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

E

Agenda Item 7(g) **CX/PR 19/51/12**
FebruarY 2019

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session
Macao SAR, P.R. China, 8-13 April 2019

CLASS B – PRIMARY FOOD COMMODITIES OF ANIMAL ORIGIN

COMMON DEFINITION OF EDIBLE ANIMAL TISSUES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS OF PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS FOR COMPOUNDS WITH DUAL USES AS PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS FOR USE BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES AND THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS

(AT STEP 3)

(Prepared by the CCPR Electronic Working Group on the Revision of the Classification chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands in collaboration with the CCRVDF Electronic Working Group on Definition of Edible Animal Tissues chaired by Kenya and co-chaired by New Zealand)

Codex Members and Observers wishing to submit comments at Step 3 on this matter should do so as instructed in CL 2019/05-PR.

Circular letters are available on the Codex webpage/Circular Letters:
http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en-

BACKGROUND

Cooperation between CCPR and CCRVDF

1. CCEXEC73 (June 2017) noted that the work of CCRVDF included compounds used as both veterinary drugs and pesticides. The Executive Committee encouraged closer collaboration between CCRVDF and CCPR when considering maximum residue limits (MRLs) for compounds used as both veterinary drugs and pesticides and invited the two committees to explore innovative ways to foster such collaboration.[1]

2. CCPR50 (April 2018) and CCRVDF24 (April 2018) considered the recommendation of CCEXEC73 on closer collaboration between CCPR and CCRVDF and noted the support of delegations on the need to evolve innovative ways for better collaboration between JMPR/JMPR[2] and CCPR/CCRVDF for optimal evaluation of dual use compounds which could include improved collaboration between JECFA/JECFA on proposals for harmonized MRLs, residue definitions, etc.; improved synchronization of work between CCPR and CCRVDF Working Group on Priorities in particular as to the prioritization of compounds with dual uses for evaluation by JECFA/JMPR.[3]

3. Within this cooperation framework, CCRVDF24 further noted that CCPR50 had taken a policy decision that for those compounds with only external animal use, CCPR would no longer establish MRLs but would forward them to JECFA and CCRVDF for their assessment and that until such time as JECFA and CCRVDF would consider such compounds, the existing MRLs for pesticides would remain to continue to have an international reference for trade.[4]

[1] REP17/EXEC73, paras. 17-19
[2] See also Agenda Item 3, CX/PR 18/50/3 and CX/PR 19/51/3 on cooperation between JECFA and JMPR to improve chronic dietary exposure assessment to compounds used both as pesticides and veterinary drugs.
[3] REP18/PR, para. 9, REP18/RVDF, paras. 7-8
[4] REP18/PR, para. 152, REP18/RVDF, para. 9

Common definition for edible offal/other animal tissues of interest in international trade

4. When considering a definition for edible offal tissues for the establishment of MRLs for veterinary drugs, the Chair of CCRVDF24 noted that lack of harmonization of the definition for offal between CCPR and CCRVDF, would result in confusion for enforcement, and could hamper trade and affect public health, in particular when setting MRLs for dual purpose compounds (i.e. a different definition for setting MRLs for residues from the use as pesticides and as veterinary drug or for setting single MRLs for compounds with dual uses). Once alignment between CCPR and CCRVDF is achieved CCRVDF could decide if further discussion was required. In the interim, CCRVDF would continue to deal with other tissues on a case by case basis.

5. The Codex Secretariat reminded CCRVDF of the need for cooperation between CCPR and CCRVDF as recommended by CCEXEC73 and clarified that the CCRVDF/EWG could coordinate informally with the CCPR/EWG (as there were no formal procedures available) to reach a harmonized definition.

6. CCRVDF24 therefore agreed to establish an Electronic Working Group (EWG) chaired by Kenya and co-chaired by New Zealand to coordinate with the CCPR EWG on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed to harmonize a common definition for edible offal and for any other animal tissues of relevance for the purpose of harmonization and the elaboration of MRLs.[5]

7. CCEXEC75 (June 2018) further recommended that the CCPR/EWG on the revision of the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXM 4-1989), in addition to its existing terms of reference (TORs), work closely with the CCRVDF/EWG on the definition of *edible* animal tissues to develop a harmonized definition that would facilitate the establishment of MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs with dual use.[6]

Considerations for a common definition of edible offal/other animal tissues of relevance in international trade for the establishment of MRLs for compounds with dual uses as pesticides and veterinary drugs by CCPR and CCRVDF

8. In order to provide the basis for discussion at the CCPR/EWG-Classification, the Chair and Co-Chair of the CCRVDF/EWG-Definition of edible animal tissues prepared a discussion paper that is presented in Appendix I (for information). Japan also provided surveys as presented in Appendices II and III (for information).

9. The current working definition of edible offal agreed by CCRVDF is: "*those parts of an animal apart from meat from the carcass, that are considered fit for human consumption*".

10. Definitions for edible offal in the *Classification of Food and Feed* include definitions in Type 06 Mammalian products, Group 032 Edible offal (Mammalian); Type 07 Poultry Product, Group 38 Poultry, Edible offal of, and Type 08 Aquatic animal products, Group 043, Fish roe (including milt = soft roe) and edible offal of fish.

11. CCRVDF normally established MRLs on muscle, liver, kidney, fat, honey, milk and eggs for a range of animal species. There is not a formal classification system, although guidance documents provide examples of tissues of interest. Some tissues are not a significant trade item or are unlikely to be consumed in a number of countries.

12. The *Classification for Food and Feed* includes primary and processed plant and animal commodities. Commodity groups include, plants, animal feed, processed food, mammalian, poultry, aquatic, amphibian and reptiles and invertebrate animals. Commodities include meat, fat, liver, kidney, edible offal, milk, skin, eggs and roe. Honey is not included in this classification.

13. CCRVDF does not use a formal classification system, but utilizes some of the Classification system in the *Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programs Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals* (CXG 71-2009). CCRVDF uses the term muscle instead of meat as used by CCPR. CCPR has a hierarchical classification system, and allows for the extrapolation from one or more representative commodity to other related commodities.

14. In the CCPR EWG, discussion and comments included support for consolidation of the definition of edible offal by Thailand, Iran, Germany, Japan, Canada and Chile. Germany supported the use of a hierarchical system along with extrapolation rules, the consolidation of the terms muscle and meat and the addition of honey to the CCPR classification system.

[5] REP18/RVDF, paras. 85 - 95
[6] REP18/EXEC75, paras. 27-28

15. Japan stressed the importance of a common commodity and residue definition and that these should be the same for food pesticides and veterinary drugs. The inclusion of fat also needs to be considered for fat-soluble compounds. Japan in a survey (Appendix II) found compounds used as both pesticide and veterinary drugs having different MRLs. The survey also found different descriptors for a similar or the same commodity (Appendix III). Examples include “fat”, “fat with skin”, “fat/skin” and “skin”. Some MRLs included notes including “The MRL includes skin + fat”, “Fat/Skin in normal proportion”. A harmonized commodity classification system is needed.

16. Canada supported the recommendations in the discussion paper (Appendix I), but questioned the definition (not referenced) in footnote 1 in the discussion paper and noted that this definition included organs specifically excluded by the *Standard for Luncheon Meat* (CXS 89-1981); the *Standard for Cooked Cured Chopped Meat* (CXS 98-1981) and by the *Classification of Food and Feed*.

17. In the CCRVDF EWG, discussion and comments included support of the proposed definition by the Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran and France. France did not support the extrapolation of MRLs between species because of differences in metabolism and a case-by-case approach should be used for risk management. The Republic of Korea, Egypt, and Iran also supported a risk management approach for setting MRLs for specific commodities.

CONCLUSIONS

18. Based on the discussion paper (Appendix I) and discussions within the respective EWGs, opportunities for consolidation between CCPR and CCRVDF include:

- A consolidated edible offal definition for both CCPR and CCRVDF.
- A consolidated edible offal hierarchical classification of edible offal for both CCPR and CCRVDF.
- Consideration of animal extrapolation rules using representative animal edible offal tissues.
- Consideration of target edible offal tissue for risk assessment.

RECOMMENDATION

19. CCPR is invited to consider the following questions based on the considerations provided in the working document and comments submitted in reply to CL 2019/05-PR in order to provide guidance to further progress work on a common definition for edible animal tissues (including edible offal tissues):

1. CCRVDF uses the term muscle, while CCPR uses meat. Can these terms be consolidated? If so, what is the appropriate term to use?
2. Is the proposed consolidated edible offal definition acceptable: “Those parts of an animal, apart from meat from the carcass, that are considered fit for human consumption”.
3. Should a consolidated edible offal hierarchical classification be used for CCPR and CCRVDF and how can this be accomplished?
4. Can animal extrapolation rules be developed for both CCPR and CCRVDF using representative animal edible offal tissues.
5. What is the best procedure to establish harmonized descriptors? Examples include different descriptors such as “fat”, “fat with skin”, “fat/skin” and “skin”.
6. Should honey be included in the Classification system as a miscellaneous commodity? If so, should honey be included in Class B (primary food commodities of animal origin) or Class E (processed food of animal origin?

APPENDIX I

DISCUSSION PAPER ON EDIBLE OFFAL AND OTHER ANIMAL TISSUES DEFINITION

(prepared by the Chair and Co-Chair of the CCRVDF/EWG)

FOR INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

1. At the 24th session of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs (CCRVDF) in Chicago, USA (23-27 April 2018), the Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group chaired by Kenya and co-chaired by New Zealand, working in English only. The purpose of the group is to coordinate with the EWG of CCPR (Classification of Food and Feed) to elaborate a definition for edible offal and for any other animal tissues of relevance, for the purpose of harmonization and the elaboration of MRLs.

2. The electronic working group was to report back to the 25th session of the CCRVDF.

BACKGROUND

3. At the 22nd CCRVDF meeting in relation to establishing MRLs for zilpaterol hydrochloride, the committee asked JECFA to consider potential residues in animal lungs and edible offal[1].

4. JECFA's response at the 23rd CCRVDF meeting was that there are several definitions for offal by various regulators and other institutions, however, none were harmonized. JECFA requested further guidance on defining a list of tissues of offal of interest to CCRVDF.

5. CCRVDF agreed to establish an EWG, hosted by Kenya, to prepare a discussion paper in response to the request from 81st JECFA for CCRVDF to "provide a definition of edible offal". The discussion paper would propose a possible definition of edible offal tissue and specify edible offal tissues of interest in international trade. The discussion paper would be considered at the 24th CCRVDF meeting.

6. The discussion paper produced by the EWG was tabled at the 24th CCRVDF meeting. After a lengthy discussion the committee adopted a working definition of edible offals as "*those parts of an animal, apart from meat from the carcass, that are considered fit for human consumption"*. It was however recognized that any definition adopted by the CCRVDF should be harmonized with any definition used by CCPR. It was noted that CCPR are currently revising its Codex Classification for Food and Animal Feed and it would opportune to co-ordinate with CCPR.

7. It was agreed to establish an EWG as stated in paragraph 1 to co-ordinate with CCPR work.

CCRVDF CODEX CLASSIFICATION

8. When considering MRLs for veterinary drugs, CCRVDF normally establishes MRLs on muscle, liver, kidney, fat, honey, milk or eggs for a range of animal species. There is no formal classification system, although the Codex Manual provides examples of tissues of interest, JECFA's Procedures for Recommending Maximum Residue Limits Residues of Veterinary Drugs In Food (Rome 2000) and the Codex Guideline Document (CAC/GL 71-2009) 'Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals' in the section on sampling outlines these commodities. Other tissues have not historically been considered due to them either not being a commodity of significant trade, or deemed unlikely to be consumed in a number of countries.

9. Consequently, residue data supplied to CCRVDF's risk assessor body JECFA for evaluation generally only relates to the above commodities identified in paragraph 8 above.

CCPR CODEX CLASSIFICATION FOR FOOD AND ANIMAL FEED

10. This classification system covers both primary and processed plants and animals commodities. Primary animal commodities are separated out in the following commodity groups:

[1] 'Edible offal' is considered to cover internal organs, mainly comprised of the thoracic organs (lungs with the trachea, oesophagus, heart), abdominal tripes (intestines, stomachs), kidneys, liver, abdominal fat, spleen, gizzard and pelvic organs (uterus, ovaries, bladder; while the term 'external organs' is used to refer to the head {eyes, muzzle, ears, tongue, brain, head meat (cheek Meat), thymus}, tail, trotters (feet, legs, claws), udder, pizzles and testicles.

- Mammalian
- Poultry
- Aquatic
- Amphibians and reptiles
- Invertebrate animals

11. These groups include cover commodities of meat, fat, liver, kidney, edible offal, milk, skin, eggs, and roe for a range of animal species. It should be noted that neither bees nor honey are covered in this classification document.

12. The definitions used for meat and edible offal in this document are:

- **Meat** means the muscular tissues, including adhering fatty tissues such as intramuscular, intermuscular and subcutaneous fat from animal carcasses or cuts of these as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution in a "fresh" state. The cuts offered to the consumer may include bones, connective tissues and tendons as well as nerves and lymph nodes.

- **Edible offal** means edible tissues and organs other than muscles (= meat) and animal fat from slaughtered animals as prepared for wholesale or retail distribution.

Note: The edible offal group name and definitions are in conformity with those recorded in the Codex Standards 89-1981 and 98-1981, Codex Standard for luncheon meat and Codex Standard for cooked cured chopped meat respectively: "Edible offal" means such offals as have been passed as fit for human consumption, but not including lungs, ears, scalp, snout (including lips and muzzle), mucous membranes, sinews, genital system, udders, intestines and urinary bladder.

SAMPLING AND PORTION SIZES METHOLOGIES

13. Aligning definitions may have some flow on impacts to how residue studies and monitoring activities are undertaken with respect to sampling and portion sizes methodologies. At this stage, no assessment has yet been undertaken on whether there could be any impacts in these areas.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CCRP AND CCRVDF CLASSIFICATION DEFINITIONS

14. The main differences between the two classification systems are:

- There is no formal classification system used by CCRVDF to define animal commodities.

- CCRVDF uses the term muscle compared to meat used by CCPR, but noting the Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals (CAC/GL 71-2009) utilizes the CCPR Codex Classification for Food and Animal Feeds in the tables in Appendix B.

- The CCPR classification system is more extensive for animal commodities and follows a hierarchical system, but does not include honey. It should also be noted while it is extensive this does not mean all the commodities identified in the classification system are either traded internationally, consumed domestically, or are likely to be exposed to pesticides. Rather commodities are listed for completeness and are only utilized where a pesticide residue/trade situation arises.

- CCPR allows for extrapolation of residue data sets to support grouping MRLs e.g. mammalian meat as opposed to cattle or sheep MRLs. CCPR's risk assessor JMPR in its procedural manual it states 'when residues in animal products arise from residues in feeds, in general, the results of cattle feeding studies may be extrapolated to other food-producing animals (ruminants, horses, pigs, rabbits and others) and laying hen feeding studies to other types of poultry (turkey, goose, duck and others). This situation occurs less frequently for CCRVDF.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR AN EDIBLE OFFAL DEFINITION

15. The following considerations have been previously discussed at CCRVDF:

- The amount and frequency of each edible offal organ traded between countries.
- The type and level of testing at the border (i.e. not every tissue imported needs to be monitored).
- Whether specific data sets are required for each tissue identified in the definition and the impacts of potentially large amounts of data needed to be generated.

16. In addition to the above, both CCPR and CCRVDF should also consider consistency of such a definition with other Codex Committees. However, the CCPR and other Codex Committees definition of edible offal excludes certain offals that are of interest to CCRVDF (e.g. lungs).

17. The CCPR classification system follows a hierarchical system. This means that residue trials can be targeted to the commodity of interest (rather than a group) while allowing for the ability to extrapolate from representative commodities to establish MRLs for the entire commodity group.

18. While CCPR does have a hierarchical system for edible offal tissues is relatively simple, it is based on the premise that residue information on the main indicator offal tissues (eg kidney and liver) are sufficient in most instances to extrapolate to an edible offal group MRL. This approach would seem to be equally applicable to CCRVDF.

19. Other codex text such as the code of hygienic practice (CXC 58-2005) defines meat as the edible part of any mammal. While the Standard for Cooked Cured Chopped Meat (CXS 98-1981) defines meat as the edible part including edible offal of any mammal slaughtered in an abattoir and edible offals as such offals as have been passed as fit for human consumption but not including lungs, ears, scalp, snout (including lips and muzzle), mucous membrane, sinews, genital system, udders, intestines and urinary bladder. Edible offal does not include poultry skin. This standard has made exclusion of specific organs from the definition of edible offals.

CONSOLIDATION OF ONE SET OF DEFINITIONS

20. There is an opportunity to reflect on having one consolidated classification list for both CCPR and CCRVDF and future proof this issue.

21. As noted above, CCRVDF already utilizes some of the CCPR Codex Classification system in its CAC/GL 71-2009 guideline document. Therefore, it would seem to be advantageous to take this a step further and utilize the Codex Classification for Food and Animal Feed for CCRVDF.

22. This also presents an opportunity to look at establishing extrapolation rules for animal commodities per se (similar to the work being done by CCRVDF for fish species). This may be of particular relevance to the edible offal definition.

23. It is important to recognize by listing tissues for edible offal (and other groups), does not automatically mean any individual offal tissue needs to be tested for. This would be impractical both from a residue trial and monitoring perspective.

24. Utilizing an hierarchical system for edible offal would provide flexibility to:

- Extrapolate from selected representative edible offal tissues (such as kidney and liver) to obtain an edible offal MRL; and/or
- Extrapolate between animal species to determine one edible offal MRL for a group of animal species; and/or
- An appropriate risk assessment has been undertaken that a particular target edible offal tissue (e.g. lung) requires a MRL instead of an edible offal MRL (as in point one above). This risk assessment should take into consideration the route of administration and drug's pharmacokinetics and elimination kinetics in the animal. This means regulatory residue trials requirements would not need mandate the analysis of a range of edible offal tissues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. Should there be support to consolidate into one set of definitions utilizing a hierarchical system along with extrapolation rules, then a comprehensive definition of edible offal could be established.

26. The EWGs (CCRVDF &CCPR) are requested to consider the working definition as adopted by CCRVDF 24(paragraph 6), the CCPR Codex Classification for Food and Animal Feeds in the tables in Appendix B and other definitions of meat and edible offals used in other codex texts to create harmony.

APPENDIX II

SURVEY ON COMPARISON OF MRLs FOR COMPOUNDS USED BOTH AS PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS

(Prepared by Japan)

FOR INFORMATION

Table 1 : Comparison of MRLs for compounds used both as pesiticides and veterinary drugs

(where there is an MRL arising from only pesticide or veterinary drug, no comparison was made)

Pesticides	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Note	Veterinary Drug			Harmonization
				Species	Tissue	MRL	
Cyfluthrin/beta-cyfluthrin	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.02		Cattle	Liver	20	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Cattle	Kidney	20	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
	Eggs	0.01	(*)				
	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2	(fat)	Cattle	Fat	200	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Cattle	Muscle	20	
	Milks	0.01		Cattle	Milk	40	*No*
	Poultry meat	0.01	(*) (fat)				
	Poultry, Edible offal of	0.01	(*)				
Cyhalothrin (includes lambda-cyhalothrin)	Kidney of cattle, goats, pigs and sheep	0.2		Cattle	Kidney	20	*yes*
				Pig	Kidney	20	*yes*
				Sheep	Kidney	20	*yes*
	Liver of cattle, goats, pigs & sheep	0.05		Cattle	Liver	20	*No*
				Pig	Liver	20	*No*
				Sheep	Liver	50	*yes*
	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	3	(fat)	Cattle	Muscle	20	
				Cattle	Fat	400	*No*
				Pig	Muscle	20	
				Pig	Fat	400	*No*
				Sheep	Muscle	20	
				Sheep	Fat	400	*No*
	Milks	0.2		Cattle	Milk	30	
Cypermethrins (including alpha- and zeta-cypermethrin)	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	(*)	Cattle	Liver	50	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Cattle	Kidney	50	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Sheep	Liver	50	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Sheep	Kidney	50	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
	Eggs	0.01	(*)				
	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	2	(fat)	Cattle	Muscle	50	
				Cattle	Fat	1000	*No*
				Sheep	Muscle	50	
				Sheep	Fat	1000	*No*
	Milk fats	0.5					
	Milks	0.05		Cattle	Milk	100	*No*
	Poultry fats	0.1					
	Poultry meat	0.1	(fat)				
	Poultry, Edible offal of	0.05	(*)				

Deltamethrin	Eggs	0.02	(*)	Chicken	Eggs	30	*No*
	Kidney of cattle, goats, pigs and sheep	0.03	(*)	Cattle	Kidney	50	*No*
				Sheep	Kidney	50	*No*
	Liver of cattle, goats, pigs & sheep	0.03	(*)	Cattle	Liver	50	*No*
				Sheep	Liver	50	*No*
	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.5	(fat)	Cattle	Muscle	30	
				Cattle	Fat	500	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
				Sheep	Muscle	30	
				Sheep	Fat	500	yes; wider coverage shall prevail
	Milks	0.05	F	Cattle	Milk	30	*No*
	Poultry meat	0.1	(fat)	Chicken	Fat	500	*No*
				Chicken	Muscle	30	
	Poultry, Edible offal of	0.02	(*)	Chicken	Kidney	50	*No*
				Chicken	Liver	50	*No*
Thiabendazole	Cattle kidney	1		Cattle	Kidney	100	*No*
	Cattle liver	0.3		Cattle	Liver	100	*No*
	Cattle meat	0.1		Cattle	Muscle	100	*Yes*
	Cattle milk	0.2		Cattle	Milk	100	*No*
	Eggs	0.1					
	Poultry meat	0.05					

(*): At or about the limit of determination.
(fat): (for meat) The MRL/EMRL applies to the fat of meat.
F: (for milks) The residue is fat soluble and MRLs for milk products are derived as explained in "Codex aximum Residue Limits/Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits for Milk and Milk Products" (only for old evaluations).

APPENDIX III

SURVEY ON TARGET TISSUES AND SPECIES FOR WHICH MRLs WERE SET FOR VETERINARY DRUGS

(Prepared by Japan)

FOR INFORMATION

Table 2 : Target tissues and species for which MRLs were set for veterinary drugs (fat, skin and the related)

Veterinary Drugs	Species	Tissue
Amoxicillin	Pigs	Fat/Skin
Avilamycin	Chicken	Fat/Skin
	Pigs	Fat/Skin
Calazolol	Pigs	Fat/Skin
Diclazuril	Poultry	Fat/Skin
Nicarbazin	Chicken	Fat/Skin
Tilmicosin	Pigs	Fat
	Chicken	Skin/Fat
Tylosin	Pigs	Fat
	Chicken	Fat/Skin
Lasalocid sodium	Chicken	Skin+Fat
	Quail	Skin+Fat
Colistin	Chicken	Fat (The MRL includes skin + fat)
	Pigs	Fat (The MRL includes skin + fat)
Erythromysin	Chicken	Fat (The MRL includes skin + fat)
Ractopamine	Pigs	Fat (The MRL includes skin + fat)
Danofloxacin	Pigs	Fat
	Chicken	Fat (Fat/Skin in normal proportion)
Lincomycin	Chicken	Fat (Additional MRL for skin with adhering fat of 300 µg/kg)
	Pigs	Fat (Additional MRL for skin with adhering fat of 300 µg/kg)
Azaperone	Pigs	Fat
Ceftiofur	Pigs	Fat
Dihydrostreptomycin	Chicken	Fat
/Streptomycin	Pigs	Fat
Doramectin	Pigs	Fat
Febantel/Fenbendazole/Oxfendazole	Pigs	Fat
Flumequine	Chicken	Fat
	Pigs	Fat
Gentamycin	Pigs	Fat
Ivermectin	Pigs	Fat
Levamisole	Pigs	Fat
	Poultry	Fat
Monensin	Chicken	Fat

	Quail	Fat
Narasin	Chicken	Fat
Neomycin	Chicken	Fat
	Pigs	Fat
Phoxin	Pigs	Fat
Porcine somatotropin	Pigs	Fat
Sarafloxacin	Chicken	Fat
Spectinomycin	Chicken	Fat
	Pigs	Fat
Spiramycin	Chicken	Fat