

CODEx ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 14

CF16/CRD02(Rev)

April 2023

ENGLISH ONLY

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEx COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS

16th Session

18-21 April 2023 (physical plenary meeting)

26 April 2023 (virtual report adoption)

REVIEW OF CODEx STANDARDS FOR CONTAMINANTS

For consideration by the virtual meeting of the Working Group on the Review of Codex Standards for Contaminants

(Prepared by the Chair of the EWG on the Review of Codex Standards for Contaminants, Canada)

BACKGROUND

1. CCCF13 (2019) agreed to establish an electronic working group (EWG), chaired by Canada, and co-chaired by Japan and the United States of America, to prepare a proposal for an approach to identify the need for review of existing standards and related texts developed by the CCCF for consideration at CCCF14.¹
2. CCCF14 (2021) agreed to an approach to evaluating existing Codex contaminant standards for review that involved establishing tracking lists of Codex standards ≥ 15 and ≥ 25 years since review or initial establishment (Lists A.1 and A.2, respectively) and those recommended for re-evaluation by CCCF, CAC, or a member country (List B). This approach would be implemented for a three-year trial period (2022-24) according to the approach and using the prioritization criteria outlined in the discussion paper. Ad hoc reviews of existing Codex standards would also continue under this proposal.²
3. CCCF15 (2022) agreed to maintain, without further prioritization, tracking Lists A and B. CCCF15 also agreed to create a new *Overall Highest Priority List of Codex Standards and Related Texts for Contaminants in Food and Feed* (hereafter referred to as the "OHPL") using the prioritization criteria or other clear, reasonable rationale and that the Working Group Chair would provide a verification function, where possible, of rationale provided. Four new prioritization criteria were also agreed to³ as was the continuation of the process by which the trial period is proceeding. No new work to review an existing Codex standard was taken up by CCCF15.⁴

CIRCULAR LETTER REQUEST (CL 2022/85-CF)

4. The circular letter issued in advance of CCCF16 (2023) requested recommendations, using the prioritization criteria or other clear, reasonable rationale, of standards and related texts from Lists A and B (Annex I, below) for inclusion in the OHPL (Annex II, below). Any recommendations should also consider the priority list of contaminants for evaluation and re-evaluation by JECFA and the outcomes of JECFA evaluations and FAO/WHO expert meetings.
5. Editorial or other feedback on Lists A and B, the prioritization criteria (Annex III), the process by which the trial period is proceeding and volunteers to lead or co-lead items in the OHPL were also requested.

CIRCULAR LETTER COMMENTS (CL 2022/85-CF)

6. Ten (10) member countries and one (1) observer organization provided comments in reply to CL 2022/85-CF: Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, Japan, Kenya, Iran, New Zealand, Peru, Republic of Korea, and the United States of America, as well as the American Oil Chemists' Society (AOCS). These comments are available on the CCCF16 website⁵ and key comments are summarized below.
7. Responses from the working group (WG) Chair to member country comments on CL 2022/85-CF are also recorded below, as required.⁶

¹ REP19/CF, para. 178

² CX/CF 21/14/16; REP21/CF, para. 218

³ i) staple foods, ii) relevance to developing countries, iii) efficiencies with other work, and iv) member country volunteer

⁴ REP22/CF15, para. 218

⁵ CX/CF 23/16/14

⁶ CX/CF 23/16/14 - Comments in reply to CL 2022/85-CF (Review of Codex standards for contaminants).

PROCESS BY WHICH TRIAL PERIOD IS PROCEEDING

8. No member countries suggested changes to the process by which the trial period is proceeding.

UPDATES AND EDITORIAL CHANGES TO LISTS A, B & OHPL

9. Two (2) member countries suggested numerous updates and editorial changes to Lists A and B (Annex I) and the OHPL (Annex II). Key updates and editorial comments are noted below and are recorded in Annexes I and II in strikethrough (text to be removed), underline (text to be moved)⁷ and **bold underline** (proposed new text):

Key Updates

- i. **List A.2:** Three (3) additional standards now meet the date criterion for inclusion in this list (established or reviewed ≥ 15 and < 25 years ago, between 1998 and 2007):
 - a) Arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads; ML, established 2007.
 - b) Tin in canned foods; ML, established 2007.
 - c) Tin in canned beverages; ML, established 2007.
- ii. **List B:** Eight (8) standards should include the additional information that the Codex Alimentarius Commission recommended reviewing the standards within a specific time frame.
 - a) Aflatoxin, total, in cereals; maximum levels (MLs) (n=7 different MLs)⁸
 - b) Arsenic, inorganic, in husked rice; ML
- iii. **OHPL:**
 - a) Methylmercury in tuna; ML. The "Other comments or information" column should reflect that this update no longer aligns with the CCCF's work to elaborate MLs for methylmercury in fish, as elaboration of MLs for methylmercury in fish is no longer on the CCCF agenda.

Key Editorial Suggestions

- iv. Add a column to Lists A and B to indicate if each standard has been added to the OHPL and the year added.
- v. Remove the columns "Prioritization Criteria Cited" and "Other Comments or Rationale" from Lists A and B and retain them in only the OHPL where standards are being prioritized for review.⁹
- vi. Add the ML value to the "Type of Standard" column in Lists A and B, when applicable, as done in the OHPL.
- vii. Alphabetize the standards in each Lists A.1, A.2 and B, as done in the OHPL and edit the note after each title to indicate that the standards within in this list are in alphabetical order and not presented in order of priority.
- viii. Move information in the "Other Comments or Rationale" to the "Prioritization Criteria Cited" column of the OHPL if it relates to one of the four new prioritization criteria CCCF15 agreed to (see para. 3, above).
- ix. Remove the column titled "Contaminant" from Lists A, B and the OHPL as it is redundant with the new row headings listing the contaminant name.
- x. Add all pertinent prioritization-related information in the row for each standard in the OHPL instead of referring to information in the OHPL for a different, but related, standard.

⁷ Four new prioritization criteria were agreed to by CCCF15 (REP22/CF15) which resulted in certain information in the 'Other comments or information' column of the OHPL being moved to the 'Prioritization criteria cited' column of this list.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Column deletion not recorded in Annex I in bold underline.

CL 2022/85-CF did not request the prioritization of standards in Lists A and B unless they were being recommended for inclusion in the OHPL. Any prioritization criteria for standards in Lists A and B only (i.e. not included in the OHPL) that were provided in response to CL 2022/85-CF are not recorded in Lists A and B as a result of the recommendation to remove the columns 'Prioritization Criteria Cited' and 'Other Comments or Rationale' from these lists and retain these columns only in the OHPL.

PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

10. One (1) member country suggested adding two (2) new prioritization criteria and dividing an existing criterion into three (3) priority-based tiers. Another member country made a comment that led to additional text being proposed for addition to an existing prioritization criterion by the WG Chair.
11. The proposals for new and updated prioritization criteria take into consideration member country suggestions and input from the WG Chair and are captured below (proposed edits to existing criteria in **bold underline**) and in Annex III (all proposed new text in **bold underline**):

Proposed New and Revised Prioritization Criteria Applicable to Maximum Levels (MLs), Guideline Levels (GLs) and Codes of Practice (CoPs)

- i. *(New proposal)* Health-based guidance value (HBGV) cannot be established: Either JECFA, upon request by CCCF, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF cannot establish a HBGV due to genotoxicity and carcinogenicity, or other rationale that does not support establishment of a threshold for the critical effect. (Priority 1)
 - a) Rationale from member country: The existing criterion “New health-based guidance value (HBGV) is available” covers a contaminant for which an existing HBGV was withdrawn as a result of re-evaluation by JECFA. The same level of attention should also be given to a contaminant for which a HBGV has not been established from the first evaluation by JECFA.
 - b) Response from WG Chair: This new proposed criterion would also apply to situations when a HBGV has been withdrawn by JECFA (e.g., lead, arsenic).
- ii. *(Proposed edit to existing)* Recommended for re-evaluation: CCCF, CAC or a member country recommended the standard for re-evaluation within a certain period of time or at an unspecified future date.
 - I. **Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) (priority 1)**
 - II. **CCCF (priority 2)**
 - III. **Member country only (priority 3)**
 - a) Rationale from member country: Dividing this criterion into three priority rankings helps weight the level the recommendation was made at.
 - b) Response from WG Chair: For item III, above, it will be important for all discussion points from member countries to be captured in CCCF meeting reports. A past example is the CoP for arsenic in rice, which was proposed for possible review by a member country but was not reported as a recommendation by CCCF (REP17/CF11, para. 102).
 - iii. *(Proposed edit to existing)* New occurrence data are available: “. . .significantly different across two or more regions or markets. **Or significant new data are available from regions of concern and/or regions where data were previously lacking.**”

Proposed New Prioritization Criteria Applicable to MLs

- iv. *(New proposal)* CoP available: CoP available for at least 3 years since ML(s) established for the relevant contaminant-food combination(s). (priority 2)
 - a) Rationale from member country: If the COP is developed and implemented by member countries for a certain combination of contaminant and food, their concentrations are expected to have decreased over time, which could support a lower ML.
 - b) Response from WG Chair: Including a minimum amount of time that a CoP should be in place before an ML is updated (e.g., three (3) years) provides a benchmark to support this prioritization criterion.

OVERALL PRIORITIZATION / RANKING OF STANDARDS IN THE OHPL

12. Two (2) member countries provided the following comments on how to prioritize for review and present standards within the OHPL (Annex II):
- i. Organize the OHPL in descending order based on the number or prioritization criteria they meet. This order alone would not necessarily imply the order of priority for re-evaluation but would help guide CCCF.

- a) Response from WG Chair: At CCCF15¹⁰, the OHPL was created and presented in alphabetical order (by contaminant) as overall priority rankings are hindered by the varying use of and rationale provided for prioritization criteria. Ordering standards in the OHPL based on the number of prioritization criteria each meets and their priority rankings would be misleading since each standard in the OHPL has not been assessed against all applicable prioritization criteria. As well, prioritization criteria of the same rank (e.g., priority 1) may not be weighted equally.
- ii. Standards that meet several of the highest priority (priority 1) criteria should be reviewed before standards that meet lower priority criteria.
- iii. If both the ML and CoP are in the OHPL for a certain contaminant and food combination, priority for re-evaluation should be given to the CoP as it is more effective in making the food safer.
- a) Response from WG Chair: To prioritize Codex standards on the OHPL for review, the WG Chair continues to recommend the general approach agreed to by CCCF14, which involves recommending standards for review that meet relatively more high or medium prioritization criteria¹¹. The prioritization criteria should be considered in parallel with the case-by-case assessment of other key factors, such as: data availability, review complexity, number of members suggesting as highest overall priority, pending results of relevant risk assessments or other related work. The WG Chair will annually incorporate member country comments into the OHPL and raise for discussion at the annual WG meeting standards in the OHPL with the strongest overall rationale for being prioritized for review.

ADDED PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA OR OTHER INFORMATION FOR STANDARDS IN THE OHPL

- 13. Five (5) member countries provided further information, recommended additional prioritization criteria or added support for prioritization criteria already listed for standards in the OHPL. New information is included in Annex II (in **bold underline**).
- 14. One (1) member country reviewed standards in the OHPL with a 'priority 1' ranking and suggested relevant reasons that these standards may be of lower priority for review at this time. The most frequent comment was to await the results of any relevant JECFA risk assessments or related work before proceeding with the review of a standard in the OHPL. All comments are included in the "Other comments or information" column in Annex II (in **bold underline**).
- 15. Three (3) member countries recommended relative priorities for the review of standards added to the OHPL (Annex II) by CCCF15 (2022). These recommendations are listed below in decreasing order of suggested priority. Any new prioritization criteria or information, or support for existing prioritization criteria already in the OHPL, are recorded below for items i) and ii), and for all items in Annex II (in **bold underline**).
 - i. Aflatoxins (total) in peanuts intended for further processing (FFP), ML
 - a) two (2) member countries recommended as the highest priority for re-evaluation based on the following prioritization criteria: List A.2 (priority 2); Efficiencies with other work (priority 2); CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts, CoP for aflatoxins in peanuts (CXC 55-2004) in List A.2)
 - b) One (1) member country suggested not prioritizing this standard for review as CCCF is currently struggling with data categorization for peanuts FFP and ready-to-eat (RTE) peanuts
 - ii. *Code of Practice Concerning Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals* (CXC 49-2001)
 - a) one (1) member country recommended as highest priority for re-evaluation based on the following prioritization criteria: Staple food (priority 1), relevant to developing countries (priority 1), technological advances (priority 2), member country volunteer (priority 2), expanded scope (priority 3)
 - iii. *Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts* (CXC 55-2004)
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country

¹⁰ CF15/CRD02

¹¹ CX/CF 21/14/16, para. 20

- iv. Aflatoxin M1 in Milks, ML
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- v. *Code of Practice for the Reduction of Aflatoxin B1 in Raw Materials and Supplemental Feeding stuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)*
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- vi. Patulin in apple juice, ML
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- vii. *Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Inorganic Tin Contamination in Canned Foods, (CXC 60-2005)*
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- viii. Cadmium, MLs: certain cereal grains, legume vegetables, pulses, Brassica vegetables, bulb vegetables, fruiting vegetables, certain leafy vegetables, certain root and tuber vegetables, certain stalk and stem vegetables, wheat, cephalopods, marine bivalve molluscs, polished rice
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- ix. Fumonisin in maize flour and maize meal, MLs
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country
- x. Acrylonitrile in food, GL; Vinyl chloride in food, GL
 - a) nominated by one (1) member country

NEW STANDARDS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN OHPL

16. One (1) member country recommended the following standards from List B for inclusion in the OHPL (Annex II). The prioritization criteria cited are recorded below and in Annex II (proposed new text in **bold underline**):
- i. Aflatoxins (total) in maize grain destined for further processing, ML
 - a) List B (priority 1)
 - b) Staple food (priority 1)
 - c) Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)
 - ii. Lead in milk, ML
 - a) List B (priority 2)
 - b) Staple food (priority 1)

USE OF PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA AND PROVISION OF SUPPORTING DETAILS

17. When recommending new standards for inclusion in the OHPL or further prioritizing standards already in the OHPL (by recommending additional prioritization criteria or citing support for criteria already listed), Codex members used the agreed-upon prioritization criteria. In a limited number of cases, members provided supporting details for the prioritization criteria cited (e.g., relevance to developing countries).

MEMBER COUNTRY VOLUNTEERS

18. Two (2) member countries volunteered to lead or co-lead specific items in the OHPL, as listed below and included in Annex II (in **bold underline**). Another member country expressed interest in volunteering in the future.
- i. New Zealand – Methylmercury in Tuna, ML
 - ii. United States of America – Code of Practice Concerning Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)
 - iii. Japan – will volunteer in the future to lead or co-lead an item(s)

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CODEX STANDARDS

19. One (1) member country suggested entirely new work to develop the following standards (in decreasing order of suggested priority) and cited certain prioritization criteria from Annex III. As proposing new work to elaborate new Codex standards is outside the scope of this WG, the proposed new standards below will not be added to the OHPL (Annex II) and could be brought to CCCF16 as proposals for new work.

- i. Code of practice for cadmium in foods.
 - a) Prioritization criteria: staple foods, developing countries, technological advances, expanded scope, member volunteer
- ii. Patulin in apple products other than apple juice, ML.
 - a) Prioritization criteria: Staple food, developing countries, expanded scope.

STEPS INVOLVED FOR PROPOSALS OF STANDARDS TO FURTHER CONSIDER FOR REVIEW

20. The steps and placement of any proposals to further consider for review an existing standard in the CCCF workflow are presented below:
 - i. WG proposes to CCCF to further consider an existing Codex contaminant standard (ML or CoP) for possible review
 - ii. CCCF supports a decision to develop a discussion paper in consideration of total workload of CCCF (i.e. follow-up work from JECFA evaluations, new standard development, forward work planning, requests from other Codex committees, other CCCF discussions)
 - iii. Development of a discussion paper
 - iv. Recommendation that there is a need to review an existing Codex standard based on the information presented in the discussion paper, OR that further work is not needed
 - v. Decision to start new work in the step procedure, OR document the decision that further work is not needed and remove the standard from the OHPL
 - vi. Review of the existing CCCF standard

OBJECTIVES OF THE VIRTUAL PRE-SESSION WORKING GROUP

21. The comments submitted in reply to CL 2022/85-CF and any related information, clarification, or suggested edits to these comments provided by the WG Chair will be considered by the WG on the 'Prioritization for re-evaluation of Codex standards and related texts for contaminants in food and feed', which is scheduled to meet virtually the week before CCCF16.
22. Discuss which, if any, of the following standards in the OHPL that the WG chair has identified for discussion based on all rationale presented in the OHPL (Annex II) could be proposed to CCCF for possible review, and seek a member country volunteers, as necessary:
 - i. *Code of Practice Concerning Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)*
 - ii. Methylmercury in tuna, ML
 - iii. Aflatoxins in peanuts for further processing, ML
 - iv. *Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxin Contamination in Peanuts (CXC 55-2004)*, CoP
 - v. *Code of Practice for the Reduction of Aflatoxin B1 in Raw Materials and Supplemental Feeding stuffs for Milk-Producing Animals (CXC 45-1997)*
 - vi. Acrylonitrile, GL in food
 - vii. Vinyl chloride, GL in food
23. The key objectives of the WG are to bring any recommendations regarding the possible review of Codex contaminant standards, as well as changes to the prioritization criteria and approach used to make these recommendations, to CCCF16 for consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PRE-SESSION WORKING GROUP, AND IF AGREEMENT, CCCF16

24. The pre-session WG is invited to seek agreement on the following items:
- i. Editorial changes and updates to Lists A, B and the OHPL;
 - ii. Two (2) new and two (2) updated prioritization criteria used to recommend contaminant standards for review;
 - iii. Any new standards being added to the OHPL;
 - iv. Continued case-by-case approach to determining what standards will proceed for review
 - v. Proposals to further consider existing Codex contaminant standards for possible review

ANNEX I

List A: Codex Contaminant Standards Established or Reviewed ≥25 and ≥15 and >25 Years Ago

(the standards within in the lists in this list are in alphabetical order and are not presented in order of priority)

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	Food(s) ^a	Type of standard ^b (ML or GL value)	Year established ^c	Corresponding standard ^a
A.1 Established or reviewed ≥25 years ago (1997 and earlier)				
Acrylonitrile				
<u>2022</u>	Food	GL (0.02 mg/kg)	1991	n/a
Aflatoxin B1				
<u>2022</u>	Raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)	CoP	1997	ML
Arsenic, total				
<u>2022</u>	Edible fats and oils	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	<1980	n/a
<u>2022</u>	Salt, food grade	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a
Cadmium				
<u>2022</u>	Salt, food grade	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a
Mercury				
<u>2022</u>	Salt, food grade	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	1987	n/a
Tin, total (*ML applies to products in containers other than tinsplate containers)				
<u>2022</u>	Cooked cured chopped meat*	ML (50 mg/kg, for each meat)	1981	CoP (CXC 60-2005)
	Cooked cured ham*			
	Cooked cured pork shoulder*			
	Corned beef*			
	Luncheon meat*			
Vinyl chloride monomer				
<u>2022</u>	Food	GL (0.01 mg/kg)	1991	n/a

Year Added to Overall High Priority List	Food(s)^a	Type of standard^b (ML or GL value)	Year established^c	Corresponding standard^a
A.2 Established or reviewed ≥15 and <25 years ago (between 1998 and 2007)				
Aflatoxins, total				
2022	Peanuts intended for further processing	ML (15 µg/kg)	1999	CoP (CXC 59-2005)
Aflatoxin M1				
2022	Milks	ML (0.5 µg/kg)	2001	CoP (CXC 45-1997)
Arsenic				
n/a	Fat spreads and blended spreads	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2007	n/a
Cadmium				
n/a	Cereal grains	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001	n/a
2022	Legume vegetables	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001	
2022	Pulses	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001	
n/a	Brassica vegetables	ML (0.05 mg/kg)	2005	
n/a	Bulb vegetables	ML (0.05 mg/kg)	2005	
n/a	Fruiting vegetables	ML (0.05 mg/kg)	2005	
n/a	Leafy vegetables	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2005	
n/a	Root and tuber vegetables	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2005	
n/a	Stalk and stem vegetables	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2005	
2022	Wheat	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2005	
2022	Cephalopods	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006	
2022	Marine bivalve molluscs	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006	
2022	Rice, polished	ML (0.4 mg/kg)	2006	

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	<u>Food(s)^a</u>	<u>Type of standard^b (ML or GL value)</u>	<u>Year established^c</u>	<u>Corresponding standard^a</u>
Contamination (general)				
<u>2022</u>	Concerning source directed measures to reduce contamination of foods with chemicals (CXC 49-2001)	CoP	2001	n/a
Patulin				
<u>2022</u>	Apple juice	ML <u>(50 µg/kg)</u>	2003	CoP (CXC 50-2003)
<u>2022</u>	Apple juice and apple Juice ingredients in other beverages (CXC 50-2003)	CoP	2003	ML
Tin, inorganic				
<u>2022</u>	Canned foods (CXC 60-2005)	CoP	2005	MLs
<u>Tin</u>				
<u>n/a</u>	<u>Canned foods (other than beverages)</u>	<u>ML</u> <u>(250 mg/kg)</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>CoP</u> <u>(CXC 60-2005)</u>
<u>n/a</u>	<u>Canned beverages</u>	<u>ML</u> <u>(150 mg/kg)</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>CoP</u> <u>(CXC 60-2005)</u>
<p>n/a - not applicable</p> <p>a - Refer to GSCFF for specific exclusions and other details.</p> <p>b - Standards referred to include Maximum Level (ML); Guideline Level (GL); Code of Practice (CoP); relevant Codex commodity standards are not included.</p> <p>c - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), its description is edited for clarity, etc.</p>				

List B: Codex Contaminant Standards Recommended for Re-Evaluation

(the standards within in this list are in alphabetical order and the lists are not presented in order of priority)

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (ML or GL value)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
Acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives					
<u>2022</u>	Cereals & cereal-based products	ML <u>(value not established)</u>	2015	Not specified	<p>“The Committee, [...], agreed that it was premature to continue with work on the extension of the MLs for DON in cereals and cereal products to its acetylated derivatives. The Committee encouraged members to continue collecting and submitting data on occurrence of acetylated DON to GEMS/Food and noted the need for development of an internationally validated method for analysis of acetylated DON.”</p> <p>“The Committee agreed that [...] when further information became available, it could be considered as part of the discussion on the MLs for DON in cereals and cereal-based products.” (REP14/CF08, paras. 61-62)</p>
Aflatoxins, total					
<u>n/a</u>	Maize grain, destined for further processing	ML <u>(15 µg/kg)</u>	2022	<p><u>2025</u> <u>(if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food)</u> <u>2027 (at latest)</u> (CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)</p>	<p>Adopted with reservations by 40 member countries (REP22/CAC, para. 71i)a). “CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</p> <p>“Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 116) “The Chair, noting the diverse views, proposed to consider an ML of 15 µg/kg as a compromise and noted that CCCF could review the ML within 5 years’ time to see if it could be adjusted. She further noted that Members should continue to implement the CoP for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxin contamination in cereals (CXG 51 – 2003) and to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food for the later review of the ML. The other option was to discontinue work on this ML.”</p> <p>“The JECFA Secretariat urged delegates to take into consideration that most health benefit would be achieved already by setting an ML of 20 µg/kg. While a comparatively lower ML of 15 or 10 µg/kg, respectively, would realize further incremental gains in its protective value for public health, the magnitude of those increments was considerably lower than and paled in comparison to the public health benefits that is realized by setting the ML at the higher end of the proposed values, compared to setting no ML [...]”</p> <p>“The Representative of WHO expressed the view that while WHO would like to see an ML as low as possible for a potent genotoxic carcinogen such as aflatoxin, he also noted the differences in views of which ML to establish. Therefore, in order to best protect public health under these circumstances, WHO informed CCCF that from a WHO perspective an ML for aflatoxins was better than no ML.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 121-123)</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noted the reservations of Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda for the reasons expressed in paragraph 124.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 129-133) (See REP22/CF15 paras. 116-128 for the full discussion and member country comments)</p>
<u>n/a</u>	Flour meal, semolina and flakes derived from maize	ML <u>(10 µg/kg)</u>	2022	<p><u>2025</u> <u>(if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food)</u> <u>2027 (at latest)</u></p>	<p>Adopted with reservations by 41 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71ii)a). “CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</p> <p>“Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 129)</p>

Year Added to Overall High Priority List	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (ML or GL value)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
				(CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)	<p>“Those not in favour of the ML, reiterated their views that MLs should be set as low as reasonably achievable. It was further noted that there was a large year-to-year variation in all regions of the world. Proposals were made for lower MLs of 2.5 µg/kg or 4 to 5 µg/kg. It was noted that an ML of 2.5 µg/kg, for example, would result in a significant reduction for human exposure to aflatoxins, with an acceptable rejection rate of 4%.”</p> <p>“The Chair reiterated that data could be reviewed again within 5 years’ time similar for the maize grain, to see if the ML could be adjusted and that Members were encouraged to continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 131-132)</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noted the reservations of Egypt, EU and Kazakhstan for the reasons expressed in paragraph 131.” (REP22/CF15, para. 133)</p>
n/a	Husked rice	ML (20 µg/kg)	2022	<p>2025 (if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food) 2027 (at latest)</p> <p>(CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)</p>	<p>Adopted with reservations by 47 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71iii)a). “CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</p> <p>Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 134)</p> <p>“Those in favour of the ML noted that it was already a compromise proposal and lower than the 25 µg/kg initially proposed by the EWG, with an appropriate rejection rate of 2.7%.”</p> <p>“Those not in favour of the ML, expressed the view that: The ML should be set as low as reasonably achievable; high consumption of husked rice in their countries, particularly because of its promotion as part of a healthier diet coupled with such a high ML may pose a greater risk to their consumers; lower MLs were already implemented at country or regional level; it was difficult to distinguish rice destined for further processing from rice for direct consumption.”</p> <p>“The Chair reminded CCCF that the ML under consideration was already a lower ML than the originally proposed ML of 25 µg/kg and that the ML could be reviewed in 5 years’ time and that Members were encouraged to continue to generate and submit data to GEMS/Food.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 135-136, 138)</p> <p>“CCCF [...] noting the reservations of Egypt, EU, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Singapore and Sudan for the reasons expressed in paragraph 136.” (REP22/CF15, para. 139)</p>
n/a	Polished rice	ML (5 µg/kg)	2022	<p>2025 (if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food) 2027 (at latest)</p> <p>(CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)</p>	<p>Adopted with reservations by 40 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71iv)a). “CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</p>

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (ML or GL value)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
n/a	Sorghum grain, destined for further processing	ML (10 µg/kg)	2022	2025 (if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food) 2027 (at latest) (CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)	<u>Adopted with reservations by 34 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71v)a).</u> <u>“CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</u> “CCCF supported the ML, while noting that the data used to derive the ML was mainly from one country and ideally, MLs should be based on more representative data. A proposal was made to set the ML at 15 µg/kg at this time and that the ML should be reviewed in 5 years’ time with more data from different regions, especially those with high consumption of sorghum.” (REP22/CF15, para. 141)
n/a	Cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs)	ML (5 µg/kg)	2022	2025 (if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food) 2027 (at latest) (CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)	<u>Adopted with reservations by 45 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71vi)a).</u> <u>“CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</u> “Diverse views were expressed on the proposed ML.” (REP22/CF15, para. 143) “Those opposed to the ML, expressed the views that: ML for aflatoxin should be set as low as reasonably achievable, in particular for foods destined for infants and young children; [...] these foods played an important role in the complementary feeding period for infants and other than milk, exclusive feeding of the products, made infants even more vulnerable to the dietary risk of contaminated cereals; a lower ML was achievable by sourcing cleaner ingredients.” “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; by already lowering the ML from 10 µg/kg to 5 µg/kg, there would be a significant protection of the health of infants and young children and could be reasonably achieved; the ML could be reviewed at a later stage to see if it could be adjusted.” (REP22/CF15, paras. 144-145) “CCCF [...] noting the reservations of the Egypt, EU, Iran, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Singapore, Uganda and the United Kingdom for the reasons expressed in paragraph 144.” (REP22/CF15, para. 150) (see REP22/CF15 paras. 143-150 for the full discussion and food aid program comments)
n/a	Cereal-based foods for older infants and young children for food aid programs	ML (10 µg/kg)	2022	2025 (if sufficient data submitted to GEMS/Food) 2027 (at latest) (CCCF to consider if call for data should be issued in advance)	<u>Adopted with reservations by 44 member countries or regions (REP22/CAC, para. 71vii)a).</u> <u>“CAC45 requested CCCF to undertake a review of all the MLs for total aflatoxins in three years’ time, should sufficient data not have been submitted by Members through GEMS/Food, to undertake this review in no more than five years.” (REP22/CAC, para. 72).</u> (See above for Cereal-based foods for infants and young children (excluding foods for food aid programs). <u>“Those opposed to the ML, expressed the views that: ML for aflatoxin should be set as low as reasonably achievable, in particular for foods destined for infants and young children; [...] these foods played an important role in the complementary feeding period for infants and other than milk, exclusive feeding of the products, made infants even more vulnerable to the dietary risk of contaminated cereals; a lower ML was achievable by sourcing cleaner ingredients.” (REP22/CF15, para. 144)</u> “CCCF [...] noting the reservations of the Egypt and EU consistent with their reservations on cereals-based foods for infants and young children.” (REP22/CF15, para. 150)

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (ML or GL value)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
Aflatoxin M1					
<u>2022</u>	Milks	ML <u>(0.5 µg/kg)</u>	2001	Not specified	<p>“Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Community, objected to the level of 0.5 µg/kg because in the case of genotoxic carcinogens, exposure at any level might pose a health risk to consumers, in particular children, and that the level should therefore be as low as reasonably achievable. Other delegations supported the level of 0.5 µg/kg as proposed, especially in view of the determination of the JECFA that with worst-case assumptions, the additional risks for liver cancer predicted with the use of the proposed MLs of aflatoxin M1 of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg were very small. Bolivia stated that if the lower level would be fixed, it would create unjustified barriers to trade without affecting the risks to consumers’ health.”</p> <p>“The Commission could not reach a consensus on this issue.”</p> <p>“In view of the importance of establishing a level for the health protection of consumers, and in consideration that the higher level provided an adequate level of protection as determined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants, the Commission adopted the ML of 0.5 µg/kg in milk. It was agreed that data supporting the lower level, if and when available, could be examined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants at a future meeting if necessary. The member states of the EU, as well as Cyprus, Estonia, Ghana, Hungary, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Swaziland and Switzerland expressed their reservations on this decision. Consumers International also expressed the concern of that organization at the decision taken.” (ALINORM 01/41, paras. 127-129) (CAC24, 2001)</p>
Arsenic					
<u>2022</u>	Rice	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	2017	2019	<p>“A delegation stated that they did not have any objections to the adoption of the CoP. However, as the results of several ongoing studies would be available in 2019, the additional information gained from these studies might need to be added to this CoP in order to make it more understandable and more practical. Thus, the delegation noted that there would be a need to revise the CoP in 2019 when the outcome from ongoing studies became available.” (REP17/CF11, para. 102)</p>
Arsenic, inorganic					
<u>2022</u>	Husked rice	ML <u>(0.35 mg/kg)</u>	2016	2020	<p><u>“CAC39 adopted the proposed ML of 0.35 mg/kg for in-As 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. (REP16/CAC, paras. 58-66)</u></p> <p>“The Committee agreed to advance the ML of 0.35 mg/kg for husked rice for adoption by CAC39 on the understanding that the ML would be reviewed three years after the implementation of the CoP for the prevention and reduction of arsenic in rice (CXC 77-2017) and would take into account all available data to clearly lower the ML of 0.35 mg/kg.” (REP16/CF10, para. 44)</p>
Fumonisin (B1 + B2)					
<u>2022</u>	Maize flour & meal	ML <u>(2 000 µg/kg)</u>	2014	2017	<p>“There was wide support for the proposed ML of 2 000 µg/kg for maize flour and maize meal. African delegations, however, proposed an ML of 1 000 µg/kg for similar reasons as indicated in the discussion on the raw maize grains [health protection], and in addition these delegations questioned whether data from Africa had been considered. Further questions were raised on the cluster diets, noting that it wasn’t necessarily reflective of actual dietary intake in many countries.”</p>

Year Added to Overall High Priority List	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (ML or GL value)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
					<p>“The JECFA Secretariat clarified that JECFA had undertaken an impact assessment of the different proposed MLs and that the different estimated exposures between the MLs of 2 000 and 1 000 µg/kg would be very low, however the rejection rate was very different. So, aspects of food security and food safety had to be carefully considered and balanced. Moreover, in JECFA’s analyses the highest daily average consumption applied from one of the GEMS/Food cluster diets was about 300 g of maize per person per day, and overall, 11% of the samples considered were from African countries (over 12 000 samples).” “In noting the need for the ML and progress on this work, and in the spirit of compromise, African delegations, while having a preference for 1 000 µg/kg, agreed to the ML of 2 000 µg/kg.” (REP14/CF08, paras. 67-69)</p> <p>“[...], the Committee agreed that the ML of 4 000 µg/kg for raw [maize] cereal grains and 2 000 µg/kg for maize flour and maize meal were ready for adoption by the Commission. In relation to the ML for maize flour and maize meal, the Committee agreed that these would be advanced for adoption with the understanding that exposure and impact assessment should be undertaken by JECFA within three years for reconsideration of the levels.” (REP14/CF08, para. 71)</p> <p>“The Committee (JECFA) reviewed the studies that have become available since the previous evaluation in 2011 and concluded that they would not change the overall toxicological assessment performed previously by the Committee. Thus, the previously established group PMTDI of 2 µg/kg bw for FB1, FB2 and FB3, alone or in combination, was retained by the current Committee. The Committee noted that the international exposure estimates for FB1 and total fumonisins were lower than those estimated by the Committee at its seventy-fourth meeting in 2011. In the current assessment, a larger part of the occurrence data was from countries belonging to the WHO European Region compared with 2011, resulting in lower overall fumonisin levels in maize. In the current assessment, no information on fumonisin levels in maize was available from countries belonging to the African, Eastern Mediterranean or South-East Asia regions, where higher fumonisin concentrations are typically detected.” (JECFA/83/SC) (2016)</p> <p>“The Committee agreed to [...] call upon countries belonging to the African, Eastern Mediterranean or South- East Asia regions to provide to GEMS/Food contaminants database information on fumonisin levels in maize and to record this in the report of the meeting.” (REP17/CF11 para. 151)</p>
Lead					
<u>n/a</u>	Milk	ML <u>(0.02 mg/kg)</u>	2001 (reviewed in 2013)	Not specified	“The Committee agreed to retain the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg (milks) and 0.2 mg/kg (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 secondary milk products. The Committee also noted that if different MLs would be considered for cereal grains in future, stricter MLs could be applied to certain cereal grains in light of available data. ” (REP13/CF07, para. 28-29)
<u>2022</u>	Cereal grains	ML <u>(0.2 mg/kg)</u>	2001 (reviewed in 2013)	Not specified	See above for the lead ML for milk. <u>“The Committee agreed to retain the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg (milks) and 0.2 mg/kg (cereals).” “The Committee also noted that if different MLs would be considered for cereal grains in future, stricter MLs could be applied to certain cereal grains in light of available data.” (REP13/CF07, para. 29)</u>
<u>n/a</u>	Table olives	ML <u>(0.4 mg/kg)</u>	2016	Not specified	“The Committee agreed to lower the ML from 1 mg/kg to 0.4 mg/kg; to re-evaluate table olives in future when more data became available, and to revoke the previous ML.” (REP16/CF10, para. 77)
<u>n/a</u>	Jams, jellies, marmalades	ML <u>(0.4 mg/kg)</u>	2017	Not specified	“The Committee thus agreed to lower the ML to 0.4 mg/kg and to re-evaluate jams, jellies and marmalades in the future when more data became available.” (REP17/CF11, para. 61)

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	Food(s)	Type of Standard ^a (<u>ML or GL value</u>)	Year Established ^b	Year of Recommended Re-evaluation	Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation
Methylmercury					
<u>2022</u>	Tuna	ML <u>(1.2 mg/kg)</u>	2018	2021	<p>“The EU expressed the view that it could not agree for the time being with any of the MLs proposed as the levels were higher than those currently in force in the EU and would result in higher exposure to mercury which was a public health concern. This view was supported by Switzerland and Norway.” (REP18/CF12, para 72)</p> <p>“CCCF agreed on an ML of 1.2 mg/kg. EU, Switzerland, and Norway expressed their reservation to this decision for the reasons given in paragraph 72.” (REP18/CF12, paras. 75-76)</p> <p>“The EU, supported by Norway and Switzerland, expressed its reservation regarding all the MLs for the reasons contained in CX/CAC 18/41/4.” (REP18/CAC41, para. 34). “The EU reiterates its reservation on the adoption at step 5/8 of the MLs for all tuna, alfonso, marlin, and shark. All these MLs have been increased from the current GL of 1 mg/kg. [...] MLs proposed as the levels are higher than those currently in force in the EU and would result in higher exposure to mercury which is a serious public health concern” (CX/CAC 18/41/4, para 34).</p> <p>“Colombia and Cuba also reserved their position on the final adoption of all the MLs, supporting instead adoption at Step 5 and further consideration in CCCF. Cuba further noted that, according to their national regulation, the proposed MLs would not sufficiently protect the health of the Cuban population.” (REP18/CAC41, para. 35) “Ecuador expressed a reservation on the setting of one single ML for methylmercury for all tuna species on the grounds that data used in establishing the ML did not take into account certain eastern Pacific tuna species with higher methylmercury concentrations. [...] If adopted, the ML should be revised after three years based on available data with a view to establishing a more globally representative ML.” (REP18/CAC41, para. 37). “The Commission adopted the proposed MLs [for methylmercury in tuna, alfonso, marlin and shark], noting the reservations expressed by Cuba, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, Norway, Senegal and Switzerland, and agreed that CCCF could consider revising the ML for tuna in the light of additional data after three years.” (REP18/CAC41, para. 39)</p> <p>Senegal didn’t express reservation for the tuna ML, but for other species. “<u>ML for tuna</u>: CCCF first considered the ML based on P95 (1.1 mg/kg) and noted that while there was some support for this ML because it would be more protective for health, that many delegations believed the rejection rate of 5% was too high, and that the ML of 1.2 mg/kg or other higher MLs such as 1.7 mg/kg should be considered which would result in lower rejection rates. Views were also expressed that the ML for tuna should be set based on the species of tuna with high mercury content, such as Bigeye or Bluefin tuna. The ML of 1.2 mg/kg was proposed as a compromise as this was based on the data of all tuna species but with a next lower rejection rate than 5%.” (REP18/CF12, para. 74)</p>
Patulin					
<u>2022</u>	Apple juice, whole commodity (not concentrated) or commodity reconstituted to the original juice concentration	ML <u>(50 µg/kg)</u>	2003	2007	<p>“The Commission noted that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had discussed the development of the proposed ML of 50 µg/kg of patulin with a view to establishing a lower level of 25 µg/kg in the future based on the application of the CoP which was aimed at achieving lower patulin levels. The Commission supported the decision of the Committee to continue to collect data on the levels of patulin in apple juice and apple juice ingredients for other beverages with the aim of reconsidering a possible reduction of the ML once the CoP had been implemented (after four years).” (ALINORM 03/41, para. 43) (CAC26, 2003)</p>

<u>Year Added to Overall High Priority List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of Standard^a (ML or GL value)</u>	<u>Year Established^b</u>	<u>Year of Recommended Re-evaluation</u>	<u>Rationale for Recommended Re-Evaluation</u>
Tin, total (*ML applies to products in containers other than tinplate containers)					
<u>2022</u>	Cooked cured chopped meat*	ML (50 mg/kg for each food)	1981	Not specified	"[...] However, the 23 rd Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had only temporarily endorsed the contaminant provisions for lead and tin, as they were felt to be excessively high. Several delegations reiterated their reservations on the high levels established for contaminants derived from the packaging material in this and the other Draft Standards before the Commission." (ALINORM 91/40, para. 321) (CAC19, 1991)
	Cooked cured ham*				
	Cooked cured pork shoulder*				
	Corned beef*				
	Luncheon meat*				
<p>n/a - not applicable</p> <p>a - ML: Maximum Level; GL: Guideline Level; CoP: Code of Practice</p> <p>b - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g., from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.</p> <p>c - Prioritization criteria most recently agreed to for the prioritization of existing Codex standards for possible review.</p>					

ANNEX II

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

(the standards within in this list are in alphabetical order and the lists are not presented in order of priority) (Last Updated 27-March-2024)

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

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
Acetylated deoxynivalenol derivatives								
<u>2022</u>	Cereals & cereal-based products	ML (value not established)	2015	CoP (CXC 51-2003)	List B (priority 2) (<u>year of recommended re-evaluation not specified</u>) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	<u>Insufficient data in GEMS/Food; U.S. not testing for derivatives; wait up to 3 years for data collection. (USA CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Acrylonitrile								
<u>2022</u>	Food	GL (0.02 mg/kg)	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raw materials in manufacture of plastic packaging commonly used in Kenya for water piping, primary packaging of most foods and drinking water. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14) 	Appears to be well managed and not detected in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Food packaging and food contact materials are covered by the scope of the definition of a contaminant. (CX/CF 19/13/18, Appendix D)</u> (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	
Aflatoxins, total								
<u>2023</u>	<u>Maize grain, destined for further processing</u>	<u>ML (15 µg/kg)</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>List B (priority 1) (recommended for re-evaluation in 2025 to 2027)</u> <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14) <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)		<u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
<u>2022</u>	Peanuts intended for further processing	ML (15 µg/kg)	1999	CoP (CXC 55-2004) (CXC 59-2005)	List A.2 (priority 2) (revised) HBGV cannot be established (priority 1) (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) <u>CoP for aflatoxins in peanuts (CXC 55-2004) in List A.2.</u> <u>CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14) <u>CoP available (priority 2)</u> <u>CoP established in 2004; significant reductions expected.</u> (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and should be ALARA in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) Concurrent elaboration of MLs for peanuts RTE and FFP would allow for proportionality and impacts of processing to be considered. (Canada, CX/CF 23/16/14) Should not be prioritized for review as CCCF is struggling with data categorization for peanuts RTE and FFP. (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)	
<u>2022</u>	Peanuts (CXC 55-2004)	CoP	2004	ML - Aflatoxins in peanuts intended for further processing (List A.2)	List A.2 (priority 2) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) <u>ML for aflatoxins in peanuts for further processing in List A.2. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>CCCF is currently elaborating an ML for aflatoxins in RTE peanuts. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14) HBGV cannot be established (priority 1) (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14) <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 2)</u> <u>Peanuts are produced around the world including developing countries.</u>	Aflatoxins are genotoxic carcinogens and should be ALARA in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) Peanuts are susceptible to <i>Aspergillus spp</i> and therefore are naturally prone to aflatoxin contamination. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Concerns about spread of aflatoxins due to climate change. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
					<p><u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Technological advances and developments (priority 2)</u> <u>sorting machine with improved performance available.</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Comparable CoP updated (priority 3)</u> <u>CoP for treenuts updated in 2010 & CoP for cereals was revised in 2017.</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u></p>			
Aflatoxin B1								
<u>2022</u>	Raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997)	CoP	1997	ML - Aflatoxin M1 in milks (List <u>A.1 A.2</u> & List B)	<p><u>List A.1 (priority 1)</u> List A.2 (priority 2) <u>HBGV cannot be established (priority 1)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> <u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> <u>ML for aflatoxin M1 in milks in List A.2</u> <u>(EU, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>(Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>Comparable CoP updated (priority 3)</u> <u>CoP for mycotoxins in cereals (CXC 51-2003) amended (2014, 2017) and revised (2016).</u> <u>(Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u></p>	Aflatoxin M1 is a genotoxic carcinogen and should be ALARA in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>CoP for mycotoxins in cereals (CXC 51-2003) established in 2003 and amended (2014, 2017) and revised (2016), updated.</u> (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	
Aflatoxin M1								
<u>2022</u>	Milks	ML (0.5 µg/kg)	2001	CoP (CXC 45-1997)	<p>List A.2 (priority 2) List B (priority 2) (revised) <u>(priority 1) (year of recommended re-evaluation not specified)</u> New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u></p>	Aflatoxin M1 is a genotoxic carcinogen and should be ALARA in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Iran, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
					<p><u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>HBGV cannot be established (priority 1)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>Tropical, humid conditions in Kenya and unsuitable storage conditions can cause the levels of aflatoxins to increase significantly. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> <u>CoP for raw materials and supplemental feedingstuffs for milk-producing animals (CXC 45-1997) in List A.1 A.2 and List B. (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>(Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>CoP available (priority 2)</u> <u>CoP established in 1997 and significant reductions expected. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u></p>	<p>CoP for mycotoxins in cereals (CXC 51-2003) established in 2003 and since amended (2014, 2017) and revised (2016). updated. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) Lower ML not supported by JECFA56 assessment (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</p> <p>Possible analytical sensitivity challenges with lower ML (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</p>		

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
Arsenic								
<u>2022</u>	Edible fats and oils	ML (0.08 mg/kg)	<1980	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) <u>New occurrence data available (priority 1)</u> <u>Data used to establish the ML is unknown; believed to be new data created over the past 40 years.</u> <u>Japan submitted data to GEMS/Food in 2018. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>HBGV cannot be established (priority 1) JECFA72 (2011) withdrew previous PTWI. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> ML for arsenic in fat spreads and blended spreads will be in List A.2. in 2023. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Assessment of non-cancer effects of organic and inorganic arsenic on JECFA priority list. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u>	ML appears to have been transferred from the commodity standards & not scientifically justified. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Await completion of the upcoming JECFA evaluation. (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<u>2022</u>	Rice	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	2017	ML - Arsenic in polished rice and ML – Arsenic in husked rice (List B)	List B (priority 2) (priority 3) (recommended for re-evaluation in 2019) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Technological advances and developments (priority 2)</u> <u>New information on prevention measures. (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	<u>Await completion of the upcoming JECFA evaluation. (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<u>2022</u>	Salt	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) (revised) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> <u>Salt is widely consumed and traded. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>New occurrence data available (priority 1)</u>	<u>Await completion of the upcoming JECFA evaluation. (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
					<p><u>Data used to establish the ML is unknown; believed to be new data from past 35 years.</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>HBGV cannot be established (priority 1) JECFA72 (2011) withdrew previous PTWI. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> <u>Assess cadmium, mercury and arsenic in salt concurrently.</u> <u>(Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u></p>			
Arsenic, inorganic								
<u>2022</u>	Husked Rice	ML (0.35 mg/kg)	2016 (<u>recommended for review in 2020</u>)	CoP (CXC 77-2017)	<p>List B (<u>priority 2</u>) (<u>priority 1</u>) <u>(recommended for re-evaluation in 2020)</u> New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>CoP available (priority 2)</u></p>	Await the completion of the JECFA evaluation. (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	EU (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Cadmium								
<u>2022</u>	Salt	ML (0.5 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	<p>List A.1 (priority 1) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> <u>Salt is widely consumed and traded.</u> <u>(Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u> <u>(Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>New occurrence data available (priority 1)</u> <u>Data used to establish the ML is unknown; believed to be new data from past 35 years.</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>New HBGV available (priority 1)</u> <u>JECFA73 (2010) withdrew previous PTWI and established a new PTMI.</u></p>		Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
					<p><u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Relevant to developing countries (priority 1)</u> <u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> <u>Assess cadmium, mercury and arsenic in salt concurrently (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u></p>			
<u>2022</u>	Legume Vegetables	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001	n/a	<p>List A.2 (priority 2) New occurrence data (priority 1) <u>Japan: data for cereals, vegetables and vegetable products, fruits and fruits products, eggs, seaweed and green tea (2009-2019) submitted to 2018 call for data; additional data for several foods.</u> (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> New dietary exposure data (priority 1) <u>JECFA91 (2021) conducted an updated exposure assessment.</u> (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> New HBGV (priority 1) <u>JECFA73 (2010) withdrew previous PTWI and established a new PTMI.</u> (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> Updated JECFA HRA (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u></p>	<p>Consider first drafting a CoP for the mitigation of cadmium in crops, followed by a data collection on products and possible review of the MLs after the application the CoP. (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u></p>	<p>EU (CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>(Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u></p>	
<u>2022</u>	Pulses	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	2001	n/a				
<u>2022</u>	Wheat	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2005	n/a				
<u>2022</u>	Cephalopods	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006	n/a				
<u>2022</u>	Marine bivalve molluscs	ML (2 mg/kg)	2006	n/a				
<u>2022</u>	Rice, polished	ML (0.4 mg/kg)	2006	CoP (CXC 77-2017) ML (rice, husked)				

<u>Year Added to List</u>	Food(s)	Type of standard (ML or GL value) ^a	Year established ^b	Corresponding standard (List) ^a	Prioritization criteria ^c cited	Other comments or information	Recommended to List or prioritized by ^d (document ref.)	Member country volunteer
Contamination (general)								
<u>2022</u>	Concerning source directed measures to reduce Contamination of Foods with Chemicals (CXC 49-2001)	CoP	2001	n/a	List A.2 (priority 2) Staple food (priority 1) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) Relevant to developing countries (priority 1) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) Technological advances (priority 2) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) Expanded Scope (priority 3) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) Member country volunteer (priority 2) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)		USA (CX/CF 22/15/17) USA (CX/CF 23/16/14)	USA
Fumonisin (B1 + B2)								
<u>2022</u>	Maize flour & maize meal	ML (2000 µg/kg)	2014 (recommended for re-evaluation in 2017)	CoP (CXC 51-2003)	List B (priority 2) (recommended for re-evaluation in 2017) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) Relevant to developing countries (priority 1) (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14) Staple food (priority 1) Maize flour and maize meal is a staple food in Kenya. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14) CoP available (priority 2) CoP established in 2003. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Maize is susceptible to <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> and <i>F. verticillioides</i> and therefore are naturally prone to fumonisin contamination. (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Occurrence data needed from Africa and Asia (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
Lead								
<u>2022</u>	Cereal grains	ML (0.2 mg/kg)	2001 (reviewed in 2013)	n/a CoP (CXC 56-2004)	List B (priority 2) (<u>year of recommended re-evaluation not specified</u>) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, <u>CX/CF 22/15/17</u>) <u>Staple food (priority 1) (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14) (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u> Relevant to developing countries (priority 1) (Ecuador, <u>CX/CF 23/16/14</u>)		Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
<u>2023</u>	<u>Milk</u>	<u>ML</u> (0.02 mg/kg)	<u>2001</u> (reviewed in 2013)	<u>CoP</u> (CXC 56-2004)	List B (priority 2) (<u>year of recommended re-evaluation not specified</u>) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (Canada, <u>CX/CF 22/15/17</u>) <u>Staple food (priority 1) (Ecuador, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>		<u>Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	
Mercury								
<u>2022</u>	Salt	ML (0.1 mg/kg)	1987	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) (revised) <u>Staple food (priority 1)</u> Salt is widely consumed and traded (Canada, <u>CX/CF 22/15/17</u>) <u>New occurrence data available (priority 1)</u> Data used to establish the ML is <u>unknown; believed to be new data from past 35 years.</u> (Japan, <u>CX/CF 23/16/14</u>) <u>New HBGV available (priority 1)</u> JECFA72 (2011) withdrew the <u>previous PTWI for total mercury and established a new PTWI for inorganic mercury.</u> (Japan, <u>CX/CF 23/16/14</u>) <u>Efficiencies with other work (priority 2)</u> Assess cadmium, mercury and arsenic in salt concurrently. (Canada, <u>CX/CF 22/15/17</u>)		Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Methylmercury								

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
<u>2022</u>	Tuna	ML	2018 (recommended for re-evaluation in 2024)	n/a	List B (priority 2) (priority 1) (recommended for re-evaluation in 2021) New occurrence data available (priority 1) (EU, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Japan, CX/CF 22/15/17) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) Aligns with ongoing CCCF work to elaborate MLs for methylmercury in fish and developing develop a sampling plan (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Await completion of FAO/WHO risk-benefit assessment and CCCF's sampling plan (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) EU (CX/CF 22/15/17)	
Patulin								
<u>2022</u>	Apple juice	ML (50 µg/kg)	2003	CoP (CXC 50-2003) (List A.2)	List A.2 (priority 2) List B (priority 1) (recommended for re-evaluation in 2007) New occurrence data available (priority 1) Japan can submit new occurrence data on patulin in apple juices. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) Patulin in apple juice CoP (CXC 50-2003) in List A.2 (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14) CoP available (priority 2) CoP established in 2003 and significant reduction expected. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Either extension to apple products other than apple juice (no JECFA eval. needed) or review of juice ML (JECFA evaluation may be required). (USA, CX/CF 22/15/17) (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14) Dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995); removed from JECFA priority list in 2007 as ML was established and not high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127) (CCCF01, 2007). (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)	USA (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya CX/CF 23/16/14	
<u>2022</u>	Apple juice and apple juice ingredients in other beverages (CXC 50-2003)	CoP	2003	ML - Patulin in apple juice (List A.2 & List B)	List A.2 (priority 2) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) ML for patulin in apple juice in List A.2 & List B (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17)	Apples are prone to infection by <i>penicillium</i> , <i>aspergillus</i> and <i>byssoschlamys spp</i> that may contaminate apple and apple products. (Kenya,	Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
					Relevant to developing countries (priority 1) <u>Kenya imports a lot of apple products (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17)</u>	CX/CF 22/15/17) Dated JECFA evaluation (JECFA44, 1995); removed from JECFA priority list in 2007 as ML was established and not high priority (ALINORM 07/30/41, para. 127) (CCCF01, 2007). (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)		
Tin, total (*ML applies to products in containers other than tinsplate containers)								
<u>2022</u>	*Cooked cured chopped meat	ML (50 mg/kg, for each meat)	1981	CoP (CXC 60-2005)	List A.1 A.2 (priority 1) List B (priority 2) (revised) (year of recommended re-evaluation not specified) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) CoP for tin in canned foods packaged in tinsplate containers (CXC 60-2005) in List A.2 MLs for tin in canned foods & canned beverages in tinsplate containers will be in List A.2 in 2023. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) CoP available (priority 2) CoP established in 2005 and significant reduction expected. (Japan, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Higher tin MLs are in place for other foods (USA, CX/CF 23/16/14)	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Republic of Korea (CX/CF 22/15/17) Japan (CX/CF 23/16/14)	
<u>2022</u>	*Cooked cured ham							
<u>2022</u>	*Cooked cured pork shoulder							
<u>2022</u>	*Corned beef							
<u>2022</u>	*Luncheon meat							
Tin, inorganic								
<u>2022</u>	Canned Foods (CXC 60-2005)	CoP	2003	MLs	List A.2 (priority 2) Efficiencies with other work (priority 2) MLs for tin in canned foods and beverages in tinsplate packaging will be in List A.2 in 2023; 5 MLs for tin meats not packaged in tinsplate cans in List A.1. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)		Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)	

<u>Year Added to List</u>	<u>Food(s)</u>	<u>Type of standard (ML or GL value)^a</u>	<u>Year established^b</u>	<u>Corresponding standard (List)^a</u>	<u>Prioritization criteria^c cited</u>	<u>Other comments or information</u>	<u>Recommended to List or prioritized by^d (document ref.)</u>	<u>Member country volunteer</u>
Vinyl chloride								
<u>2022</u>	Food	GL (0.01 mg/kg)	1991	n/a	List A.1 (priority 1) <u>Relevant to Developing countries (priority 1) Raw materials in manufacture of plastic packaging which is commonly used in Kenya for water piping, primary packaging of most foods and drinking water (Kenya, CX/CF 22/15/17) Ecuador (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	Appear to be well managed and not detected in foods. (Canada, CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Food packaging and food contact materials are covered by the scope of the definition of a contaminant. (CX/CF 19/13/18, Appendix D) (Kenya, CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	Canada (CX/CF 22/15/17) Kenya (CX/CF 22/15/17) <u>Kenya (CX/CF 23/16/14)</u>	
<p>a - ML: Maximum Level; GL: Guideline Level; CoP: Code of Practice</p> <p>b - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g. from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.</p> <p>c - Prioritization criteria most recently agreed to for the prioritization of existing Codex standards for possible review.</p> <p><u>d - Member country initially nominating the standard to the OHPL or member country that clearly identifies the standard as a high priority for review</u></p>								

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

Criteria ^a for identifying standards and related texts for contaminants for review	Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern ^b	Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF ^d 1 – highest priority 2 – medium priority 3 – lowest priority
<i>Criteria for Maximum levels (ML), Guideline Levels (GL) and Codes of Practice (CoP)</i>		
List A.1: Established or Reviewed ≥ 25 years ago ^c	Moderate to high	1
List A.2: Established or Reviewed ≥ 15 and < 25 years ago ^c	Low to moderate	2
List B: Recommended for re-evaluation: CCCF, CAC or a member country recommended the standard for re-evaluation within a certain period of time or at an unspecified future date.	Low to Moderate	<u>1 – CAC</u> <u>2 – CCCF</u> 3 – member country only
Staple food: The food commodity that the standard applies to is a staple food.	Moderate to high	1
Developing countries: Standards relevant to the needs of developing countries.	Moderate to high	1
New occurrence data are available: Occurrence data identified by CCCF or its member countries and/or submitted to the GEMS/Food database are significantly different ^e across two or more regions or markets than those used to establish the existing ML or GL. <u>Or significant^e new data are available from regions of concern and/or regions where data were previously lacking.</u>	Moderate to high	1
New dietary exposure data are available: CCCF, JECFA, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF developed new dietary exposure estimates or revised existing estimates that are significantly different ^e than the previous estimates that were used to establish the existing ML or GL.	Moderate to high	1
New health-based guidance value (HBGV) is available: Either JECFA, upon request by CCCF, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF developed a new HBGV, revised an existing HBGV that is significantly different ^e than the previous HBGV that was used to establish the existing ML or GL, or withdrew an existing HBGV.	Moderate to high	1
<u>Health-based guidance value (HBGV) cannot be established: Either JECFA, upon request by CCCF, or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF cannot establish a HBGV due to genotoxicity and carcinogenicity or other rationale that does not support establishment of a threshold for the critical effect</u>	<u>Moderate to high</u>	<u>1</u>
A new or updated health risk assessment is available: Either JECFA or other relevant joint FAO/WHO expert consultations recognized by CCCF published a health risk assessment and the conclusions are significantly different ^e than the previous evaluation.	Moderate to high	1
Efficiencies with other work: Standard review involving the same or similar commodity, or the same contaminant is underway or commencing.	n/a	2
Member country volunteer: A Codex member country volunteers to take on the work to draft a discussion paper outlining any proposed changes to the Codex standard.	n/a	2

Criteria ^a for identifying standards and related texts for contaminants for review	Likelihood of indicating a potential safety concern ^b	Overall proposed prioritization for review by CCCF ^d 1 – highest priority 2 – medium priority 3 – lowest priority
Additional Criteria for Maximum Levels (MLs)		
Codex commodity standards: Significant ^e revisions have been made to the commodity standards for relevant foods or food groups for which MLs are established.	n/a	3
Codex Classification of Food and Feed (CXM 4-1989): Significant ^e revisions have been made to this document for relevant foods or food groups for which MLs are established.	n/a	3
Trade disruptions: An existing ML for a certain food and contaminant combination is responsible for disruptions in international trade.	n/a	2
CoP available: CoP available for at least 3 years since ML(s) established for the relevant contaminant-food combination(s).	<u>n/a</u>	<u>2</u>
Additional Criteria for Codes of Practice (CoPs)		
Technological advances and developments: Significant ^e new information is available on contamination sources or processes, and/or agricultural, production and manufacturing practices related to food or feed contaminant management and control.	n/a	2
Expanded scope: CoP could include other contaminants or toxins, or food or feed, with comparable contamination sources or processes, and/or agricultural, production and manufacturing practices.	n/a	3
Comparable CoP updated: Updates to a CoP for a similar food or feed and contaminant combination may be transferable to another CoP or make an existing CoP redundant.	n/a	3
<p>n/a – not applicable</p> <p>a - Certain criteria may overlap, particularly those relating to the various elements of a health risk assessment.</p> <p>b - Potential safety concern would be determined once any new data and scientific information are assessed.</p> <p>c - The year the standard was initially established, and, if applicable, most recently reviewed by CCCF. A 'review' involves a full assessment of available data and information, which may or may not result in the standard being changed; a review would not include several standards being consolidated or when a standard is discussed, moved (e.g., from a commodity standard into the GSCFF), or its description is edited for clarity, etc.</p> <p>d - Priority rankings are intended as a guide, not to generate a precise numeric ranking.</p> <p>e - The significance would be determined on a case-by-case basis by CCCF.</p>		