1. Candidate countries' progress in adopting the *acquis communautaire*

Slovakia, Slovenia, Latvia and Estonia reported on the progress made in transposing and introducing into national law the *acquis* on animal feedingstuffs. Slovenia expressed its appreciation of the advice received and the fruitful co-operation during the recent peer-review mission to their country.

2. Examination of a question submitted by Denmark: classification of the nematode-trapping fungus *Duddingtonia flagrans*

A discussion took place concerning the categorisation of the fungus *Duddingtonia flagrans*. A majority of Member State delegations expressed their willingness to evaluate the conformity of this product in the event that a dossier were submitted.

3. Status as regard feed legislation on short–chain fructooligosaccharides (scFOS)

It was not possible to reach a consensus on the legal status of this substance. Given that the new Regulation on additives for use in animal nutrition would be implemented within a year, a decision could subsequently be taken on this issue.

4. Exchange of views on the items to be included in the co-ordinated inspection programme on animal nutrition for 2004, pursuant to Article 22 of Council Directive 95/53/EC

Some delegations suggested a number of issues to be included in the co-ordinated inspection programme for 2004. The main discussions focussed on mycotoxins, heavy metals, carry-over of certain growth promoters, indication of establishments’ approval and registration numbers and risky industrial processes. In addition to these, the Commission also suggested controls on the source of certain feed materials and on the new labelling requirements for compound feedingstuffs, which would come into force in November 2003.

The Commission services would prepare a proposal for a recommendation to be discussed during a subsequent meeting of the Standing Committee.

5. Additives – trace elements

A vote was taken and the Committee adopted an opinion endorsing the proposed measures by qualified majority. Two delegations abstained.

Few amendments were introduced in the text voted on.

The German delegation made the following declaration:

« Protokollerklärung zum Kommissionsvorschlag Reduzierung der Spurenelementhöchstgehalte (SANCO/367/Rev. 5/2000)

Die deutsche Delegation kann dem Vorschlag der Kommission zur Herabsetzung der Höchstgehalte an Spurenelementen in der vorliegenden Form nicht zustimmen. Zwar anerkennt sie, dass die vorgesehene Reduzierung der Höchstgehalte für Spurenelemente in der Tierernährung ein Schritt in die richtige Richtung ist. Dieser Schritt ist aber nicht ausreichend, um insbesondere auch unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Vorsorge die Belastungen der Böden durch Kupfer und Zink im erforderlichen Ausmaß nachhaltig zu reduzieren. Deutschland hätte sich deshalb vor allem eine stärkere Rückführung der Höchstgehalte für Zink und Kupfer gewünscht.»


When the above-mentioned Directive was adopted, the Commission gave an undertaking to review the provisions laid down in the Annex to the Directive on the basis of updated scientific risk assessments, while taking into account the prohibition of any dilution of contaminated non-complying product intended for use in animal feed.

The Commission had therefore asked the Scientific Committee for Animal Nutrition (SCAN) to provide these updated scientific risk assessments without delay. The opinion adopted by the SCAN in April 2003 provides a comprehensive overview of the possible risks to animal and public health arising from the presence of various undesirable substances in animal feed. It was nevertheless acknowledged that detailed risk assessments were necessary to enable a complete review of the provisions in the Annex to be carried out.
Information was brought to the attention of the Committee to the effect that, as from 1 August 2003, the supply of some essential valuable feed materials might be jeopardised as a result of the level of undesirable substances in some feed materials – owing to normal background contamination – being near to or in excess of the maximum permitted level laid down in the Annex. Acknowledging this fact, the majority of the Committee agreed to adjust the maximum level for undesirable substance/feed material combinations, provided that these modifications were provisional and subject to review on the basis of a detailed risk assessment:

- arsenic in calcium carbonate (10 ppm), calcareous marine algae (10 ppm), magnesium oxide (20 ppm), feedingstuffs obtained from the processing of fish or other marine animals (15 ppm), seaweed meal and feed materials derived from seaweed (40 ppm) and fish feed (6 ppm);
- lead in phosphates, calcium carbonate, calcareous marine algae and mineral feedingstuffs (all 15 ppm);
- fluorine in marine crustaceans such as marine krill (2000 ppm), magnesium oxide (600 ppm), calcium carbonate (350 ppm) and calcareous marine algae (1000 ppm);
- aflatoxin B1 in all feed materials (0.02 ppm) and in compound feedingstuffs with a maximum level above 0.02 ppm (0.02 ppm);
- free gossypol in cotton seed (5000 ppm) and feed materials derived from cotton seed (1200 ppm);
- deletion of Camelina sativa from the list.

The Commission representative stated that, once the internal procedure had been completed at the Commission, these conclusions would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee for its opinion.

The presence of mercury in calcium carbonate and endosulfan in soybean oil was raised, but no conclusions were reached due to the late availability of data in support of a possible modification.

The Committee agreed in substance that a specific provision should be made for cases where feed materials were directly fed to animals, or in cases where complementary feedingstuffs were used to prevent animals being exposed to higher levels of an undesirable substance than the corresponding maximum permitted level of exposure in instances where only complete feedingstuffs were used in a daily ration. However, no conclusive decisions were taken as to the form this provision should take, or when it should be introduced.

In relation to the discussions above, the Committee agreed on the list of substances for which a detailed risk assessment was a high priority. The Commission stated that these requests would be submitted without delay to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). A brief exchange of views also took place concerning measurement uncertainty and correction for recovery.

7. TIMETABLE FOR ADDITIVES

7.1. New dossiers


On expiry of the sixty-day period provided for in Article 4(4) of Directive 70/524/EEC, no objections were raised regarding the acceptability of the dossier. The in-depth evaluation process provided for in Article 4(6) of Directive 70/524/EEC was therefore deemed to have commenced on 26 June 2003.


7.2 Current dossiers


8. Any other business.

8.1 Article 9g substances
The Commission department informed the Member States that the evaluation of the two antibiotic growth-promoters and the seven coccidiostats was likely to take longer than anticipated. It was therefore expected that no decision would be taken before 30 September 2003 on whether substances would be linked to the party responsible for putting them into circulation, or whether they would be withdrawn from Annex I Chapter B. The Commission thus intended to apply Article 9g(6) and extend the authorisation until a decision was taken on each of the substances individually.

This matter would be discussed at the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

8.2 Format for reporting data on antibiotics consumption

The proposed format for reporting data on the use of antibiotics for the purpose of growth promotion, including the question of the reporting period, was discussed and endorsed by all Member States.

8.3 Relationship between rapid alert notifications under Article 50 of Regulation 178/2002 and alert notifications under Article 16a of Directive 95/53/EC

A discussion took place concerning the reporting obligation pursuant to Article 50 of the general food law Regulation, and it was concluded that the alerts with a bearing on animal health and the environment were not covered by the above-mentioned obligation, and that they should instead be notified under Article 16a of Directive 95/53/EC. It was proposed that the same notification channels and reporting forms should be used as for the RASFF, but with a clear indication of the underlying legal basis.