

REPORT OF THE INDIAN
DELEGATION TO THE 38th
SESSION OF THE CODEX
COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE
(Houston, USA : December 4 – 9, 2006)

REPORT OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION TO THE 38th SESSION OF
THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE
(Houston, USA : December 4 – 9, 2006)

Summary of decisions on the Agenda

Agenda No.	Subject	Committee's Decision	Action Point for India
1.	Adoption of the Agenda (CX/FH 06/38/1)	Agenda adopted with slight re-arrangement	Nil
2.	Matters referred by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and/or Other Codex Committees to the Food Hygiene Committee (CX/FH/06/38/2)	Decisions noted by the Committee	Nil
3.	Progress Report on the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA) and Related matters (CX/FH 06 38/3)	<p>Report noted by the Committee.</p> <p>(a) <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group set up to discuss use of lactoperoxidase system in milk</p> <p>(b) Work done by FAO on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)</p> <p>(c) Item specific guidance on GAP (proposal for new work)</p>	<p>Nil</p> <p>India to request FAO for similar programmes in India</p> <p>India is Chair of the <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Priorities and the concerned official would need to keep track</p>

4(a)	Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix III (CX/FH 06/38/4)	Document finalized and recommended to CAC for adoption at Step 8	Document to be put to use by Ministry of Health and other food hygiene regulatory bodies
4(b)	Annex III : Examples of the Use of Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives, Process and Product Criteria at Step 4 CX/FH 06 38/4 – Add.1	Document retained at Step 4. Working Group led by the US set up. India is a member of the Working Group	Await circular letter and formulate comments
5(a)	Draft Revision of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix IV (CX/FH 06/38/5)	Document finalized and recommended to CAC for adoption at Step 8	Document to be circulated to industry and others concerned
5(b)	Annex: Microbiocidal Treatment and the Application of the Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives and Performance Criteria at Step 4 (CX/FH 06/38/5 – Add. 1)	Document retained at Step 4. Working Group led by the US set up. India is a member of the Working Group as stated under Agenda 4(b)	Await circular letter and formulate comments
6(a)	Draft Guidelines on the Application of General Principles of Food Hygiene to the Control of <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> in Ready-to-Eat Foods at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix II (CX/FH 05/37/6)	Document finalized and recommended to CAC for adoption at Step 8	Document to be circulated to industry and others concerned

6(b)	Annex: Deriving Microbiological Limits and Samples Plans in Microbiological Criteria from FSOs; Example : <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> in Ready-to-Eat Foods at Step 4 (CX/FH 06/38/6 – Add. 1)	Working Group led by Germany was established	Nil
7.	Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Powdered Formulae for Infants and Young Children at Step 4 – (CX/FH 06/38/7)	Working Group led by Canada was established. India is a member of the Working Group	Await circular letter and formulate comments
8.	Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Validation of Food Hygiene Control Measures at Step 4 – (CX/FH 06/38/8)	Working Group led by the US was established. India is member of the Working Group	Await circular and formulate comments
9.	Management of the Work of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene – ALINORM 06/29/33; Appendix V	Work to develop a document on the application of risk analysis policy to be applied by the CCFH to be considered by <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on CCFH Priorities	India is Chair of the <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Priorities and the concerned official would need to keep track of the developments
10.	<u>Other Business and Future Work</u> :		
	(a) Elaboration of Risk-based Standards for Microbiological Hazards: Enhancing the Process (CX/FH 06/38/9)	Proposal referred to the <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Priorities	Nil
	(b) The use of Lactoperoxidase System for Milk and Milk Products in International Trade (fb38_lpe)	Due to lack of consensus, the Committee referred the matter to the CAC	Nil

	<p>(c) Discussion of the Report of the <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group for Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities (CRD 1; CX/FH 06/38/10)</p> <p>(d) Next meeting of <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group on Priorities</p> <p><u>Issues arising from Previous Discussions</u></p> <p>(i) Product specific guidelines for Good Agricultural Practices</p>	<p>Committee agreed to take up new work on combined proposal on <i>Salmonella</i> and <i>Campylobacter</i> in broiler chickens. India is a member of the WG led by New Zealand and Sweden</p> <p>India became the Chair</p> <p>Committee requested FAO and WHO to provide scientific advice</p>	<p>Await circular letter and formulate comments</p> <p>Official to be identified</p> <p>Nil</p>
11.	Date and Place of the Next Session	39 th Session of the CCFH to take place in India during Oct 29 – Nov 2/3, 2007 (Duration to be decided by the US Codex Sectt. and informed to India)	India to decide on venue and inform the US Codex Sectt., and initiate preparations
12.	Adoption of the Report	Report adopted	Nil
	<u>Action Points for India</u>	---	<p>Initiate work on following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next CCFH session • <i>Ad hoc</i> Working Group • Subject specific WGs

REPORT OF THE DELEGATION IN DETAIL

The 38th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene was held at Hotel Intercontinental in Houston, Texas, USA during December 4 – 9, 2006. The Session was welcomed by Dr Edwin Price, Associate Vice-Chancellor and Director of the Norman E. Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas as well as Dr Richard Raymond, Under Secretary for Food Safety, USDA and was chaired by Dr. Karen Hulebak, Dy. Administrator, Office of Public Health & Science, FSIS, USDA. During her opening remarks, Dr. Hulebak expressed the hope that the Committee might be able to agree on the texts of at least two documents, namely, the Egg Code and the *Listeria* guidelines, as these were relatively simpler to complete. The Indian delegation comprised of the following :

- (1) Ms. Upma Chawdhry, Joint Secretary (A & LH), Department of Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture
- (2) Shri R. K. Chaudhry, Director (Trade), Department of Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture
- (3) Dr. D. Chattopadhyaya, Assistant Director General (IF), Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
- (4) Shri S. Dave, Director, Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEDA)

Before departure from India, extensive discussions were held at least three times in the Shadow Committee in addition to separate meetings between the members to finalize India's comments on the agenda. The Shadow Committee had taken the view that certain documents were of main concern to India, particularly, because certain paras amounted to an inflexible approach towards small scale producers in the developing countries or there were concepts like traceability and precautionary principles built into the documents. In some cases, it appeared that due to lack of transparency, there was a possibility that the provisions, if adopted, would result into non-tariff barriers to India's export interests. Moreover, there were major concerns about the use of lactoperoxidase system in milk and on certain technical aspects of the powdered milk formulae for consumption by infants and young children. It was decided that the Indian delegation would make every effort to ensure that such provisions were not included in the Codex documents. Such documents were as follows :

- a) Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (4a),
- b) Draft Revision of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products (5a),
- c) Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Powdered Formulae for Infants and Young Children (7),
- d) Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Validation of Food Hygiene Control Measures (8),
- e) The use of Lacto-peroxidase System for Milk and Milk Products in International Trade (10c), and
- f) Date and Place of the Next Session (11)

On this basis, the Shadow Committee prepared India's comments. Once finalized, these were forwarded to the National Codex Contact Point in the Ministry of Health for onward transmission to the Codex Secretariat. India's comments were on Agenda Nos. 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), 7, 8, 9, 10(a), 10(b) & 10(c) and were contained in CRD – 5 (copy enclosed). A copy of all the other CRDs is also enclosed for reference. Prior to the plenary, on 4th December, a meeting of the Asia group was organized by Korea, which is the co-ordinator for Asia. The Indian delegation could not participate in this meeting, as it had no prior intimation about it.

The major interventions of India and other countries and the ensuing discussions & decisions on various agenda items are given below :

Agenda No. 1 – Adoption of the Agenda (CX/FH 06/38/1)

In line with her opening remarks, Dr. Karen Hulebak suggested that the Committee may take up the Egg Code (Agenda 5-a) and the *Listeria* guidelines (Agenda 6-a) after the Agenda No. 2, as these were relatively easier to complete. The Committee agreed and adopted the agenda.

Agenda No. 2 – Matters referred by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and/or Other Codex Committees to the Food Hygiene Committee (CX/FH/06/38/2)

The Committee noted the matters referred to it by the CAC and other Committees, particularly the CCGP with regard to the process by which the CCFH would manage its work. Certain modification had been suggested by the CCGP, which were accepted. The Committee also

deleted the Annex, as it was not required. Instead, it agreed to develop the document on the application of risk analysis policies to be applied by CCFH. It was decided to refer this work to the CCFH Working Group on work priorities. Since India would chair the *Ad hoc* Working Group on items of new work for the Committee during the next session, the Indian official needs to ascertain whether this would form a part of that responsibility and accordingly initiate action on the subject.

Agenda No. 3 – Progress Report on the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA) and Related matters (CX/FH 06 38/3)

Under this agenda, the Committee briefly discussed the report of JEMRA on the benefits and potential risks of the use of lactoperoxidase system in the preservation of raw milk. The representative of FAO briefly outlined its findings. India was of the opinion that the report did not provide sufficient scientific justification about its safety. India's views were supported by many countries, such as the US, Australia, Spain, Canada, Jamaica and the European Commission. The representative of FAO contradicted by stating that JEMRA did examine health risks and reported about it. Since, this issue was slated for discussion under Agenda 10(b), it was decided to set up an intra-session Working Group to consider the report and present its report. To strengthen the arguments for the ensuing discussions, the delegation sought additional details from NDDDB (Dr. N. N. Varshney) on the basis of which India's views were presented to the Working Group led by Japan. A copy of India's view is enclosed.

The representative of FAO also gave a brief account of the work carried out by them on the implementation of Good Agricultural Practices in different countries. The Indian delegation enquired from FAO if they would be in a position to organize similar training programmes in India, in view of the fact that a document had already been prepared by India. The request was positively responded to and India was asked to send up the request as early as possible, since FAO was currently finalizing its capacity building programmes for the year 2007, and there was a possibility to include India's request at this stage.

The US delegation suggested that there was a need to develop product – specific guidance documents for Good Agricultural Practices, on account of growing public health concerns and recommended that the CCFH may consider new work in this respect. It was decided to establish an intra-session *Ad hoc* Working Group led by the US to review the US proposal presented in CRD 6 to request the FAO & WHO to provide scientific advice on the issue so that the CCFH could undertake new work. India was a member of the Working Group and attended the meeting.

Agenda No. 4(a) – Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix III (CX/FH 06/38/4)

Under this agenda item, the Appendix III to the ALINORM 05/28/13 was taken up for discussion. During initial discussions, some delegations felt that the document should be split up into two documents, namely, Principles and Guidelines. However, it was eventually agreed that there should be one document.

India's proposal to delete reference to environmental conditions and risk management at the consumption level and to replace these and distribution etc. with 'handling practices' in the second paragraph under Para 4 was initially not supported by EC, US, Jamaica and the IDF. However, after discussions, all the examples in parenthesis were deleted.

Another major intervention made by India was in the fourth paragraph under Para 5.1, whereby it was suggested that the emergency measures, if taken, should be transparent and temporary and subject to review within a time frame. The chair supported India's proposal and after discussion it was agreed to state that such measures should be temporary, clearly communicated and subject to review within a time frame. This was one major achievement in this document, though this was opposed by EC and the US. At the suggestion of Thailand supported by India, it was agreed that in situations of insufficient scientific information, countries may select a 'provisional decision' and not a 'provisional MRM option' as proposed by certain countries.

Under Para 5.4, India again suggested that the risk managers should not decide on provisional MRM options in case some elements of the MRA needed further study. This suggestion was accepted and the contents of the square brackets were removed.

In Para 6.1.2, India strongly opposed the reference to traceability/product tracing stating that traceability was only a tool to take a MRM option and not a MRM option in itself. It was suggested that since the CCFICS was still initiating work on formulating guidelines on the subject, this reference should be deleted or kept in square brackets. Though, there was opposition from the EC, the Committee deleted the reference with the condition that the subsequent reference in this para (as it referred to awareness programmes) and under para 7.3 of the document. This was another major success in this document.

Under Para 6.2, India and the US suggested that the selected MRM option should be feasible instead of being merely practical. After some discussion, this proposal was also agreed upon. Similarly, in Para 6.2.1, India's suggestion, the phrase 'desired level of control' was modified to 'appropriate level of control'.

While the ANNEX 1 to the document was deleted, as it was not found to be necessary on account of clarity in the document itself, the ANNEX 2 was retained. It was, however, agreed that the annex required more work to be done in light of the comments received at the session.

The Committee agreed to forward the document to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8 and to retain the annex at Step 6 for further consideration.

Agenda No. 4(b) – Annex III : Examples of the Use of Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives, Process and Product Criteria at Step 4 (CX/FH 06 38/4 – Add. 1)

An informal intra-session Working Group led by France was set up to consider the document. The report of the Working Group was presented in CRD 17 and discussed. The Committee was of the view that much work was required to be done on the metrics at the national and international level for making progress in this direction and, therefore, decided to hold the document at Step 4. The Committee agreed to establish a physical Working Group led by the US. India is a member of this Working Group.

Agenda No. 5(a) – Draft Revision of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix IV (CX/FH 06/38/5)

Under this agenda, the Appendix IV to ALINORM 05/28/13 was taken up for discussion. The leader of the Drafting Group, Australia, presented the document and expressed the hope that this time the egg code would be sent to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8, as enough flexibilities had already been provided for the small scale producers in the current document. In light of this, the Indian delegation decided to raise only the critical issues of interest to India.

Under Para 3.2.1, there was considerable discussion with regard to addition of a bullet concerning destruction of *Salmonella enteridis* positive flocks in accordance with country requirements. India was of the view that the entire flock should not be destroyed. India had suggested

that the producing country's requirements should be met and there was no need to destroy the entire flock. India was supported by Thailand, Australia and Nigeria. In fact, Nigeria went on to the extent of suggesting that a similar bullet should be added for avian flu. The EC proposal suggesting destruction of the entire flock showing *Salmonella enteridis* positive birds got support from a number of its member countries and, thus, a bullet point on this was incorporated. The reservation of India and Thailand was recorded. The Indian delegation to the CAC should raise this point when the agenda on adoption of the code comes up for consideration, if necessary, as some flexibility has been provided by adding the words, "where practicable" in the beginning.

Under Para 3.2.3.1 relating to use of water, India had pointed out that if use of surface water were to be allowed, it should be allowed for all form of bird farming, not only in case of free – range foraging. Accordingly, it was suggested to delete the flexibility available to free – range birds. This was accepted and the para was adequately modified. This was also a significant achievement in this document.

Under Para 3.5, India has had suggested removal of the reference to traceability/product tracing in line with the suggestion under the MRM document. However, this was not agreed to, but the Committee agreed to add a footnote giving reference of the adoption of the principles. India's reservation stating that the guidelines for traceability/product tracing were still to be elaborated was recorded in the report.

With certain other modifications, the Committee agreed to forward the document to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8. The Committee also agreed to delete the Annex I, as the food safety metrics are still under development. For this, the US will lead the Working Group. India is a member of the Working Group.

India, now, needs to circulate this document to the industry and other regulatory bodies to considering adapting our existing guidelines to the new text.

Agenda No. 5(b) – Annex: Microbiocidal Treatment and the Application of the Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives and Performance Criteria at Step 4 CX/FH 06/38/5 – Add. 1

The Committee was of the view that much work was required to be done on the metrics at the national and international level for making progress in this direction and, therefore, decided to hold the document at Step 4. The Committee agreed to establish a physical Working Group led by the US. India is a member of this Working Group.

Agenda No. 6(a) – Draft Guidelines on the Application of General Principles of Food Hygiene to the Control of *Listeria monocytogenes* in Ready-to-Eat Foods at Step 7 – ALINORM 05/28/13; Appendix II (CX/FH 05/37/6)

India had no major interest in the development of this document, and no comments were sent. With certain other modifications, the Committee agreed to forward the document to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8.

Agenda No. 6(b) – Annex: Deriving Microbiological Limits and Samples Plans in Microbiological Criteria from Food Safety Objectives; Example : *Listeria monocytogenes* in Ready-to-Eat Foods at Step 4 (CX/FH 06/38/6 – Add. 1)

The Committee agreed to establish a physical Working Group led by the Germany to develop the microbiological criteria on the *Listeria monocytogenes* in Ready-to-Eat Foods.

Agenda No. 7 – Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Powdered Formulae for Infants and Young Children at Step 4 (CX/FH 06/38/7)

The document was introduced by Canada. There were some general discussions with regard to the scope of this document. Some suggested that only powdered products posing greater risks to infants should be covered by the document. Others were of the view that all products, including follow-up formulae, meant for infants and young children covered by the FAO/WHO risk assessment exercise should be covered by the document. Finally, the Committee took the view that all products having relevance to GHP and HACCP should be covered by the Code.

The Committee felt that the document needed to be re-drafted. A physical Working Group led by Canada was, therefore, established to revise the Code. The group would meet in Canada in May/June 2007. India is a member of the Working Group.

Agenda No. 8 – Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Validation of Food Hygiene Control Measures at Step 4 (CX/FH 06/38/8)

The US, as the leader of the Draft Group, presented the background and details of the revised draft guidelines and raised four issues that needed clarifications. These were :

- Whether the scope of the guidelines needed any changes,
- Whether the document should cover verification and monitoring,
- Whether more examples were required to be added in light of the comments submitted by the members, and
- Whether the Annex – I (Nature of Food Safety Control Measures) needed to be retained or removed.

Some delegations were of the view that the current scope of the document was too broad and there would be difficulties in validating food safety control measures throughout the entire food chain. Other delegation felt that the scope was alright and there was no need to limit its scope. The Committee decided to apply the guidelines to validation of control measures at any stage of the food chain and that it should apply to individual control measures or a limited combination or sets of control measures.

Regarding verification and monitoring, the members felt that a lot of clarity was still required. The Committee felt that the document essentially aimed at the validation process, so reference to verification and monitoring should only be explained through illustrations. However, even with regard to the validation process, examples on individual food safety control systems (e.g., HACCP, GHP) would be extremely useful to the countries and industry.

The Committee agreed that a physical Working Group led by the US would revise the proposed guidelines with the aim of completing the work in two years so that the guidelines can finally adopted by the Commission at Step 8 in 2009. India is a member of the Working Group.

Agenda No. 9 – Management of the Work of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene – ALINORM 06/29/33; Appendix V

The Committee reviewed the amendments suggested by the CCGP and accepted the amendments for the management of its work. The Committee also noted the recommendations of the CCGP that the CCFH should develop a document on the application of risk analysis policy to be applied by the CCFH. Accordingly, the Committee decided to refer the work on developing the document to its *Ad hoc* Working Group on Priorities for consideration. Since India is the Chair of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Priorities, the official responsible needs to take care of this decision. Who is going to formulate the proposal for consideration is something that will need to be found out.

Agenda No. 10 – Other Business and Future Work :

(a) Elaboration of Risk-based Standards for Microbiological Hazards: Enhancing the Process (CX/FH 06/38/9)

The proposal to undertake new work on the subject was referred to the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Priorities for consideration.

(b) The use of Lacto-peroxidase System for Milk and Milk Products in International Trade (fb38 Ipe)

A meeting of the *Ad hoc* Working Group led by Japan was held. India's views were adequately presented, which were supported by many countries, including the US, the EC and Australia. It was noted that though FAO had done a lot of work on the safety of the lactoperoxidase system in milk, there still remained issues that need further scientific examination before it could be considered for use. Kenya supported the use of the system stating that countries that were unable to set up cold chain infrastructure and facing milk shortages could benefit from it. The EC vehemently opposed the use of lactoperoxidase and added that they would never do away with the cold chain system in milk. There was clearly no consensus on use of the system. The Committee decided to refer the matter to the Commission. Cuba, the main proponent of the lactoperoxidase system, could not attend the CCFH meeting due to visa problems.

(c) Discussion of the Report of the *Ad hoc* Working Group for Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities (CRD 1; CX/FH 06/38/10)

The meeting of the *Ad hoc* Working Group for Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities that was held on 3rd December could not be attended by India. The Working Group led by Australia considered various proposals and recommended the following four items for new work :

- Guidelines for the application of General Principles of Food Hygiene to the Risk-based Control of *Salmonella* in broiler chickens (proposal by Sweden) ;
- Guidelines for Risk Management Options for *Campylobacter* in broiler chickens (proposal by New Zealand) ;
- Guidelines for Hygienic Control of *Vibrio* in seafood (proposal by the US) ; and
- Development of Guidelines to Control Norovirus in bivalve molluscan shellfish (proposal by The Netherlands).

The Committee felt that the first two proposals could be clubbed together into one item and accorded highest priority to it as item for new work. The second priority was given to the *Vibrio* proposal. With regard to the last item (Norovirus), it was decided that consultations by JEMRA may be undertaken in 2007. The Committee agreed to take up only one item for new work (the combined proposal on *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in broiler chickens). It was decided that both New Zealand and Sweden would frame the project document, which would then be sent to the Commission for approval. The Committee also generally discussed the scope and form of the proposed guidelines and agreed to establish a physical Working Group led by New Zealand and Sweden to develop a discussion paper for the next CCFH Session. India is a member of this Working Group because of trade interest in poultry meat.

The Committee also agreed to re-establish the *Ad hoc* Working Group for Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities to consider new proposals. On the basis of informal discussions with the Chair of CCFH, India agreed to Chair the Working Group. This meeting will be held on 28th October, 2007 (Sunday), a day prior to the CCFH Session, in India. The Codex Secretariat in Rome will send out a circular letter inviting proposals for new work. The US Codex office would work closely with India in evaluating the proposals. India needs to identify the official to chair the *Ad hoc* Working Group, would initiate work in this direction.

Issues arising from Previous Discussions :

In addition to two issues relating to fishery products, the delegation of the US presented its report on the discussions held in the intra-session *Ad hoc* Working Group to consider new work for the development of product-specific guidance documents for Good Agricultural Practices in fresh fruits and vegetables. There was broad support for the proposal. The Committee requested the FAO and WHO to provide scientific advice on the issue as per the terms of reference prepared by the US as a result of the discussions held in the Working Group meeting.

Agenda No. 11 – Date and Place of the Next Session

It was announced that the 39th Session of the CCFH would be held in India during October 29 – November 3, 2007. It was also mentioned by the Chair that the US Codex office would shortly let us know whether the session would be for five or six days. India is required to inform the

venue to the Codex Secretariat as soon as possible so that this information could be hosted by them on the Codex website. India will also be the co-chair of this session. India will also chair the *Ad hoc* Working Group on 28th October (Sunday) and present its report on items of new work, proposed to be taken up by the CCFH, at the next session.

Agenda No. 12 – Adoption of the Report

After deliberations and modifications, the report of the CCFH Session was adopted on the final day. A copy of the draft report along with six annexes presented by the Codex Secretariat for adoption is enclosed.

Action Points for India

- 1) Since India would be hosting the next CCFH session in October 2007, it is suggested that a small steering committee be set up to initiate the work on identified activities as soon as possible. The arrangements may be co-ordinated by the National Codex point. A budget outline may be decided on the lines of the CCPR experience two years ago. The name of the co-chair of the session from India may also be decided.
- 2) Since India would chair the *Ad hoc* Working Group as stated above, the person to chair it may be identified and given the responsibility to co-ordinate the entire function. A team of at least two subject matter experts may also be decided upon to provide support to the chair.
- 3) As India has opted to be a member of the Working Groups mentioned below, the National Codex Contact point in the Ministry of Health should forward the announcements and the documents to the concerned Shadow Committees immediately so that India's comments could be formulated. At that stage, it would be important to finalise the members of the Indian delegation to attend the meetings of these working groups.
 - (a) Physical Working Group on developing the document on Examples of the Use of Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives, Process and Product Criteria. The Group is led by the US.
 - (b) Physical Working Group on developing the document on Microbiocidal Treatment and the Application of the Food Safety Objectives, Performance Objectives and Performance Criteria. This documents is to be prepared in the context of eggs and egg products. The Group is led by the US.

The meeting on (a) and (b) referred to above would be held together.

- (c) Physical Working Group on Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Powdered Formulae for Infants and Young Children. The Group is led by the Canada.
- (d) Physical Working Group to develop Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Validation of Food Hygiene Control Measures. The Group is led by the US.
- (e) Physical Working Group to develop a Discussion Paper on "Guidelines for the control of *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in broiler chicken meat". The Group is led by New Zealand & Sweden.
