further noted that the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) was reviewing dose coefficients for ingestion of radionuclides to assess public exposure and the associated health risk from intake of radionuclides in food. The review was expected to be finalised within 2-3 years. The Committee agreed to consider in future any work on guideline levels for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF pending the outcome of the work of the ICRP on the review of dose coefficients for ingestion of radionuclides to assess public exposure and associated health risk due to intake of radionuclides in food (REP15/CF, paras. 132-134)

CCCF10 (2016) was informed by IAEA on Technical Document (TECDOC) i.e. "Criteria for Radionuclide Activity Concentrations for Food and Drinking Water" for use by Member Countries to develop national radionuclide reference levels for existing exposure situations. (REP16/CF, paras. 27-29, REP16/CAC, para. 242)

CCCF13 (2019) agreed to establish a EWG on radioactivity in feed and food to produce a discussion paper for consideration at its next session, chaired by EU, co-chaired by Japan, with the following TOR:

- (i) Provide factual information on the radioactivity of both human-made and natural origin that can be found in feed and food (including drinking water) in normal circumstances (i.e. not in an emergency exposure situation following a nuclear or radiological emergency).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Radionuclides

(ii) Identify the issues related to the presence in normal circumstances of radioactivity in feed and food (including drinking water) of both human-made and natural origin, such as feed and food safety, transfer of radioactivity from feed to food of animal origin, possible public health risks via intake of food, trade issues, etc.

The Committee noted that this discussion paper would:

(i) result in an increased understanding of the presence of radioactivity in feed and food (including drinking water) in normal circumstances and related issues, and

(ii) provide the Committee with the appropriate information enabling CCCF14 to take an informed decision in 2020 on possible follow-up actions (REP19/CF, paras. 16-17).

CCCF14 (2021) noted that in the discussion paper it was concluded that naturally occurring radionuclides (i.e. mainly ^{40}K , ^{210}Po , ^{210}Pb , ^{228}Ra and ^{226}Ra) are found in many different foods and tend to give radiation doses higher than those provided by artificially produced radionuclides (such as ^{134}Cs , ^{137}Cs , ^{131}I and ^{90}Sr) in situations not affected by a nuclear emergency situation in the past, but no specific safety problem for food, feed or drinking water due to the presence of naturally occurring radionuclides had been identified. Furthermore, no international trade issues had been identified due to the presence of naturally occurring radionuclides in food, feed and drinking water (REP21/CF, para. 183).

The committee agreed:

i) that no further work was required to be done by CCCF at this time given that naturally occurring radionuclides in food, feed and water did not seem to be an issue for food safety and trade;

ii) to welcome the offer of IAEA to elaborate with the collaboration of FAO and WHO an informative document for the food safety regulators community, providing the state of the art of natural radioactivity in food/feed/water, thereby also reflecting regional variations and

iii) to request IAEA to keep CCCF informed of any development in the field of naturally occurring and artificially produced radioactivity, in particular on the FAO/IAEA/WHO work to develop methodologies that could be used to produce criteria with which to assess radionuclides in food (REP21/CF, para. 185).

At CCCF15 (2022), the representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre introduced the item and summarized the information provided in the written report related to nuclear and related techniques for food safety and control plus radioactivity in food. This included an update on ongoing international work on radionuclides in food, feed and drinking water in non-emergency situations. This technical work was concluding. Three documents were in preparation, one was already published online as preprint FAO, IAEA and WHO Safety Report 114 'Exposure due to Radionuclides in Food Other Than During a Nuclear or Radiological Emergency. Part 1: Technical Material'. It includes information on the observed distributions of concentrations of key natural radionuclides in various foods, the use of dietary surveys to assess ingestion doses arising from exposure to radionuclides and it also provides information on radionuclide concentrations in natural mineral waters, in aquaculture and in other foods collected from the wild. A part 2 document is also in press. It will put forward proposals that competent authorities could use to implement radiation safety standards as they relate to radioactivity in food in existing exposure situations. The third document in preparation is the information document that will be presented at the next CCCF after circulation to Codex Members for comments (REP22/CF, para. 40).

CCCF15 noted the information provided and thanked the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their work on contaminants in food and feed (REP22/CF, para. 41).

At CCCF16 (2023), in addition to the information provided in the working document, the Codex Secretariat recalled the discussion related to the presence of natural radionuclides in food, feed, and water, and that CCCF14 (2021) had agreed 11 that no action was needed at Codex level for the time being. However, CCCF14 welcomed the offer by IAEA to elaborate, with the collaboration of FAO and WHO, an informative document for the food safety regulators community, providing the state of the art of natural radioactivity in food, feed, and water. This document was being circulated for comments by Codex members in CL 2023/17-CF12, available in English, French, and Spanish, with

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 1

Radionuclides

a deadline for comments of 30 June 2023. The Secretariat encouraged Members and Observers to send their comments as indicated in the CL so that IAEA, FAO, and WHO can review the document and present it to CCCF17 for consideration (REP23/CF, para. 19).

CCCF16 (REP23/CF, para. 20):

(i) expressed its appreciation to the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre;

(ii) noted the information provided; and

(iii) encouraged Members and Observers to submit comments in reply to CL 2023/17-CF.

At CCCF17 (2024), the representative from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) provided an update, noting that 2024 would be the 60th anniversary of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture, and highlighting activities in the past year. He also thanked all those that had provided comments in response to CL 2023/17-CF and indicated that the information document on natural radionuclides in food, feed and water would be updated for CCCF18 in line with these comments. The document would also reflect revised information to be published by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effect of Atomic Radiation later in the year (REP24/CF, para. 19).

CCCF17 expressed its appreciation to the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre and noted the information provided by the IAEA representative (REP24/CF, para. 20).

**SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED DRAFT REVISED GUIDELINE LEVELS FOR RADIONUCLIDES IN FOODS
CONTAMINATED FOLLOWING A NUCLEAR OR RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY**

The Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods and specifically the values presented in Table 1 above are based on the following general radiological considerations and experience of application of the existing international and national standards for control of radionuclides in food.

Significant improvements in the assessment of radiation doses resulting from the human intake of radioactive substances have become available since the Guideline Levels were issued by the Codex Alimentarius Commission in 1989³⁶ (CXG 5-1989).

Infants and adults: The levels of human exposure resulting from consumption of foods containing radionuclides listed in Table 1 at the suggested guideline levels have been assessed both for infants and adults and checked for compliance with the appropriate dose criterion.

In order to assess public exposure and the associated health risks from intake of radionuclides in food, estimates of food consumption rates and ingestion dose coefficients are needed. According to Ref. (WHO, 1988) it is assumed that 550 kg of food is consumed by an adult in a year. The value of infant food and milk consumption during first year of life used for infant dose calculation equal to 200 kg is based on contemporary human habit assessments (F. Luykx, 1990³⁷; US DoH, 1998³⁸; NRPB, 2003³⁹). The most conservative values of the radionuclide-specific and age-specific ingestion dose coefficients, i.e. relevant to the chemical forms of radionuclides which are most absorbed from the gastro-intestinal tract and retained in body tissues, are taken from the (IAEA, 1996).

Radiological criterion: The appropriate radiological criterion, which has been used for comparison with the dose assessment data below, is a generic intervention exemption level of around 1 mSv for individual annual dose from radionuclides in major commodities, e.g. food, recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection as safe for members of the public (ICRP, 1999)⁴⁰.

Naturally occurring radionuclides: Radionuclides of natural origin are ubiquitous and as a consequence are present in all foodstuffs to varying degrees. Radiation doses from the consumption of foodstuffs typically range from a few tens to a few hundreds of microsieverts in a year. In essence, the doses from these radionuclides when naturally present in the diet are unamenable to control; the resources that would be required to affect exposures would be out of proportion to the benefits achieved for health. These radionuclides are excluded from consideration in this document as they are not associated with emergencies.

One-year exposure assessment: It is conservatively assumed that during the first year after major environmental radioactive contamination caused by a nuclear or radiological emergency it might be difficult to readily replace foods imported from contaminated regions with foods imported from unaffected areas. According to FAO statistical data the mean fraction of major foodstuff quantities imported by all the countries worldwide is 0.1. The values in Table 1 as regards foods consumed by infants and the general population have been derived to ensure that if a country continues to import major foods from areas contaminated with radionuclides, the mean annual internal dose of its inhabitants will not exceed around 1 mSv (see Annex 2). This conclusion might not apply for some radionuclides if the fraction of contaminated food is found to be higher than 0.1, as might be the case for infants who have a diet essentially based on milk with little variety.

Long-term exposure assessment: Beyond one year after the emergency the fraction of contaminated food placed on the market will generally decrease as a result of national restrictions (withdrawal from the market), changes to other produce, agricultural countermeasures and decay.

³⁶ The Codex Alimentarius Commission at its 18th Session (Geneva 1989) adopted Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Foods Following Accidental Nuclear Contamination for Use in International Trade (CXG 5-1989) applicable for six radionuclides (⁹⁰Sr, ¹³¹I, ¹³⁷Cs, ¹³⁴Cs, ²³⁹Pu and ²⁴¹Am) during one year after the nuclear accident.

³⁷ F. Luykx (1990) Response of the European Communities to environmental contamination following the Chernobyl accident. In: Environmental Contamination Following a Major Nuclear Accident, IAEA, Vienna, v.2, 269-287.

³⁸ US DoHHS (1998) Accidental Radioactive Contamination of Human Food and Animal Feeds: Recommendations for State and Local Agencies. Food and Drug Administration, Rockville.

³⁹ K. Smith and A. Jones (2003) Generalized Habit Data for Radiological Assessments. NRPB Report W41.

⁴⁰ International Commission on Radiological Protection (1999). Principles for the Protection of the Public in Situations of Prolonged Exposure. ICRP Publication 82, Annals of the ICRP.

Radionuclides

Experience has shown that in the long term the fraction of imported contaminated food will decrease by a factor of a hundred or more. Specific food categories, e.g. wild forest products, may show persistent or even increasing levels of contamination. Other categories of food may gradually be exempted from controls. Nevertheless, it must be anticipated that it may take many years before levels of individual exposure as a result of contaminated food could be qualified as negligible.

ANNEX 2

ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN INTERNAL EXPOSURE WHEN THE GUIDELINE LEVELS ARE APPLIED

For the purpose of assessment of the mean public exposure level in a country caused by the import of food products from foreign areas with residual radioactivity, in implementing the present guideline levels the following data should be used: annual food consumption rates for infants and adults, radionuclide- and age-dependent ingestion dose coefficients and the import/production factors. When assessing the mean internal dose in infants and adults it is suggested that due to monitoring and inspection the radionuclide concentration in imported foods does not exceed the present guideline levels. Using cautious assessment approach it is considered that all the foodstuffs imported from foreign areas with residual radioactivity are contaminated with radionuclides at the present guideline levels.

Then, the mean internal dose of the public, E (mSv), due to annual consumption of imported foods containing radionuclides can be estimated using the following formula:

$$E = GL(A) \cdot M(A) \cdot e_{ing}(A) \cdot IPF$$

where:

$GL(A)$ is the Guideline Level (Bq/kg)

$M(A)$ is the age-dependent mass of food consumed per year (kg)

$e_{ing}(A)$ is the age-dependent ingestion dose coefficient (mSv/Bq)

IPF is the import/production factor⁴¹ (dimensionless).

Assessment results presented in Table 2 both for infants and adults demonstrate that for all the twenty radionuclides doses from consumption of imported foods during the 1st year after major radioactive contamination do not exceed 1 mSv. It should be noted that the doses were calculated on the basis of a value for the IPF equal to 0.1 and that this assumption may not always apply, in particular to infants who have a diet essentially based on milk with little variety.

It should be noted that for ²³⁹Pu as well as for a number of other radionuclides the dose estimate is conservative. This is because elevated gastro-intestinal tract absorption factors and associated ingestion dose coefficients are applied for the whole first year of life whereas this is valid mainly during suckling period recently estimated by ICRP to be as average first six months of life (ICRP, 2005⁴²). For the subsequent six months of the first year of life the gut absorption factors are much lower. This is not the case for ³H, ¹⁴C, ³⁵S, iodine and cesium isotopes.

As an example, dose assessment for ¹³⁷Cs in foods is presented below for the first year after the area contamination with this nuclide.

For adults: $E = 1000 \text{ Bq/kg} \cdot 550 \text{ kg} \cdot 1.3 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ mSv/Bq} \cdot 0.1 = 0.7 \text{ mSv}$;

For infants: $E = 1000 \text{ Bq/kg} \cdot 200 \text{ kg} \cdot 2.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ mSv/Bq} \cdot 0.1 = 0.4 \text{ mSv}$

⁴¹ The import/production factor (IPF) is defined as the ratio of the amount of foodstuffs imported per year from areas contaminated with radionuclides to the total amount produced and imported annually in the region or country under consideration.

⁴² International Commission on Radiological Protection (2005) Doses to Infants from Radionuclides Ingested in Mothers Milk. To be published.

Radionuclides

TABLE 2

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVE DOSE FOR INFANTS AND ADULTS FROM INGESTION OF IMPORTED FOODS IN A YEAR

Radionuclide	Guideline Level (Bq/kg)		Effective dose (mSv)	
	Infant foods	Other foods	1 st year after major contamination	
			Infants	Adults
²³⁸ Pu	1	10	0.08	0.1
²³⁹ Pu			0.08	0.1
²⁴⁰ Pu			0.08	0.1
²⁴¹ Am			0.07	0.1
⁹⁰ Sr	100	100	0.5	0.2
¹⁰⁶ Ru			0.2	0.04
¹²⁹ I			0.4	0.6
¹³¹ I			0.4	0.1
²³⁵ U			0.7	0.3
³⁵ S*	1000	1000	0.2	0.04
⁶⁰ Co			1	0.2
⁸⁹ Sr			0.7	0.1
¹⁰³ Ru			0.1	0.04
¹³⁴ Cs			0.5	1
¹³⁷ Cs			0.4	0.7
¹⁴⁴ Ce			1	0.3
¹⁹² Ir			0.3	0.08
³ H**	1000	10000	0.002	0.02
¹⁴ C			0.03	0.3
⁹⁹ Tc			0.2	0.4

* This represents the value for organically bound sulphur.

** This represents the value for organically bound tritium.

See for “Scientific justification for the Guideline Levels” (Annex 1) and the “Assessment of human internal exposure when the Guideline Levels are applied” (Annex 2).

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Copper**

Reference to JECFA: 10 (1966), 14 (1970), 26 (1982)
 Toxicological guidance value: PMTDI 0.05 - 0.5 mg/kg bw (1982)
 Contaminant definition: Copper, total
 Synonyms: Cu

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Edible fats and oils, refined (not covered by individual standards)	0.1	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Edible fats and oils, virgin (not covered by individual standards)	0.4	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Edible fats and oils, cold pressed (not covered by individual standards)	0.4	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Named animal fats	0.4	Adopted	CXS 211-1999	FO		Lard, rendered pork fat, premier jus and edible tallow. This ML is mentioned to be a quality characteristic, for voluntary application by commercial partners and not for application by governments. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 211-1999.	1)

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Copper**

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Vegetable oils, Crude	0.4	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		Named vegetable oils from arachis, babassu, coconut, cottonseed, grapeseed, maize, mustard seed, palm kernel, palm, rapeseed, safflower seed, sesame seed, soya bean, and sunflower seed, and palm olein, stearin and super olein. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	OC 0172
Named Vegetable oils, refined	0.1	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	OR 0172 1)
Named vegetable oils, virgin	0.4	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	
Olive oils and olive-pomace oils	0.1	Adopted	CXS 33-1981	FO		These quality and composition factors are supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet these supplementary factors, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 33-1981.	
Milkfat products	0.05	Adopted	CXS 280-1973	MMP		This limit applies to anhydrous milkfat, milkfat, anhydrous butteroil and butter oil and ghee. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 280-1973.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Copper**

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Casein products	5	Adopted	CXS 290-1995	MMP		This limit applies to edible acid casein, edible rennet casein and edible caseinate, intended for direct consumption or further processing. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 290-1995.	
Salt, food grade	2	Adopted	CXS 150-1985	NFSDU, FA		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 150-1985.	
Natural mineral waters	1 mg/l	Adopted	CXS 108-1981	NMW, CF		Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 108-1981.	

- 1) The revised Standards for oils and fats contain the following wording for the mentioned contaminant MLs: “The products covered by the provisions of this Standard shall comply with MLs being established by the CAC but in the meantime the following limits will apply.”

Copper as cupric sulfate has been evaluated by JECFA in 1966, 1970, and 1982. The PMTDI was established to be 0.05-0.5 mg/kg bw. A provisional guidance value of 0.5 mg/kg bw/day was proposed in 1966 on the understanding that a very considerable margin appeared to exist between normal intakes and those that could lead to chronic copper poisoning, and that the dietary levels of those constituents such as molybdenum and zinc, which are known to affect copper metabolism, lie within normal limits. JECFA14 concluded in 1970 from more recent food analyses that the daily intake of 20 mg was likely to be exceeded by significant sections of the population with no apparent deleterious effects. On this basis the tentative assessment of the maximum acceptable daily load of 0.5 mg/kg bodyweight was retained. JECFA26 (1982) reaffirmed the provisional value based on the same rationale.

In EHC 200 (1998) it was concluded that the upper limit of the acceptable range of oral intake (AROI) in adults is uncertain but is most likely in the range of several but not many mg/day in adults (several meaning more than 2 or 3 mg/day). This evaluation was based solely on studies of gastrointestinal effects of copper-contaminated drinking water. The available data on toxicity in animals were not considered helpful in establishing the upper limit of the AROI due to uncertainty about an appropriate model for humans, but they help to establish a mode of action for the response.

WHO established a drinking water guideline of 2 mg/liter in 2003, based on the 1993 Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality, 2nd edition, where a provisional health-based guideline value of 2 mg/liter for copper was derived from the PMTDI of 0.5 mg/kg bw/day as proposed by JECFA26. The document mentioned that this PMTDI was based on a rather old study in dogs, that did not take into account differences in copper metabolism between infants and adults, but this rationale could not be found in the JECFA26 (see above).

Copper in Natural Mineral Waters

CCCF2 (2008) considered the proposed draft amendments to Section 3.2 “Health-Related Limits for Certain Substances” of the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters, referred by CCNMW08. The Committee also considered whether the health-related provision in Section 3.2 should be included in Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was pointed out that iron, zinc and copper had been considered as quality factors rather than safety factors and therefore the levels for those substances had been currently not included in

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Copper**

Schedule I of the GSCTF. It was noted that some delegations believed that the level for copper was based on both safety and quality parameters of mineral water. CCCF2 temporarily endorsed the section pending elaboration of appropriate methods of analyses by CCMAS and decided to postpone the decision on inclusion of those substances in the GSCTF (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 23-27). After establishment of an EWG by CCCF4, CCCF5 (2011) agreed to inform the Commission to remove the footnote which indicated the temporary endorsement (footnote 3) from the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters (CXS 108-1981) as there was no need for the endorsement of these sections since there was no safety concern associated with these compounds at the proposed levels. The Committee did not integrate the levels in the GSCTFF (REP11/CF, para 89-90).

Copper in salt, food grade

CCFA43 (2011) started a new work on the revision of the Standard for Food Grade Salt (CXS 150-1985). The copper had been moved to section 3.2 “Naturally present secondary products and contaminants”. Copper had no entry in the GSCTFF and was also a micronutrient and its level in food was considered to reflect quality aspects rather than safety issues. Its presence as a contaminant might result from the use of copper-based equipment in salt production.

The Committee did not support proposals to increase the maximum level for copper to 10 mg/kg because there were not sufficient data to justify this. The Committee agreed to forward the revised proposed draft Standard to CAC34 for adoption at Step 5. (REP11/FA, paras. 131 and 136)

CAC34 (2011) adopted the revised proposed draft Standard at Step 5 and CAC35 (2012) adopted the the revised draft Standard at Step 8. (REP11/CAC, para. 116, and REP12/CAC, para. 145)

Copper is both an essential nutrient and a drinking-water contaminant. It has many commercial uses. It is used to make pipes, valves and fittings and is present in alloys and coatings. Copper sulfate pentahydrate is sometimes added to surface water for the control of algae. Dissolved copper can sometimes impart a light blue or blue-green colour and an unpleasant metallic, bitter taste to drinking-water.

Dietary copper intake will vary with the types of food consumed, the condition of the soils the foods are produced on (e.g. copper content) and drinking-water characteristics. Copper is ubiquitously distributed in foods, but the richest sources of copper in food are liver, seafood (especially shellfish and crustaceans), grains, cereal products and potatoes, which contribute to about 65% of total dietary intake. Also, drinking-water may contribute for a considerable part to the total daily intake of copper. The average daily intake of copper has been estimated to range from 0.5 to 0.7 mg for infants 6 months of age or less up to 2-3 mg for adults, however this level is likely to be exceeded in arid areas where there may be a high intake of water containing high levels of copper.

Sensitivity to the toxic effects of excess dietary copper is influenced by its chemical form, species, and interaction with other dietary minerals. High levels can cause symptoms of acute toxicity, including nausea, abdominal discomfort (diarrhea), emesis, haemoglobinuria and/or haematuria, jaundice, oliguria/anuria, hypotension, coma and death. Histopathological effects were observed in the gastrointestinal tract, liver and kidney. WHO (1974) concluded that the fatal oral human dose is about 200 mg/kg. There is limited information on chronic copper toxicity. However, copper does not appear to be a cumulative toxic hazard for man, except for individuals suffering from Wilson's disease. Copper is not considered to be mutagenic, carcinogenic or affect reproduction. Teratogenicity/embryotoxicity is observed in some animal studies.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Iron**

Reference to JECFA:	27 (1983)
Toxicological guidance value:	PMTDI 0.8 mg/kg bw (1983, Group PMTDI, applies to iron from all sources except for iron oxides used as colouring agent, supplemental iron taken during pregnancy and lactation, and supplemental iron for specific clinical requirements)
Contaminant definition:	Iron, total
Synonyms:	Fe

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Edible fats and oils, refined (not covered by individual standards)	2.5	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Edible fats and oils, virgin (not covered by individual standards)	5.0	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Edible fats and oils, cold pressed (not covered by individual standards)	5.0	Adopted	CXS 19-1981	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 19-1981.	
Named vegetable oils, virgin	5.0	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	OC 0172

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Iron**

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Named vegetable oils, refine	1.5	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	OR 0172
Crude palm kernel olein	5.0	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	
Crude palm kernel stearin	7.0	Adopted	CXS 210-1999	FO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 210-1999.	
Olive oils and olive-pomace oils	3.0	Adopted	CXS 33-1981	PO		This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 33-1981.	
Named animal fats	1.5	Adopted	CXS 211-1999	FO		Lard, rendered pork fat, premier jus and edible tallow. This quality factor is supplementary information to the essential composition and quality factors of the standard. A product, which meets the essential quality and composition factors but does not meet this supplementary factor, may still conform to the standard. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 211-1999.	

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Iron**

Commodity/Product Name	Maximum Level (ML) (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
Milkfat products	0.2	Adopted	CXS 280-1973	MMP		This limit applies to anhydrous milkfat, milkfat, anhydrous butteroil and butter oil and ghee. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 280-1973.	
Casein products	20	Adopted	CXS 290-1995	MMP		50 mg/kg in roller dried caseinates. This limit applies to edible acid casein, edible rennet casein and edible caseinate, intended for direct consumption or further processing. Relevant Codex commodity standard is CXS 290-1995.	

Iron has been evaluated by JECFA in 1983. The PMTDI is established to 0.8 mg/kg bw as a precaution against storage in the body of excessive iron. (Hydrated) iron oxides have been evaluated by JECFA in 1974, 1978 and 1979 (based on their use as colouring agents). An ADI of 0.5 mg/kg bw was established for these iron forms.

WHO did not propose a health-based guideline value for iron in drinking-water 1993 Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality, but it was mentioned that a value of about 2 mg/litre can be derived from the PMTDI established in 1983 by JECFA as a precaution against storage in the body of excessive iron.

Iron is one of the most abundant metals in the Earth's crust. It is found in natural fresh waters at levels ranging from 0.5 to 50 mg/liter. Iron may also be present in drinking-water as a result of the use of iron coagulants or the corrosion of steel and cast iron pipes during water distribution.

Iron is an essential trace element required by all forms of life. In man it is required for the synthesis of haem proteins and in many enzyme systems. Various groups (male, female, children, pregnant, lactating) differ in requirement for iron, iron deficiency is one of the most common nutritional deficiencies in children, in women of child bearing age, and pregnant women. It rarely occurs in adult men, except in cases of chronic bleeding.

Iron occurs as a natural constituent of all foods of plant and animal origin, and may also be present in drinking water. In food it occurs as iron oxides, inorganic and organic salts or organic complexes such as haem iron. Processing may affect the chemical form of iron. Levels of iron range from low for many fruits, vegetables and fats, to medium for red meats, chicken, eggs, whole wheat flour, to high for organ tissues, fish, green vegetables and tomatoes. Meat and grain contribute to a great part of diet-derived iron. Other important dietary sources include water, beverages and iron medication. The average daily intake of iron has been estimated to be 17 mg/day for males and 9-12 mg/day for females. Iron fortification of food, but also contamination of food during its preparation (iron-rich soil) could increase the intake of iron. The chemical form of the dietary iron is important for determining the amount of iron available for absorption, but also the source of iron (plant or animal), its interaction with other food components and the body's need for iron (mucosal regulation) affect absorption.

Quality factors**Iron**

The effects of toxic doses of iron in animal studies are characterized by initial depression, coma, convulsion, respiratory failure and cardiac arrest. Post-mortem examination reveals adverse effects on the gastrointestinal tract. No long-term feeding studies are available, however, injection-site tumors have been observed in several animals studies after injection with iron preparations. Some iron-forms were found positive in mutagenicity tests. No teratogenic effects or effects on reproduction were observed.

In human, acute toxicity of iron ingested from normal dietary sources has not been reported; the amount of iron absorbed in normal subjects is subject to mucosal regulation so that excessive iron is not stored in the body. However, subjects with impaired ability to regulate iron absorption (i.e. suffering from idiopathic haemochromatosis), will be at risk from excessive exposure to iron. Excess iron intake may result in siderosis (deposition of iron in tissue) in liver, pancreas, adrenals, thyroid, pituitary and heart depending on the chemical form. Haemochromatosis patients suffer from liver cirrhosis, adrenal insufficiency, heart failure or diabetes. It is unknown whether excessive iron in the diet of individuals with impaired ability to regulate iron absorption will accelerate the clinical symptoms of the disease or increase the incidence of preclinical haemochromatosis.

List of Maximum Levels for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, Part 2

Quality factors**Zinc**

Reference to JECFA: 10 (1966), 26 (1982)
 Toxicological guidance value: PMTDI 0.3-1 mg/kg bw (1982)
 Contaminant definition: Zinc, total
 Synonyms: Zn

Commodity / Product Name	Level (mg/kg)	Step	Reference or Adoption year	Ref to CC	Portion of the Commodity/Product to which the ML applies	Notes/Remarks	Notes for CCCF
No ML							

Zinc has been evaluated by JECFA in 1966 and 1982. The PMTDI is established to 0.3-1 mg/kg bw, based on clinical studies in which up to 600 mg of zinc sulfate (equivalent to 200 mg elemental zinc) has been administered daily in divided doses for a period of several months, without any reported adverse effects, including effects on blood counts and serum biochemistry. There is a wide margin between nutritionally required amounts of zinc and toxic levels.

WHO proposed in 2003 that, taking into account recent studies on humans, the derivation of a guideline value was not required at the time. It was stated however, that drinking-water containing zinc at levels above 3 mg/litre may not be acceptable to consumers based on taste considerations.

Zinc is a ubiquitous metal present in the environment, most rocks and many minerals contain zinc which can be used for the zinc industry. Zinc is utilized as protective coating of other metals, dye casting, construction industry, for alloys, dry cell batteries, dental, medical and household applications, fungicide, topical antibiotics and lubricants. Natural emissions results from erosion and forest fires. Anthropogenic sources are mining, zinc production facilities, iron and steel production, corrosion of galvanized structures, coal and fuel combustion, waste disposal and the use of zinc-containing fertilizers and pesticides.

Zinc is an essential trace element; the requirement for zinc changes throughout life and health effects associated with zinc deficiency are numerous. Zinc occurs as a natural constituent in all plant and animal tissues and functions as an integral part of several enzyme systems. Protein foods are important dietary sources of zinc. Levels range from high for oysters with lesser amounts in other seafood, muscle meats, nuts, whole cereals. Sugar, citrus fruits and non-leafy vegetables are poor sources of zinc. The interaction with other dietary factors affects the absorption of zinc. The average daily intake of zinc has been estimated to be maximally 20 mg/day for adults.

In animal studies, zinc in toxic doses caused weakness, anorexia, anemia, diminished growth, loss of hair, lowered food utilization, changes in the levels of liver and serum enzymes, morphological and enzymatic changes in the brain, and histological and functional changes in the kidney. The haematopoietic system, kidney and pancreas were found to be the target organs after long-term oral exposure to zinc. Genotoxicity tests failed to prove that zinc is mutagenic and only (very) high levels of zinc showed teratogenic effects or effects on reproduction.

In human, high levels of zinc cause acute effects such as vomiting and gastrointestinal irritation (nausea, cramps, diarrhea), however when bound to food components (i.e. meat, oysters) these effects are expected to be less. No information is available on toxic effects in man due to chronic excessive intake of zinc, however impaired copper uptake in humans has been noted following the chronic elevated intake of zinc. Some effects of zinc therefore may be secondary to impaired copper utilization (i.e. anemia).

Annex: PREVIOUS JECFA EVALUATIONS AND FAO/WHO EXPERT CONSULTATION REPORTS AND CCCF FOLLOW-UP

Table of contents

Part 1: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards under consideration of follow-up action

action	2
Ergot alkaloids	2
Furan	2
Fumonisin (including evaluation for co-exposure with aflatoxins)	3
Trichothecenes (T-2, HT-2 and DAS)	4

Part 2: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards with agreed / ongoing follow-up

Acrylamide	5
Aflatoxins	6
Arsenic	7
Cadmium	8
Dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs	9
Lead	10
Methylmercury	12
Pyrrolizidine alkaloids	12
Sterigmatocystin	13
Tropane alkaloids	13

Part 3: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards with follow-up completed/not required

required	14
Acrylamide	14
Aflatoxin M ₁	14
Aflatoxins	15
Aluminium	16
Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (Azaspiracid group, Brevetoxin group, Cyclic Imines group, Domoic acid group, Okadaic acid group, Pectenotoxins group, Saxitoxin group, Yessotoxin group)	17
Cadmium	18
Cadmium	19
Chrolopropanols and Glycidol	19
Chrolopropanols	20
Ciguatoxin	20
Cyanogenic glycosides	21
Deoxynivalenol	22
Diacetoxyscirpenol (including T-2 and HT-2 toxin)	22
Ethyl carbamate	23
Fumonisin	23

Melamine	24
Mercury	24
Methylmercury	25
Methylmercury	26
Ochratoxin A	27
PAHs	29
PBDEs	29
Non-dioxin-like PCBs	30
Perchlorate	30
Radionuclides	31
Tin	31
Trichothecenes, T2 and HT-2	31

Index by meeting	32
------------------	----

Note: Evaluations by JECFA and FAO/WHO expert consultation prior to 2005 have not been included in this version of the inventory due to time constraints related to editing. This will be taken into consideration as a point for improvement in future versions.

Part 1: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards under consideration of follow-up action

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Ergot alkaloids						
JECFA-91 (1-12/2/2021)	5/3/2021 (summary) 23/11/2022 (report) 31/3/2023 (monograph)	JECFA91 noted that some estimates of chronic and acute dietary exposure exceeded the EAs group HBGV, and that this may indicate a human health concern. JECFA91 recommended the establishment of sampling plans for EAs.	CCCF15 (2022) agreed to request JECFA to issue a call for data on the occurrence of ergot alkaloids. (REP22/CF15 para.224iv) CCCF16 (2023) agreed to reconsider the opportunity to develop discussion papers on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on ergot alkaloids. (REP23/CF16 para.113(ii)) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to reconsider the elaboration of a discussion paper on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on ergot alkaloids. (REP24/CF para.164(ii))	CX/CF 16/10/13	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (mycotoxin – spices)	N/A
Furan						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report) 13/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA72 calculated MOE at the dietary exposures to furan for consumers with average and high exposure. This estimate will also cover dietary exposure of children. The Committee considered that these MOEs indicate a human health concern for a carcinogenic compound. The furan levels can be reduced in some foods through volatilization (e.g. by heating and stirring canned or jarred foods in an open saucepan). However, there is currently a lack of quantitative data for all foods, and no information is available on other mitigation methods.	CCCF4 (2010) agreed that a discussion paper prepared by EWG would be presented to the next session. (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.116) CCCF5 (2011) agreed that discussion on furan could be taken up when more adequate data became available. (REP11/CF para.79)	CX/CF 11/5/13	N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Fumonisin (including evaluation for co-exposure with aflatoxins)						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	30/3/2017 (report) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	JECFA83 noted that the international exposure estimates for FB1 and total fumonisins were lower than those estimated at JECFA74(2011) but it is likely that the exposures to fumonisins in areas where maize is a staple food and high contamination with fumonisins can occur are higher than those estimated. The Committee recommended that exposure to fumonisins be reduced, particularly in areas where maize is the major dietary staple food and where high contamination can occur. [Co-exposure of fumonisins with aflatoxins] JECFA 83 concluded that there are few data available to support co-exposure as a contributing factor in human disease. However, the interaction between AFB1 and fumonisins remains a concern. The Committee recommended to reduce human exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins, alone or in combination, in particular in developing countries.	CCCCF11 (2017) noted that the issue of fumonisins had been addressed by the in-session WG on follow-up of JECFA83 and that the resulting call for data/CL could also include spices besides maize. (REP17/CF para. 121) CCCCF11 agreed to call upon countries belonging to the African, Eastern Mediterranean or South-East Asia regions to provide information on fumonisin levels in maize. (REP17/CF para.151)		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (mycotoxin – spices)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Trichothecenes (T-2, HT-2 and DAS)						
JECFA-93 (24-30/3/2022)	12/4/2022 (summary) 31/3/2023 (report) 15/7/2024 (monograph)	JECFA93 concluded that dietary exposure estimates for the sum of T-2 and HT-2 are higher than the group TDI of 25 ng/kg bw, indicating a possible health concern. The estimates of acute dietary exposure to DAS in combination with T-2 and HT-2 should be carried out at a future meeting.	CCCCF15 (2022) agreed to request JECFA to issue a call for data on the occurrence of T-2 and HT-2 toxin and diacetoxyscirpenol. (REP22/CF15 para.224iv) CCCCF16 (2023) agreed to reconsider the opportunity to develop discussion papers on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on trichothecenes (T-2, HT-3 and DAS). (REP23/CF16 para.113(ii)) CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to reconsider the elaboration of a discussion paper on the need and feasibility of possible follow-up actions on trichothecenes T-2, HT-2, and DAS. (REP24/CF para. 164(ii))		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin–cereals)	N/A

"N/A" indicates that no new or revised COPs or MLs have been established as follow-up actions to the JECFA evaluation. COPs adopted prior to the JECFA evaluations or established through processes other than follow-up actions are listed as “relevant COP”.

Part 2: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards with agreed / ongoing follow-up

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Acrylamide						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report) 13/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA72 noted that mitigation after 2003 has been reported for food types with high acrylamide levels or single products that contain higher levels within their food type. The Committee recommended further efforts on developing and implementing mitigation methods for acrylamide in foods of major importance for dietary exposure.	CCCF4 (2010) agreed to reconsider work on acrylamide in future to allow sufficient time for the implementation of the COP. (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.105) CCCF16 (2023) agreed to establish an EWG to develop a discussion paper on acrylamide taking into account the most recent JECFA evaluation. (REP23/CF16 para. 133(iv)) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to re-establish the EWG to develop a discussion paper with a proposal for a draft revised COP (CXC67-2009). (REP24/CF17 para.114 (i))	CX/CF 24/17/12	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 67-2009 (acrylamide–food)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Aflatoxins						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	JECFA/83/SC (summary) 30/3/2017 (report) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	JECFA83 noted that international dietary exposure estimates for AFB1 and AFM1, AFM1 will generally make a negligible (<1%) contribution to aflatoxin-induced cancer risk for the general population. The Committee concluded that enforcing an ML for ready-to-eat peanuts would have little further impact on dietary exposure. The Committee recommended that efforts continue to reduce aflatoxin exposure. Based on their contribution in some areas of the world, rice, wheat and sorghum need to be considered in future risk management activities. [Impact assessment for RTE peanuts] JECFA83 calculated that five food commodities (maize, peanuts, rice, sorghum and wheat) each contribute more than 10% to international dietary exposure estimates for more than one GEMS/Food cluster diets, for either AFT or AFB1. The Committee performed an impact assessment of different MLs for RTE peanuts and concluded that enforcing an ML of 10, 8 or 4 µg/kg for RTE peanuts would have little further impact on dietary exposure to AFT for the general population, compared with setting an ML of 15 µg/kg. At an ML of 4 µg/kg, the proportion of the world market of RTE peanuts rejected would be approximately double the proportion rejected at an ML of 15 µg/kg (about 20% versus 10%).	[cereals] CCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper on AFT and sterigmatocystin in cereals. (REP17/CF para.151) CCCF15 (2022) agreed to advance the MLs in cereals to CAC for adoption (Step 5/8) and review them in 5 years' time. (REP22/CF15 para. 154(ii)) [peanuts] CCCF10 (2016) agreed to consider MLs for AFT in peanuts at the next session. (REP16/CF para.173) CCCF11 (2017) discussed the revised proposed draft ML of 15 µg/kg, prepared by India as chair of the EWG based on the outcome of JECFA83. In view of the lack of consensus on the recommendation and the need for further consideration of the JECFA report, the Committee agreed to request comments on the levels of 10 µg/kg or 15 µg/kg at Step 3. (REP17/CF para.108) CCCF12 (2018) agreed that JECFA would issue a call for data in three-years' time and that an EWG would be established. (REP18/CF para.115) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to establish an EWG to develop the ML in RTE peanuts. (REP24/CF17 para.80(ii)) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to new work on the revision of COP (CXC55-2004). (REP24/CF17 para.123(i))	[cereals] CX/CF 18/12/15 CX/CF 19/13/15 CX/CF 21/14/10 CX/CF 21/14/10- Part II CX/CF 22/15/9 CX/CF 23/16/7 [ML for RTE peanuts] CX/CF 16/10/8 CX/CF 18/12/10 CX/CF 22/15/10 CX/CF 23/16/8 CX/CF 24/17/7 [COP for peanuts] CX/CF 24/17/14	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin–cereals) CXC 55-2004 (aflatoxins–peanuts) CXC 78-2017 (mycotoxin – spices) CXC 82-2023 (mycotoxins – cassava) CXC 59-2005 (aflatoxins–tree nuts) CXC 65-2008 (aflatoxin–dried fig)	[cereals] maize grain, destined for further processing; flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize; husked rice; polished rice; sorghum grain, destined for further processing; cereal-based food for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs); cereal-based food for infants and young children for food aid programs (REP22/CAC para.71)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Arsenic						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report)	JECFA72 noted that drinking-water was a major contributor to total inorganic arsenic dietary exposures and, depending on the concentration, can also be an important source of arsenic in food through food preparation and possibly irrigation of crops, particularly rice. For certain regions of the world where concentrations of inorganic arsenic in drinking-water are elevated. There is a possibility that adverse effects could occur as a result of exposure to inorganic arsenic from water and food, but these would be at a low incidence that would be difficult to detect in epidemiological studies.	CCCCF4 (2010) agreed that an EWG would prepare a discussion paper. (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.107) CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to initiate new work on arsenic in rice. (REP11/CF para.64) [ML] CCCCF8 (2014) agreed to forward the draft ML in polished rice to CAC37 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP14/CF para. 46) CCCCF10 (2016) agreed to advance the ML for husked rice for adoption (Step 8) by CAC39 and review the ML three years after the implementation of the COP. (REP16/CF para. 44) [COP] CCCCF8 (2014) agreed to initiate new work on a COP for rice. (REP14/CF para.95) CCCCF11 (2017) agreed to send the proposed draft COP to CAC40 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP17/CF para.103)	CX/CF 11/5/10 [ML] CX/CF 12/6/8 CX/CF 14/8/6 CX/CF 15/9/7 CX/CF 16/10/5 [COP] CX/CF 13/7/14 CX/CF 14/8/13 CX/CF 15/9/8 CX/CF 16/10/8	CXC 77-2017 (arsenic-rice)	polished rice (REP14/CAC para.79-82)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Cadmium						
JECFA-91 (1-12/2/2021)	5/3/2021 (summary) 23/11/2022 (report) 31/3/2023 (monograph)	JECFA91 reassessed cadmium exposure to include the contribution of all food sources and concluded that major contributors were cereals and cereal products, vegetables and seafood. Application of both established and proposed MLs for chocolate and cocoa powder may result in substantial rejection rates (up to 30%) for products from some regions but has only a minor impact (mean decrease across clusters of 0.7%, range 0.0–2.4%) on total dietary cadmium exposure.	CCCCF14 agreed to advance the ML of 0.3mg/kg for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids to Step 8 for adoption by CAC44. (REP21/CF , paras. 18-27) CCCCF15 agreed to advance an ML of 2.0 mg/kg for cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis) to CAC45 for adoption at Step 5/8. (REP22/CF15 , paras. 42-61) CCCCF16 (2023) agreed that the USA would prepare a discussion paper to consider the development a CoP to prevent or reduce cadmium contamination in foods (REP23/CF, para. 139). CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to start new work on a COP and establish an EWG. (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 133(i))	[COP for cocoa] CX/CF 22/15/6 CX/CF 21/14/7 [ML for cocoa products] CX/CF 21/14/5 CX/CF 21/14/6 CX/CF 22/15/5 [General COP] CX/CF 24/17/16	CXC 81-2022 (cocoa beans)	Chocolates containing or declaring < 30% total cocoa solid on a dry matter basis, Chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solid on a dry matter basis (REP21/CAC , para. 44) Cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis ready for consumption) (REP22/CAC , para. 65)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs						
Ad-hoc Joint FAO/WHO Expert consultation on risks and benefits of fish consumption (9-13/10/2023)	1/11/2023 (summary) 25/9/2024 (background) 25/10/2024 (report)	The Expert Consultation recommended that Member States: • Collect standardized data on fish contaminants and nutrients. • Develop, maintain and improve existing databases on levels and trends over time of specific contaminants, in particular MeHg, dioxins and dl-PCBs for fish consumed by region. • Collect standardized data on dietary intake of fish including amount, type and source, representative at regional, national or subnational levels for quantitative risk-benefit assessment of fish. • Develop and evaluate risk analysis strategies (risk assessment, risk management and risk communication) that maximize benefits and minimize risks from consuming fish.	CCCCF17 (2024) noted the information provided. (REP24/CF17 para.18) CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to address the recommendations in the frame of ongoing discussion on the Guidance on data analysis. (REP24/CF187 para.164(i))		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 62-2006 (Dioxin, Dioxins-like PCBs and non-Dioxin-like PCBs in Food and Feed)	N/A
WHO expert consultation on updating the 2005 toxic equivalency factors for dioxin like compounds, including some polychlorinated biphenyls (October 2022)	Publication (DeVito et al., 2024)	• An updated database of dioxins and PCBs was used to derive 2022 WHO-TEFs. • A consensus-based weighting scheme and Bayesian methodology was applied. • “Best-Estimate” TEFs were derived following this procedure. • “Best-Estimate” TEFs were the basis to derive new 2022 WHO-TEFs.	CCCCF17 (2024) noted the information provided. (REP24/CF17 para.18) CCCCF17 kept dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in a priority list for future JECFA evaluation (REP24/CF, Appendix X).		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 62-2006 (Dioxin, Dioxins-like PCBs and non-Dioxin-like PCBs in Food and Feed)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Lead						
JECFA-73 (8-17/6/2010)	16/1/2011 (report) 16/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA73 re-evaluated lead and concluded that the effects on neurodevelopment and systolic blood pressure provided the appropriate bases for dose–response analyses. The Committee concluded that, in populations with prolonged dietary exposures to lead that are at the higher end of the ranges identified above, measures should be taken to identify major contributing sources and foods and, if appropriate, to identify methods of reducing dietary exposure that are commensurate with the level of risk reduction.	CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to establish an EWG to reconsider the existing MLs. (REP11/CF para. 96) CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to start new work on the revision of MLs in some commodities. (REP12/CF para.126) CCCCF7 (2013), CCCC8 (2014), CCCC9 (2015), CCCC10 (2016), CCCC11 (2017), CCCC12 (2018), CCCC13 (2019) agreed to advance the draft MLs for adoption (Step 5/8) by CAC. (REP14/CF para.33; REP15/CF para.49-51; REP16/CF para.89; REP17/CF para.88; REP18/CF para.45; REP19/CF para.44) CCCC14 (2021) agreed discontinue work on an ML for herbal teas, yoghurt, cheese and milk-based products for infants and young children at this time. (REP21/CF para.101) CCCC15 (2022) agreed to discontinue work on fresh eggs, dried garlic and molasses. (REP22/CF15 para.102) CCCC17 (2024) discussed on MLs in herbs, spices etc. (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 61) [COP] CCCC13 (2019) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a revised COP (CXC 56-2004). (REP19/CF para.107(ii)) CCCC14 (2021) agreed to forward the revised COP (CXS 56- 2004) to CAC44 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP21/CF para.106)	[ML] CX/CF 12/6/13 CX/CF 13/7/5 CX/CF 14/8/5 CX/CF 15/9/5 CX/CF 16/10/7 CX/CF 18/12/5 CX/CF 19/13/5 CX/CF 21/14/8 CX/CF 22/15/7 CX/CF 23/16/5 CX/CF 24/17/5 [Future work on ML] CX/CF 18/12/14 CX/CF 19/13/9 [COP] CX/CF 19/13/11 CX/CF 21/14/9	CXC 56-2004 (lead–foods) (revised2021)	Infant Formula and Formula for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants and for Follow up Formula; (Revision) (REP14/CAC para.74-79) Fruit Juices and Nectars, Ready-to-drink; Canned Fruits; Canned Vegetables; Berries and Other Small Fruits; Cranberry; Currant; Elderberry; Brassica Vegetables; Legume Vegetables; Fruiting Vegetables, Cucurbits; Fruiting Vegetables, Other than Cucurbits; (REP15/CAC Appendix III) fruit juices and nectars ready-to-drink ; canned fruits; canned vegetables; pickled cucumbers; table olives; (REP16/CAC para.74) Edible Fats ,Oils; Pulses; Jams, Jellies, Marmalades; Preserved Tomatoes; Canned Chestnuts, Canned Chestnuts Puree; (REP17/CAC para.57)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
			[quinoa] CAC40 (2017) requested that CCCF consider including quinoa in the MLs for lead and cadmium in cereals in the GSCTFF. (REP17/CAC, para.81(ii)) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to forward the ML in quinoa for adoption by CAC47. (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 119)	[quinoa] CX/CF 19/13/10 CX/CF 21/14/13 CX/CF 24/17/13		selected commodities; (REP18/CAC Appendix III) wines; fortified / liqueur wines; edible offal (cattle, pig and poultry); (Revision) (REP19/CAC para.51) fruit juices and grape juice; (Revision) (REP21/CAC para.44) cereal-based foods for infants and young children; white and refined sugar, corn and maple syrups, honey; sugar-based candies; (REP22/CAC para.65) ready-to-eat meals for infants and young children; soft brown, raw and non-centrifugal sugars; (REP23/CAC para.68,69) spices; quinoa; (REP24/CAC para.63)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Methylmercury						
Ad-hoc Joint FAO/WHO Expert consultation on risks and benefits of fish consumption (9-13/10/2023)	1/11/2023 (summary) 25/9/2024 (background) 25/10/2024 (report)	The Expert Consultation recommended that Member States: • Collect standardized data on fish contaminants and nutrients. • Develop, maintain and improve existing databases on levels and trends over time of specific contaminants, in particular MeHg, dioxins and dl-PCBs for fish consumed by region. • Collect standardized data on dietary intake of fish including amount, type and source, representative at regional, national or subnational levels for quantitative risk-benefit assessment of fish. • Develop and evaluate risk analysis strategies (risk assessment, risk management and risk communication) that maximize benefits and minimize risks from consuming fish.	CCCCF17 (2024) noted the information provided. (REP24/CF17 para.18) CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to address the recommendations in the frame of ongoing discussion on the Guidance on data analysis. (REP24/CF187 para.164(i))		N/A	N/A
Pyrrolizidine alkaloids						
JECFA-80 (16-25/6/2015)	16/2/2016 (report) 27/11/2020 (monograph-pyrrolizidine alkaloids)	JECFA80 noted that the calculated MOEs for honey and tea for high consumers (and for average tea consumption by children) indicated a concern. Based on average exposure, the MOEs were of less concern (except for the exposure of children from tea consumption). The Committee noted that exposure to PAs resulted from other food items as well, and animal products such as milk might contribute to the total exposure as a result of the presence of PAs in feed.	CCCCF10 (2016) noted that it was premature to develop a discussion paper at this point and agreed to discuss PAs at its next Session once the full JECFA evaluation becomes available. (REP16/CF para.169, 173) CCCCF15 (2022) agreed to re-convene the EWG to prepare a discussion paper. (REP22/CF15 para.224i) CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to further develop the discussion paper on the revision of the COP which would address also practices for honey. (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 104(i))	CX/CF 23/16/11 CX/CF 24/17/10	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 74-2014 (pyrrolizidine alkaloids in food and feed)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Sterigmatocystin						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	30/3/2017 (report) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	JECFA83 noted that estimates for the African Region based only on adult populations and for which only one food commodity (sorghum) was considered may indicate a human health concern. MOEs were not calculated for Europe or Japan, as sterigmatocystin was not detected in any samples. For all other regions, JECFA83 considered that the MOEs were not of human health concern even at the UB high exposure.	CCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper on AFT and sterigmatocystin in cereals. (REP17/CF para.151) CCCF12 (2018) noted that it was premature to set MLs due to the lack of analytical method and consideration could be given to development of an annex to COP (CXC51-2003). (REP18/CF para.132)	CX/CF 18/12/15	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (Mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (Mycotoxin - spices)	N/A
Tropane alkaloids						
FAO/WHO Expert meeting on Tropane Alkaloids (30/3- 3/4/2020)	2020	The expert meeting considered that the dietary exposures related to WFP products to be low concern for the target population. Based on the recommended intake of various WFP products of 100 g/day, a combined hyoscyamine/scopolamine concentration in dry food of less than approximately 30 µg/kg (in Super Cereal) or 10 µg/kg (in Super Cereal Plus and Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements) should be health protective for adults and children respectively.	CCCF14 (2021) agreed to issue a CL on possible follow-up actions. (REP21/CF para.235ii) CCCF15 (2022) agreed to reconsider follow-up actions on tropane alkaloids. (REP22/CF15 para.224 iii) CCCF16 (2023) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper on tropane alkaloids. (REP23/CF16 para.113(i)) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to re-establish the EWG to prepare a revised discussion paper including proposal for a new COP. (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 109(1))	CX/CF 24/17/11	N/A	N/A

"N/A" indicates that no new or revised COPs or MLs have been established as follow-up actions to the JECFA evaluation. COPs adopted prior to the JECFA evaluations or established through processes other than follow-up actions are listed as "relevant COP".

Part 3: Contaminants and toxins assessed from 2005 onwards with follow-up completed/not required

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Acrylamide						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 considered that average and high level of intake of acrylamide of the general population may indicate a human health concern. Therefore, appropriate efforts to reduce concentrations of acrylamide in food and beverage should be continued.	CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to start new work on the COP. (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.188) CCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the draft COP to the CAC32 for adoption (Step 8). (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.64 , Appendix IV)	CX/FAC 04/36/34 CX/FAC 05/37/33 CX/FAC 06/38/35 [draft COP] CX/CF 07/1/15 CX/CF 08/2/8	CXC 67-2009 (acrylamide–food)	N/A
Aflatoxin M₁						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	30/3/2017 (report) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	JECFA83 noted that given the relative cancer potencies and international dietary exposure estimates for AFB1 and AFM1, AFM1 will generally make a negligible (<1%) contribution to aflatoxin-induced cancer risk for the general population. [co-exposure with fumonisins] There was no co-occurrence of AFM 1 and FB 1 or AFB 1 and FB 1 in infant formula from data in the GEMS/Food contaminants database, because there were no detections of FB1 in infant formula. There were no papers identified in the literature reporting FB1 levels in infant formula. Therefore, there is no indication that there would be co-exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins from infant formula.	No mention of follow-up under the CCCF in the report.		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 45-1997 (AFB1 – raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Aflatoxins						
JECFA-68 (19-28/6/2007)	7/1/2007 (report) 10/8/2008 (monograph)	JECFA68 considered that ML at 20 µg/kg in almonds, Brazil nuts, hazelnuts, pistachios and dried figs would have an impact on the relative contribution to dietary AFT exposure only in certain clusters, and this is due solely to the elevated AFT level in pistachios. For the tree nuts other than pistachios, the presence of an ML has no effect on dietary AFT exposure evaluated. The Committee noted that the reduction of dietary AFT exposure is an important public health goal, particularly in populations that consume high levels of any potentially AFT-contaminated food.	[tree nuts] CCCCF1 (2007) agreed to resume discussion on MLs after the results of the 68th JECFA evaluation are available. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.57) CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the MLs for total aflatoxins in almonds, hazelnuts and pistachios to CAC31 for adoption (Step 8). (ALINORM 08/31/41 para.127) CCCCF3 (2009) agreed to initiate new work on the revision of the COP (CXC 59-2005). (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.123) CCCCF4 (2010) agreed to forward the MLs in Brazil nuts and the draft revision of COP (CXC59-2005) to CAC33 for adoption (Step 5/8). (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.76 and 85)	[ML for Almonds, Hazelnuts and Pistachios] CX/CF 07/1/9 CX/CF 08/2/10 CX/CF 08/2/11 [ML for Brazil nuts] CX/CF 07/1/10 CX/CF 08/2/12 CX/CF 09/3/7 CX/CF 10/4/6 [COP] CX/CF 10/4/7	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 59-2005 (aflatoxins–tree nuts)	Almonds, Hazelnuts and Pistachios “For further processing” and “Ready-to-eat” (ALINORM 08/31/REP Appendix VII)
			[dried figs] CCCCF1 (2007) agreed to establish an EWG on dried figs. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.121) CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the draft COP to CAC31 for adoption (Step 5/8). (ALINORM 08/31/41 para.163) CCCCF4 (2010) agreed to initiate new work on MLs in dried figs. (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.114) CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to forward ML for dried figs to CAC35 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP12/CF para.82)	CX/CF 07/1/20 [COP] CX/CF 08/2/13 [ML] CX/CF 12/6/10		Shelled, Ready-to-Eat Brazil Nuts and Shelled, Destined for Further Processing Brazil Nuts (ALINORM 10/33/REP Appendix III)
					N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 65-2008 (aflatoxin–dried fig)	Dried Figs, including Sampling Plan (REP12/CAC Appendix III)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Aluminium						
JECFA-67 (20-29/6/2006)	1/1/2007 (report) 10/8/2007 (monograph)	JECFA67 established a PTWI for Al of 1 mg/kg bw for all aluminium compounds in food. The Committee noted that the PTWI is likely to be exceeded to a large extent by some population groups, particularly children, who regularly consume foods that include aluminium-containing additives. The Committee also noted that dietary exposure to aluminium is expected to be very high for infants fed on soya-based formula.	CCCF1 (2007) were informed of the outcome of the evaluation by JECFA67. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.30) No mention of follow-up under the CCCF in the report.		N/A	N/A
JECFA-74 (14-23/6/2011)	4/7/2011 (summary) 16/6/2012 (Report) 16/6/2012 (monograph)	JECFA74 noted that a study, in which aluminium citrate was administered in drinking-water, provided a NOAEL of 30 mg/kg bw per day and concluded that the NOAEL of 30 mg/kg bw per day was an appropriate basis for establishing a PTWI. Because long-term studies on the relevant toxicological endpoints had become available since the 67th meeting, an additional uncertainty factor for deficiencies in the database was considered to be no longer necessary. A PTWI of 2 mg/kg bw was established by applying an uncertainty factor of 100 for interspecies and intraspecies differences. The PTWI applies to all aluminium compounds in food, including food additives. The Committee noted that dietary exposure of children to aluminium-containing food additives, including high- level dietary exposure, can exceed the PTWI by up to 2-fold. For potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments at the maximum proposed use levels and using conservative estimates, JECFA noted that dietary exposure at the highest range of estimates is 200 times higher than the PTWI.	JECFA74 evaluated Aluminium-containing food additives. Follow-up was not discussed at the CCCF.		N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (Azaspiracid group, Brevetoxin group, Cyclic Imines group, Domoic acid group, Okadaic acid group, Pectenotoxins group, Saxitoxin group, Yessotoxin group)						
FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc expert consultation on biotoxins in Bivalve Molluscs (26-30/9/2004)	2005 (short summary) 2011 (report)	The following was recommended to Codex: • Codex should continue to work on risk management recommendations (e.g. Standards and Code of Practice) to address issues related to biotoxins in bivalve molluscs. • When selecting detection methods, consideration should be given to the situation in developing countries.	CCCF2(2008) provisionally endorsed the proposed levels for marine biotoxins in the Draft Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs proposed by CCFFP. (ALINORM 08/31/41 para.28-31)		N/A	Azaspiracid group -Live and raw bivalve molluscs Brevetoxin group - Live and raw bivalve molluscs Domoic acid group - Live and raw bivalve molluscs Okadaic acid group - Live and raw bivalve molluscs Saxitoxin group - Live and raw bivalve molluscs (CXS 292-2008)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Cadmium						
JECFA-77 (4-13/6/2013)	7/1/2014 (report) 13/1/2014 (monograph)	JECFA77 assessed the exposure from cocoa and cocoa products. The estimates of mean population dietary exposure to cadmium from products containing cocoa equated to 0.02–1.6% of the PTMI of 25 µg/kg bw. The potential dietary exposures to cadmium for high consumers were estimated to be 30–69% of the PTMI for adults and 96% of the PTMI for children 0.5–12 years of age.	[ML] CCCF8 (2014) agreed to initiate new work on MLs for cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products. (REP14/CF para.142) CCCF14 (2021) agreed to advance the ML for chocolates for adoption by CAC44 (Step 5/8, Step 8). (REP21/CF para. 26, 39) CCCF15 (2022) agreed to forward the ML for cocoa powder to CAC45 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP22/CF15 para.59) [COP] CCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish EWG to prepare a discussion paper to develop COP. (REP17/CF para.155) CCCF15 (2022) agreed to forward the COP for cocoa beans to CAC45 for adoption (Step 8). (REP22/CF15 para.68)	[ML] CX/CF 15/9/6 CX/CF 16/10/9 CX/CF 18/12/6 CX/CF 19/13/6 CX/CF 21/14/6 CX/CF 22/15/5 [COP] CX/CF 18/12/16 CX/CF 19/13/12 CX/CF 21/14/7 CX/CF 22/15/6	CXC 81-2022 (cadmium–cocoa)	chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on dry matter basis; chocolates containing or declaring ≥30% to <50% total cocoa solid on a dry matter basis; (REP21/CAC para.44) cocoa powder (100% cocoa solids on a dry matter basis); (REP22/CAC para.6 5)
JECFA-73 (8-17/6/2010)	16/1/2011 (report) 16/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA73 withdrew the PTWI of 7 µg/kg body weight and established a PTMI of 25 µg/kg body weight. The estimates of exposure to cadmium through the diet for all age groups, including consumers with high exposure and subgroups with special dietary habits (e.g. vegetarians), examined by the Committee at this meeting are below the PTMI.	CCCF5 (2011) agreed that no follow-up was necessary since the estimates of exposure to cadmium were below this PTMI. (REP11/CF para.95)		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 81-2022 (cadmium–cocoa)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Cadmium						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 conducted intake and impact assessment requested by CCFAC36 for the seven commodity groups; rice, wheat, potatoes, stem and root vegetables, leafy vegetables, other vegetables and molluscs taking into account different MLs. The Committee concluded that the effect of different MLs on the overall intake of cadmium would be very small.	CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to advance the draft MLs for Cd in wheat grain; potato; stem and root vegetables; leafy vegetables; and other vegetable to CAC28 for adoption (Step 8). (ALINORM 05/28/12 para.175) CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to advance the draft MLs for Cd in polished rice and marine bivalve molluscs and cephalopods to CAC29 for adoption (Step 8). (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.159)		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 81-2022 (cadmium–cocoa)	wheat grain; potato; stem and root vegetables; leafy vegetables; other vegetables; (ALINORM 05/28/41 Appendix V) marine bivalve molluscs, cephalopods; polished rice; (ALINORM 06/29/41 Apprndix IV)
Chrolopropanols and Glycidol						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	30/3/2017 (report: 3-MCPD esters and 3-MCPD; Glycidyl esters) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	[3-MCPD esters and 3-MCPD] JECFA83 noted that estimated dietary exposures to 3-MCPD for the general population, even for high consumers did not exceed the new PMTDI. Estimates of mean dietary exposure to 3-MCPD for formula-fed infants, however, could exceed the PMTDI for certain countries. The Committee recommended that appropriate efforts to reduce concentrations of 3-MCPD esters and 3-MCPD in infant formula continue to be implemented. [Glycidyl esters] JECFA83 considered that the MOEs for infants, children and adults were low and that they may indicate a human health concern. The Committee recommended that appropriate efforts to reduce concentrations of glycidyl esters and glycidol in fats and oils, in particular when used in infant formula, should continue to be implemented.	CCCF11 (2017) agreed to endorse the proposal for new work on a COP for 3-MCPDE and GE and establish an EWG. (REP17/CF para.151) CCCF13 (2019) agreed to advance the draft COP for adoption by CAC42 (Step 8). (REP19/CF para.79)	CX/CF 18/12/9 CX/CF 19/13/7	CXC 79-2019 (3-MCPDEs and GEs – refined oils) [relevant COP] CXC 64-2008 (3-MCPD–Acid hydrolysed vegetable protein)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Chrolopropanols						
JECFA-67 (20-29/6/2006)	1/1/2007 (report: 1,3-dichloro-2-propanol ; 3-chloro-1,2-propanediol) 10/8/2007 (monograph)	[1,3-dichloro-2-propanol (1,3-DCP)] JECFA67 concluded that a representative mean intake for the general population of 1,3-DCP and an estimated high-level intake could be used in the evaluation. Based on those margins of exposure, the Committee concluded that the estimated intakes of 1,3-DCP were of low concern for human health. [3-chloro-1,2 propanediol (3-MCPD)] JECFA67 concluded that, based on national estimates from a wide range of foods, intake of 3-MCPD were 1-35% of the PMTDI for the average and 3-85% for the high consumers. Regular consumption of a certain brand or specific type of product could result in intakes greater than the PMTDI. The Committee noted that reduction in the concentration of 3-MCPD in soy sauce made with acid-HVP could substantially reduce the intake of this contaminant by certain consumers of this condiment young children are also included.	CCCCF1 (2007) was reminded that the outcome of the JECFA evaluation would be taken into consideration during discussion. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.32) CCCCF1 agreed to forward the proposed draft ML and proposed draft COP to the CAC30 for adaption as Step 5. It was agreed that the draft ML should be further considered in light of finalization and implementation of the COP. (ALINORM 07/30/41) CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the draft ML and COP to CAC31 for adoption (Step 8). (ALINORM 08/31/41 para.67 and 73)	[ML] CX/FAC 06/38/33 CX/CF 07/1/13 [COP] CX/FAC 06/38/31 CX/CF 07/1/14	CXC 64-2008 (3-MCPD– Acid hydrolysed vegetable protein)	Liquid Condiments containing Acid- Hydrolyzed Vegetable Proteins (ALINORM 08/31/REP para.24)
Ciguatoxin						
FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Ciguatera Poisoning (19-23/11/2018)	2020 (report)	Considering the currently existing scientific gaps, it was not possible to complete a full risk assessment. However, it was noted that some risk management considerations could be given to inform regional interventions.	CCCCF14 (2021) agreed to issue a CL on possible follow-up actions. (REP21/CF para.235ii) CCCCF15 (2022) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper on the development of a COP. (REP22/CF15 para.224ii) CCCCF17 (2024) agreed to forward the COP to CAC47 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 97(ii))	CX/CF 23/16/10 CX/CF 24/17/9	CXC 83-2024 (Prevention and Reduction of Ciguatera poisoning)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Cyanogenic glycosides						
JECFA-74 (14-23/6/2011)	16/6/2012 (report) 16/6/2012 (monograph)	JECFA74 noted that, for the ML of 10 mg/kg as HCN for cassava flour, there are no estimates of dietary exposure available that exceed the ARfD or PMTDI. This is supported by the maximum amount of food that can be consumed based on existing Codex detailed estimates of cassava and cassava flour consumption and concentrations in food for cassava-eating communities would help in supporting the guidance values. The ML for sweet cassava is for the raw product. If the starting level of HCN in the raw sweet cassava were 50 mg/kg as HCN, the minimum effective processing would result in a concentration of 15 mg/kg as HCN, and the most effective processing would give a HCN concentration of 2 mg/kg.	CCCF6 (2012) agreed to establish an EWG to start new work on cassava and cassava products. (REP12/CF para.165) CCCF7 (2013) agreed to forward to the draft COP for adoption by CAC36 (Step 5/8). (REP13/CF para.92) CCCF7 (2013) agreed to discontinue work on the revision or establishment of MLs for cassava and cassava products and to transfer the MLs from the standard to the GSCTFF. (REP13/CF para.87-88) CCCF11 (2017) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a discussion paper to advise on the need and feasibility to establish an ML for HCN in all fermented cassava products. (REP17/CF para.14) CCCF14 (2021) discontinued the work on MLs for HCN in cassava and cassava-based products. (REP21/CF para. 172)	[COP] CX/CF 13/7/11 [ML] CX/CF 13/7/10 CX/CF 18/12/13 CX/CF 19/13/14 CX/CF 21/14/12	CXC 73-2013 (hydrocyanic acid–cassava)	Cassava flour, Gari (REP13/CAC)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Deoxynivalenol						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report) 13/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA72 concluded all of the mean estimates of national exposure to DON were below the group PMTDI. National reports showed dietary exposures that were above PMTDI in only a few cases, only for children at upper percentiles. For acute dietary exposure, the estimate of 9 µg/kg bw per day, based on high consumption of bread and a regulatory limit for DON of 1 mg/kg food, was close to the group ARfD. The Committee recommended that ADME studies be conducted on DON-3-glucoside, which has been detected in cereals and beers and might therefore contribute to systemic exposure to DON.	CCCCF4 (2010) agreed to prepare a project document and the draft MLs in cereals and cereal-based products. (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.110) CCCCF6 (2012) noted that there was no need to revise the COP at this stage. (REP12/CF para.74) CCCCF8 (2014) agreed that no further consideration would be given to acetylated derivatives of DON as a separate item, but 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/CF para.62) CCCCF9 (2015) agreed to advance the MLs in cereal-based foods and its sampling plans to CAC38 for adoption (Step 8). (REP15/CF para.91)	[cereal ML] CX/CF 11/5/6 CX/CF 12/6/9 CX/CF 13/7/7 CX/CF 14/8/8	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (Mycotoxin - spices)	Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Young Children; Flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley; Cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) destined for further Processing; Including sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis. (REP15/CAC Appendix III)
Diacetoxyscirpenol (including T-2 and HT-2 toxin)						
JECFA-83 (8-17/11/2016)	30/3/2017 (report) 13/12/2018 (monograph)	JECFA83 concluded that LB estimates for Europe do not exceed the group PMTDI for T-2, HT-2 and 4,15-DAS.	CCCCF11 (2017) agreed to request JECFA to update the 2001 JECFA evaluation of T-2/HT-2 toxin taking into account new toxicity studies. (REP17/CF para.151) <i>see JECFA-90 (Trichothecenes)</i>		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (Mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (Mycotoxin - spices)	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Ethyl carbamate						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 concluded that exposure to ethyl carbamate in food would be of low concern and that all intakes from food and beverages was of concern. The Committee noted that mitigation measures to reduce concentrations of ethyl carbamate in some alcoholic beverages should be continued.	CCCF1 (2007) noted that JECFA64 concluded that health risks for the general population were low and that only sub-populations consuming a high quantity of specific alcoholic beverages might be exposed to certain health risks. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.137) CCCF3 (2009) agreed to start new work on a proposed draft COP. (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.115) CCCF5 (2011) agreed to forward the draft COP to CAC34 for adoption (Step 5/8) . (REP11/CF para.26)	CX/CF 09/3/13 [COP] CX/CF 10/4/4 CX/CF 11/5/4	CXC 70-2011 (Ethyl carbamate–stone fruit distillates)	N/A
Fumonisin						
JECFA-74 (14-23/6/2011)	16/6/2012 (report) 16/6/2012 (monograph)	[Fumonisin] JECFA74 concluded that implementation of the MLs proposed by CCCF could significantly reduce exposure (by more than 20%) to total fumonisins in six clusters (A, B, D, F, G, K). The main contribution to reduction was due to the proposed Codex ML for the category “corn/maize grain, unprocessed”. The Committee noted that implementation of the proposed MLs would result in rejection of 1–88% of “corn/maize grain, unprocessed” and 4–57% of “corn/maize flour/meal” across the clusters. The Committee also noted that the national estimates of exposure to fumonisins show that the exceedance of the PMTDI occurs only in limited regions presenting high maize consumption levels and highly contaminated maize. The Committee concluded that no or little effect on the international exposure estimates was noticed as a result of implementing MLs higher than those proposed by CCCF.	CCCF3 (2009) agreed to initiate work on establishing MLs of fumonisins in maize and maize-based products. (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.101) CCCF7 (2013) agreed to it was too early to start new work on the revision of the COP (CXC51-2003) (REP13/CF para.132) CCCF8 (2014) agreed to forward the proposed draft MLs in maize and maize products for adoption by CAC37 (Step 5/8) . (REP14/CF para. 72)	CX/CF 09/3/9 [maize ML] CX/CF 10/4/8 CX/CF 13/7/17 CX/CF 14/8/9	N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin–cereals) CXC 78-2017 (Mycotoxin - spices)	Maize and maize products and associated sampling Plans; (REP14/CAC Appendix III)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Melamine						
FAO/WHO Expert meeting (1-4/12/2008)	2009 (report)	Expert meeting established the TDI for melamine (0.2 mg/kg bw) and noted that estimates of exposure to baseline levels of melamine from all sources (up to 13 µg/kg body weight per day) were well below the TDI. Expert meeting also noted that development of a TDI does not mean that adulteration of food to a level consistent with the TDI is acceptable.	CCCF3 (2009) agreed to initiate new work on MLs for melamine in foods and feed. (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.126) CCCF4 (2010) agreed to forward MLs for powdered infant formula and foods and animal feed to CAC33 for adoption (Step 5/8). (ALINORM 10/33/41 para.68) CCCF5 (2011) and CCCF6 (2012) agreed to forward the ML for liquid infant formula to CAC35 for adoption (Step 8). (REP12/CF para.58)	CX/CF 10/4/5	N/A	Food (Powdered Infant Formula and Foods other than Infant Formula) and Feed; (ALINORM 10/33/REP - Appendix III) Liquid Infant Formula (ready to consume); (REP12/CAC Appendix III)
Mercury						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report) 13/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA72 concluded that the upper limits of estimates of average dietary exposure to total mercury from foods other than fish and shellfish for adults (1 µg/kg bw per week) and for children (4 µg/kg bw per week) were at or below the new PTWI (4 µg/kg bw) for inorganic mercury.	CCCF5 (2011) agreed that no follow-up as regards the existing MLs for mercury was necessary. (REP11/CF para.98)		N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Methylmercury						
FAO/WHO Expert meeting on the risks and benefits of fish consumption (25-29/1/2010)	10/2/2010 (report)	The Expert meeting concluded that consumption of fish provides energy, protein, and a range of other important nutrients, including the long-chain n-3 PUFA (LC n-3 PUFA), that eating fish was part of the cultural traditions of many peoples and that in some populations fish was a major source of food and essential nutrients. Consultation recommended a series of steps that member states should take to better assess and manage the risks and benefits of fish consumption and more effectively communicate with their citizens.	CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to consider the need to review the existing GLs for methylmercury in fish when the full report of Expert consultation becomes available. (REP11/CF para.98) CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to development of a discussion paper on the review of the GL for methylmercury in fish and predatory fish. (REP12/CF para.174) CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to that consumer advice should not be developed at the international level and that such guidance was more appropriate at the national level. It was also agreed to review the GLs with a view to their revision or conversion to MLs. (REP13/CF para.125-126) CCCCF8 (2014) noted that the risk of mercury exposure from the diet would depend on the patterns of consumption of fish and the types of fish consumed; and that no further work would be done at the international level. (REP14/CF para.113) CCCCF12 (2018) agreed to advance the MLs for tuna, alfonsino, marlin and shark for adoption (Step 5/8), discontinue the work on ML for amberjack and swordfish, and request revocation of the GLs. (REP18/CF para.91) CCCCF14 (2021) agreed to discontinue the review of MLs for additional species	[GL] CX/CF 13/7/16 CX/CF 14/8/16 [ML and sampling plan] CX/CF 15/9/13 CX/CF 16/10/15 CX/CF 17/11/12 CX/CF 18/12/7 CX/CF 19/13/13 CX/CF 21/14/11 CX/CF 22/15/8 CX/CF 24/17/6	N/A	tuna; alfonsino; marlin; shark; (REP18/CAC Appendix III) orange roughy; pink cusk eel; (REP22/CAC Appendix II) Sampling plan for methylmercury in fish; (REP24/CAC-Appendix II)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
			other than orange roughy and pink cusk eel. (REP21/CF para. 166) CCCF15 (2022) agreed to advance the MLs for orange roughy and pink cusk eel to CAC for adoption (Step 5/8) and abandon work on the ML for Patagonian tooth fish and a separate guidance paper. (REP22.CF15 para. 112) CCCF17 (2024) agreed to forward the sampling plan to CAC47 for adoption (Step 5/8). (REP24/CF17/Rev. para. 69)			
Methylmercury						
JECFA-67 (20-29/6/2006)	1/1/2007 (report) 10/8/2007 (monograph)	JECFA67 recommended that known benefits of fish consumption need to be taken in consideration and advice to population subgroups that may be at risk may provide an effective method for lowering the number of individuals with exposures greater than the PTWI.	CCCF1 (2007) reaffirmed the decision of CCFAC38 to postpone consideration of the need to revise the GLs for Me-Hg pending the outcomes of a joint FAO/WHO expert consultation on health risks associated with methylmercury and dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish and the health benefits of fish consumption and to retain the current guideline levels for the time being. (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.35) CCCF5 (2011) agreed to consider the need to review the existing GLs for methylmercury in fish when the full report of Expert consultation becomes available. (REP11/CF para.98) <i>See above section on methylmercury, FAO/WHO expert consultation.</i>		N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Ochratoxin A						
JECFA-68 (19-28/6/2007)	7/1/2007 (report) 10/8/2008 (monograph)	JECFA68 (2007) concluded that the current estimate of overall dietary exposure to ochratoxin A from cereals, based mainly on European data, was well below the PTWI. Owing to the very small number of samples contaminated above the proposed ML for cereals, such an ML would have very limited impact compared with no ML.	[cereals] CCCF1 (2007) had agreed to retain the Draft ML of 5 µg/kg for OTA in raw wheat, barley and rye at Step 7 and to consider it again at its following session in light of the outcome of the re-evaluation of OTA by JECFA68. CCCF2 (2008) agreed to forward the Draft ML of 5 µg/kg for OTA in Raw Wheat, Barley and Rye to the CAC31 for adoption at Step 8. (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 112) [coffee and cocoa] CCFAC37 (2005) agreed to establish an EWG to develop a discussion paper on OTA contamination in coffee and cocoa, which would take into account the JECFA evaluation, the outputs of the FAO Coordinated Project “Enhancement of Coffee Quality through the Prevention of Mould Formation” and other relevant information. CCFAC38 (2006) agreed with the recommendations of the ad hoc WG to establish two EWGs to prepare separate discussion papers on OTA in coffee and OTA in cocoa, respectively, for circulation, comments and consideration at its next Session that might allow the Committee to decide if the development of Codes of Practice was appropriate. CCCF1 (2007) decided to establish two EWGs to prepare a revised discussion paper for consideration at the second	[coffee and cocoa] CX/FAC 06/38/27 [coffee] CX/CF 07/1/18 CX/CF 08/2/14 CX/CF 09/3/8 [cocoa] CX/CF 07/1/19 CX/CF 08/2/15 CX/CF 11/5/12 CX/CF 12/6/15 CX/CF 13/7/9	CXC 51-2003 (mycotoxin – cereals) (revised 2014, 2016) CXC 69-2009 (OTA–coffee) CXC 72-2013 (OTA-cocoa) [Relevant COP] CXC 78-2017 (mycotoxin – spices) CXC 82-2023 (mycotoxins – cassava) CXC 63-2007 (OTA-wine)	Barkey, Rye, Wheat (ALINORM 08/31/REP , para. 26)

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
			session. (ALINORM 07/30/41, paras. 113 and 117). CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to establish an EWG to prepare a draft proposed Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA contamination in coffee pending the formal approval of new work by the Commission (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 168) CCCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the proposed draft Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA contamination in coffee at Step 5/8 (ALINORM 09/32/41, para. 95 and Appendix VI). CCCCF2 (2008) agreed to suspend the consideration of this matter with the understanding to re-consider OTA contamination in cocoa in light of the new data available in the near future (ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 170). CCCCF5 (2011) agreed to re-establish the EWG to update the discussion paper with a view to the development a code of practice for cocoa. (REP11/CF, para. 75). CCCCF6 (2012) agreed to initiate a new work on the development of a code of practice for the prevention and reduction of OTA in cocoa. (REP12/CF, para. 141 and Appendix X). CCCCF7 (2013) agreed to forward the proposed draft Code to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC36 (REP13/CF, para. 79, Appendix IV).			

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
PAHs						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 concluded that the critical effect of PAHs is carcinogenicity and that the estimated intakes of PAHs were of low concern for human health. Measures to reduce intake of PAH could include avoiding contact of foods with flames, and cooking with the heat source above rather than below the food. Efforts should be made to reduce contamination with PAHs during drying and smoking processes. Washing or peeling fruit and vegetables before consumption would help to remove surface contaminants.	CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to start new work on the elaboration of COP. (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.188) CCCCF3 (2009) agreed to forward the draft COP to CAC32 for adoption (Step 8) . (ALINORM 09/32/41 para.67)	CX/FAC 05/37/34 CX/FAC 06/38/36 CX/CF 07/1/16 CX/CF 08/2/9	CXC 68-2009 (PAH -food-smoking and drying processes)	N/A
PBDEs						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 noted that the available data on PBDE were not adequate for allocating a PMTDI or PTWI. The Committee considered that continuing studies of PBDEs in samples from humans, including human milk, would be useful in assessing the overall exposure to PBDEs in foods and other possible sources.	CCFAC37 (2005) endorsed the recommendations of the ad hoc Working Group on the Contaminants and Toxins that no action was required for PBDEs. (ALINORM 05/28/12 para.41)		N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Non-dioxin-like PCBs						
JECFA-80 (16-25/6/2015)	16/2/2016 (report) 27/9/2016 (monograph -PCBs)	As the MOEs are based on minimal effect doses, they were considered to be adequate and to give some assurance that dietary exposures to NDL-PCBs are unlikely to be of health concern for adults and children, based on the available data. For breastfed infants, the MOEs would be expected to be lower. However, based on present knowledge, the benefits of breastfeeding are considered to outweigh the possible disadvantages that may be associated with the presence of NDL-PCBs in breast milk. JECFA80 recognized that there are similarities in some of the reported effects for NDL-PCBs and that, ideally, risk estimates for combined exposure are desirable. JECFA83 concluded that risk estimates for combined exposure cannot be done on the basis of currently available data, but noted that the points of departure selected for derivation of the MOEs were particularly conservative, as they were based on effects on liver and thyroid that were not of clear toxicological significance, the changes were minimal and the lowest doses at which they were seen were used for the points of departure, combined with upper-bound estimates of body burden.	CCCF10 (2016) agreed to consider a discussion paper on possible inclusion of NDL-PCBs in the COP (CXC 62-2006) to evaluate if recommendations from the JECFA assessment on NDL-PCBs could be included at the next session. (REP16/CF paras. 168 and 173) CCCF11 (2017) agreed to start new work on non-dioxin-like PCBs in the COP (CXC62-2006). (REP17/CF para.146) CCCF12 (2018) agreed to advance the proposed draft COP to CAC41 for adoption (Step 5/8) . (REP18/CF para.98)	CX/CF 17/11/13 CX/CF 18/12/8	CXC 62-2006 (dioxins, dioxin-like PCBs and non-dioxin-like PCBs in Food and Feed) (revised 2018)	N/A
Perchlorate						
JECFA-72 (16-25/02/2010)	1/1/2011 (report) 13/1/2011 (monograph)	JECFA72 concluded that the estimated dietary exposures of 0.7 µg/kg bw per day (highest) and 0.1 µg/kg bw per day (mean), including both food and drinking-water, are well below the PMTDI. The Committee considered that these estimated dietary exposures were not of health concern.	CCCF5 (2011) agreed that no follow-up was necessary since no health concern was identified at current estimated levels of exposure from food and drinking water. (REP11/CF para.99)		N/A	N/A

JECFA EVALUATION			CCCF Follow-up			
Meeting	Publication	Evaluation	Decision/Work	Discussion paper	COP	MLs
Radionuclides						
Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture	2016 (IAEA-TECDOC-1788)	TECDOC-1788 clarifies the existing international recommendations for food and drinking water and the circumstances in which these should be used, it also highlights that, when addressing the management of radionuclides in non-emergency situations, the current international approaches are inconsistent in relation to scope, radiation protection criteria and terminology.	CCCF8 (2014) agreed to establish an EWG to follow-up on the IAEA's work. (REP14/CF para. 18) CCCF13 (2019) agreed to establish an EWG on radioactivity in feed and food to produce a discussion paper. (REP19/CF para.26) CCCF14 (2021) agreed that no further work was required to be done by CCCF at this time. (REP21/CF para.185)	CX/CF 19/13/4 CX/CF 21/14/14	N/A	N/A
Tin						
JECFA-64 (8-17/2/2005)	1/1/2006 (report) 12/6/2006 (monograph)	JECFA64 reiterated its opinion that the available data for humans indicated that inorganic tin at concentrations of >150 mg/kg in canned beverages or 250 mg/kg in canned foods may produce acute manifestations of gastric irritation in certain individuals. Therefore, ingestion of reasonably-sized portions of food containing inorganic tin at concentrations equal to the proposed standard for canned beverages (200mg/kg) may lead to adverse reactions.	CCFAC38 (2006) agreed to forward the proposed draft MLs for tin of 150 mg/kg in canned beverages and 250 mg/kg in canned foods other than beverages to CAC29 for adoption at Step 5. (ALINORM 06/29/12 para.182) CCCF1 (2007) agreed to forward the draft MLs for Tin in canned foods and in canned beverages to CAC30 for adoption (Step 8) . (ALINORM 07/30/41 para.82)		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 60-2005 (tin -canned foods)	Canned Foods (other than beverages); Canned Beverages; (ALINORM 07/30/REP-Appendix IV)
Trichothecenes, T2 and HT-2						
JECFA-90 (26/10-16/11/2020)	6/10/2022 (report) 14/7/2023 (monograph)	JECFA90 derived chronic dietary exposure estimates of 6.0 to 18 ng/kg bw per day for T-2, HT-2 and DAS combined. The toxicological evaluation and overall risk assessment will follow at a future meeting.	The full evaluation was not yet complete and was still on the priority list for JECFA evaluations, thus follow-up actions could be considered once the full evaluation became available . (REP21/CF, para. 233) <i>See JECFA-93 (Trichothecenes)</i>		N/A [Relevant COP] CXC 51-2003 (Mycotoxin – cereals) CXC 78-2017 (Mycotoxin - spices)	N/A

"N/A" indicates that no new or revised COPs or MLs have been established as follow-up actions to the JECFA evaluation. COPs adopted prior to the JECFA evaluations or established through processes other than follow-up actions are listed as "relevant COP".

Index by meeting

JECFA-93 (2022)

Trichothecenes
(T-2, HT-2 and DAS) (Inv-4)

JECFA-91 (2021)

Ergot alkaloids (Inv-2)
Cadmium (Inv-8)

JECFA-90 (2020)

Trichothecenes, T2 and HT-2 (Inv-31)

JECFA-83 (2016)

Aflatoxins (Inv-6)
Aflatoxin M₁ (Inv-14)
Chrolopropanols and Glycydol (Inv-19)
Diacetoxyscirpenol
(including T-2 and HT-2 toxi) (Inv-22)
Fumonisin (including evaluation for
co-exposure with aflatoxins) (Inv-3)
Sterigmatocystin (Inv-13)

JECFA-80 (2015)

Non-dioxin-like PCBs (Inv-30)
Pyrrolizidine alkaloids (Inv-12)

JECFA-77 (2013)

Cadmium (Inv-18)

JECFA-74 (2011)

Cyanogenic glycosides (Inv-21)
Fumonisin (Inv-23)
Aluminium (Inv-16)

JECFA-73 (2010)

Cadmium (Inv-18)
Lead (Inv-10 and 11)

JECFA-72 (2010)

Acrylamide (Inv-5)
Arsenic (Inv-7)
Deoxynivalenol (Inv-22)
Furan (Inv-2)
Mercury (Inv-24)
Perchlorate (Inv-30)

JECFA-68 (2007)

Aflatoxins (Inv-15)
Ochratoxin A (Inv-27)

JECFA-67 (2006)

Aluminium (Inv-16)
Chrolopropanols (Inv-20)
Methylmercury (Inv-26)

JECFA-64 (2005)

Acrylamide (Inv-14)
Cadmium (Inv-19)
Ethyl carbamate (Inv-23)
PAHs (Inv-29)
PBDEs (Inv-29)
Tin (Inv-31)

Ad-hoc Joint FAO/WHO Expert consultation on risks and benefits of fish consumption (2023)

Methylmercury (Inv-12)
Dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs (Inv-9)

WHO expert consultation on updating the 2005 toxic equivalency factors for dioxin like compounds, including some polychlorinated biphenyls (2022)

Dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs (Inv-9)

FAO/WHO Expert meeting on Tropane Alkaloids (2020)

Tropane alkaloids (Inv-13)

FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Ciguatera Poisoning (2018)

Ciguatoxin (Inv-20)

Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture : TECDOC-1788 (2016)

Radionuclides (Inv-31)

FAO/WHO Expert meeting on the risks and benefits of fish consumption (2010)

Methylmercury (Inv-25)

FAO/WHO Expert meeting (2008)

Melamine (Inv-24)

FAO/IOC/WHO ad hoc expert consultation on biotoxins in Bivalve Molluscs (2004)

Biotoxin in Bivalve Molluscs (Azaspiracid group, Brevetoxin group, Cyclic Imines group, Domoic acid group, Okadaic acid group, Pectenotoxins group, Saxitoxin group, Yessotoxin group) (Inv-17)