FOOD FORTIFICATION **LEGISLATION AND STANDARDS: IN PRACTICE**

PHILIP RANDALL (WITH CONTRIBUTIONS FROM **QUENTIN JOHNSON**)









AÖA Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

HOW ARROGANT ARE WE THAT WE DO NOT EVEN PROBE OR QUESTION OUR ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH LEGISLATION OR STANDARDS

FROM QUENTIN'S SLIDE 2

- LAWS CREATE THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR BOTH STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS.
- REGULATIONS PROVIDE THE FOOD CONTROL AUTHORITIES TO BE ABLE TO INSPECT AND MONITOR THE PRODUCTION OF FORTIFIED FOODS TO A STANDARD
- REGULATIONS PROVIDE THE AUTHORITIES WITH THE MECHANISM TO ENFORCE THE STANDARDS THROUGH INSPECTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS



WHEAT FLOUR AND OTHER FOODS CURRENTLY BEING FORTIFIED HAVE BEEN PRODUCED IN-COUNTRY FOR MANY YEARS WITHOUT:

- ✓ BEING INSPECTED BY EVERY AGENCY IN THE COUNTRY
- ✓ BEING REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH MULTIPLE PIECES OF LEGISLATION
- ✓ BEING ANALYSED BY LABORATORIES ILL-DESIGNED FOR THE PURPOSE
- BEING TREATED AS A PASS/FAIL SITUATION AS IS THE NORM WITH A PUBLIC SAFETY ISSUE

SETTING THE STANDARD TOO HIGHHIDDEN AGENDAS

OVER CONTROL

DOES HAVE AN UNEXPECTED 'BENEFIT' AS IT CLEARLY EXPOSES WEAKNESSES IN THE FOOD CONTROL SYSTEM WHICH

TURNS INTO A MAJOR DRAWBACK AS THE REGULATOR DEMANDS ABILITY TO MONITOR AS A CONDITION OF 'ALLOWING' FORTIFICATION

WHAT IS IN A STANDARD? IT IS NOT JUST ABOUT FORTIFICATION AS THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLE INDICATES

FLOUR COMPOSITION

Parameter	Baker's flour	Home baking flour	Biscuit flour	Cracker flour	Self- raising flour	Standard flour	Atta flour	Whole- meal flour	Method of test
Moisture content, max. %,m/m	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	ISO 711 or ISO 712
Crude fibre content, max.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.0	ISO 5498
Total ash content, max. %,m/m	0.7	0.7	0.55	0.70	2.0	1.10	2.0	2.0	ISO 2171
Residue on sieving through 180 micron- sieve, max. %	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8	30.0	55.0	30.0	0
Protein content, min. %, m/m	11.0	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	11.0	12.0	12.0	ISO 20483

0

> THE WHEAT FLOUR SHALL BE FORTIFIED WITH ALL THE MICRONUTRIENTS INDICATED USING THE FORTIFICANTS SHOWN IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE PRODUCT CONFORMS TO THE LIMITS SET IN TABLE

FACTORIES SHOULD AIM AT FORTIFYING THE PRODUCTS AT THE RECOMMENDED FACTORY LEVEL TO ENSURE THE PRODUCT CONFORMS TO THE REGULATORY LEVELS THROUGHOUT THE DISTRIBUTION CHAIN

	Fortificant	Recommended	Regulatory levels, mg/kg		
Nutrient	compound	factory level, mg/kg	Min	Max	
Vitamin A1	Vitamin A (Retinyl) palmitate	1.0 ± 0.4	0.5	1.4	
Vitamin B11	Thiamin Mononitrate	9.8 ± 4.4	4.6	(14.2)*	
Vitamin B21	Riboflavin	6.6 ± 3	3.3	(9.6) *	
Niacin ₁	Niacinamide	60 ± 30	30	(90)*	
Vitamin B61	Pyridoxine	6.5 ± 3.5	3	(10) *	
Folate	Folic acid	2.3 ± 1	1.1	3.2	
Vitamin B12	Vitamin B12 (Water soluble, 0.1%)	0.02 ± 0.009	0.01	(0.029) *	
Zinc	Zinc oxide	88 ± 28	60	116	
Total iron	Total iron	30 ± 10	20	(60) *	
	NaFeEDTA ₂	30 ± 10	20	40	
Added Iron	Ferrous fumarate2	40 ± 10	30	50	
The maximum limits for	1The addition of these these nutrients may not be neces	micronutrients is optional in XX ssary because the upper tolerand	XXX. ce limits of these nu	utrients are very h	

STABILITY REQUIREMENT

THE VITAMIN FORTIFICANTS AND PREMIXES SHALL HAVE STORAGE STABILITY SUCH THAT NO MORE THAN 20 % OF ITS ORIGINAL ACTIVITY WILL BE LOST WHEN STORED FOR 21 DAYS AT 45°C IN A WELL CLOSED CONTAINER AT A LEVEL 2.5G PER KG IN WHEAT FLOUR HAVING MOISTURE CONTENT IN THE RANGE OF 13.5 % TO 14.5 %.

► THE SUPPLIER OF THE PREMIX SHALL PROVIDE THE STABILITY DATA FOR THE FORTIFICANTS AND PREMIXES.

ALSO ADD IN – OR REFER TO CODEX

MICROBIOLOGICAL LIMITS
HEAVY METAL LIMITS
PESTICIDE RESIDUES
MYCOTOXINS

USING THE WRONG METHODOLOGY

WHEAT FLOUR SHALL COMPLY WITH THOSE MAXIMUM MYCOTOXIN LIMITS ESTABLISHED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION FOR THIS COMMODITY. IN PARTICULAR, TOTAL AFLATOXIN LEVELS IN WHEAT FLOUR FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION SHALL NOT EXCEED 10 MCG/KG (PPB) WITH **B**₁ **NOT EXCEEDING 5 MCG/KG** (PPB) WHEN TESTED ACCORDING TO ISO 16050.

►ISO 16050:2003 SPECIFIES A REVERSE-PHASE HIGH-PERFORMANCE LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPHIC METHOD, WITH IMMUNOAFFINITY COLUMN CLEAN-UP AND POST-COLUMN DERIVATIZATION, FOR THE DETERMINATION OF AFLATOXINS IN CEREALS, NUTS AND DERIVED PRODUCTS. THE LIMIT OF QUANTIFICATION FOR AFLATOXIN B₁, AND FOR THE SUM OF AFLATOXINS B₁, B₂, G₁ AND G₂, IS 8 MCG/KG.

SO WHAT'S THE PROBLEM?

IT'S EASY – WE HAVE BEEN ADDING BAKERY IMPROVERS ETC. FOR DECADES !!

AS WE HAVE BEEN ADDING IMPROVERS WE ARE FULLY CONVERSANT WITH MICRO-FEEDERS

IMPROVERS ARE USUALLY SPECIFIED AS "WITHIN GMP" LIMITS IMPROVERS ARE NOT A SAFETY RISK

NO ONE HAS BEEN CHECKING ADDITION RATE OF BAKERY IMPROVERS STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS ARE BEING WRITTEN (OR RATHER CUT AND PASTE) WITH LITTLE OR NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE FOOD PRODUCTION PROCESS, ITS VARIABILITY, CRITICAL CONTROL POINTS ETC. AND EVEN LESS KNOWLEDGE OF FORTIFICATION

WHAT THE LAW SAYS AND WHAT IT MEANS

- LAW SAYS MILLERS MUST ADD A SPECIFIC QUANTITY OF FORTIFICATION PREMIX SAY 200G/MT BUT MAY BE AS HIGH AS 600G/MT
- LAW SAYS MILLERS MUST INDICATE THEIR PRODUCT IS FORTIFIED AND THE LEVEL OF THAT FORTIFICATION
- LAW SAYS THAT THE PRODUCT MUST BE COMPLIANT AT POINT OF SALE BUT HAS, OR DOES NOT CONCERN ITSELF WITH THE DISTRIBUTION CHAIN

LAW MEANS EVERY 0.5 TO 1 G THE LABORATORY ANALYSES MUST COMPLY

WHAT THE LAW DOES NOT SAY OR TAKE INTO ACCOUNT

HOW WELL CAN MILLS MIX FORTIFICANTS

>WHAT THE INTRINSIC NUTRIENT CONTENT IS

HOW THE LABORATORY IS SUPPOSED TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN ADDED AND INTRINSIC CONTENT WHEN IT ACTUALLY MEASURES TOTAL CONTENT

HOW MUCH UNCERTAINTY AT 95% CONFIDENCE IN LABORATORY ANALYSIS

WHAT THE LAW DOES NOT TELL US

HOW THE REGULATORY MINIMUM AND MAXIMUMS WERE CALCULATED (SOMETIMES WHY WE EVEN HAVE A MAXIMUM)

HOW THEY DETERMINED THAT THE RECOMMENDED FACTORY LEVEL DO ENSURE THE PRODUCT CONFORMS TO THE REGULATORY LEVELS THROUGHOUT THE DISTRIBUTION CHAIN

HOW A SAMPLE IS TO BE TAKEN – OR IF THEY DO THE METHODOLOGY DOES NOT MEET INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

THE MAJOR WEAKNESS

0

WHAT THE REGULATOR HAS FAILED TO DO

RISK ANALYSIS ✓ RISK ASSESSMENT RISK MANAGEMENT ✓ RISK COMMUNICATION ASCERTAIN WHO HAS THE CAPACITY TO ✓ CONDUCT INSPECTIONS ✓ CONDUCT ANALYSIS

► ADVISE ALL PARTIES ON HOW THE ESTIMATES OF UNCERTAINTY ARE TO BE ACTED UPON

INSTRUCTIONS ON CODEX SAMPLING PROCEDURES CX/MAS 1 – 1987

•" IN PARTICULAR, THE ESTIMATE OF THE VALUE MAY BE DEPENDENT UPON THE METHOD OF ANALYSIS USED, BUT IT IS ALWAYS DEPENDENT ON THE TYPE OF SAMPLING PLAN AND THE LOT ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE USED"

EURACHEM – MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY FROM SAMPLING

HTTPS://WWW.EURACHEM.ORG/IMAGES/STORIES/GUIDES/PDF/UFS_2007.PDF

➢ IF THE OBJECTIVE OF THE MEASUREMENT IS TO ESTIMATE THE VALUE OF THE ANALYTE CONCENTRATION IN A SAMPLING TARGET, THEN THE UNCERTAINTY ASSOCIATED WITH THE SAMPLING PROCESS MUST INEVITABLY CONTRIBUTE TO THE UNCERTAINTY ASSOCIATED WITH THE REPORTED RESULT

ALL PARTIES NEED GUIDANCE FROM THE APPROPRIATE REGULATOR ON HOW THESE ESTIMATES OF UNCERTAINTY ARE TO BE ACTED UPON, TO ENSURE THE RELIABILITY OF THE DECISIONS BASED UPON THE MEASUREMENTS

► THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE QUALITY OF THE WHOLE MEASUREMENT PROCESS SHOULD ULTIMATELY REST WITH ONE ORGANISATION. AND

SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE ON ANALYSIS

USE OF A STANDARD LEVEL OF FORTIFICATION AND THE TOLERANCES THAT THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY (CFIA) APPLY TO DETERMINE IF FORTIFIED FLOUR (NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND IMPORTS) IS ADEQUATELY FORTIFIED IS 80% TO 175%

✓ HTTP://WWW.INSPECTION.GC.CA/FOOD/NON-FEDERALLY-REGISTERED/PRODUCT-INSPECTION/FLOUR-SAMPLES/ENG/1383837268150/1383837269041

SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE ON ANALYSIS

➤THE MILLS PROVIDED ABOUT 3000 ANALYSES WHEAT FLOUR SAMPLES (CIRCA 15,000 ANALYTICAL RESULTS) IN AN EXERCISE BETWEEN THE CANADIAN MILLERS ASSOCIATION AND THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY

THIS CLEARLY BRINGS INTO QUESTION ANY EXISTING FORTIFICATION STANDARD WHERE THE TOLERANCE RANGE HAS BEEN DETERMINED WITHOUT ANY DUE ATTENTION TO ACTUAL PRACTICE

✓ CANADIAN EXAMPLE WAS A PAPER BASED SURVEY AND ASSESSMENT USING THE RESULTS FROM ALL THE MILLS RATHER THAN THE CFIA TESTING ALL THE SAMPLES OF FLOUR

PART OF THE SOLUTION

FILL CRITICAL INFORMATION GAPS

GET INDUSTRY FORTIFYING AND BEING CONFIDENT IN THEIR SKILLS. INDUSTRY AND STANDARDS INSTITUTES TESTING AT MILL LEVEL AND <u>MUTUALLY</u> ESTABLISHING WHAT IS ACCEPTABLE VARIATION IN TERMS OF ADDITION AND IN TERMS OF MILL VARIABILITY AND IN ANALYTICAL CAPABILITY.

TEST FORTIFIED WHEAT FLOUR IN THE MARKETPLACE TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE VARIOUS METHODS BY WHICH THE FLOUR IS SOLD I.E. OPEN MARKET, SMALL RETAILER, LARGE RETAILER, "WALKMANS" ETC.



- ➢IF THE RESULTS INDICATE SIGNIFICANT LOSSES AT THIS STAGE IN THE DISTRIBUTION CHAIN THEN:
- DETERMINE IF THIS LOSS CAN BE MITIGATED THROUGH BETTER HANDLING, CHANGING SOURCE OF PRE-MIX, EDUCATION ETC - IF NOT INCREASE THE LEVEL OF ADDITION AT THE MILL, WAIT A MONTH OR SO AND REPEAT UNTIL THE LEVEL IN THE MARKETPLACE IS ACCEPTABLE (ON OR ABOVE THE DESIRED LEVEL)

NOW YOU CAN THINK ABOUT DEVELOPING A FORTIFICATION TECHNICAL REGULATION

INDUSTRY MUST BE PART OF THE PROCESS OF BOTH THE TECHNICAL REGULATION AND THE NATIONAL STANDARD

AN ALTERNATIVE

0

SYSTEMS APPROACH

AUTO-CONTROL IS A SYSTEM BASED ON THE OFFICIAL USE OF RESULTS OF SELF-MONITORING OBTAINED BY A PRODUCTION FACILITY. PROVIDED THAT THE VALIDITY OF THESE FACTORY RESULTS CAN BE VERIFIED THEY COULD REPLACE THE OFFICIAL CONTROL LABORATORY RESULTS TO DECIDE IF THE PRODUCT MEETS QUALITY SPECIFICATIONS. HTTP://WWW.MONIQA.ORG/WEBFM_SEND/225