A.01 Feed Additives - Applications under Regulation (EC) N° 1831/2013 Art. 4 or 13.

Two applications were presented for the discussion since a new functional group as feed hygiene agent was requested.

A.02 Feed Additives - Applications under Regulation (EC) N° 1831/2003 Art. 9

Discussion on EFSA Scientific Opinions on the safety and efficacy of:


Not discussed.

A.2.2. bentonite-and sepiolite (Toxfin® Dry) as feed additive for all species. Annex.

Following the discussion a new Annex will be submitted to a future meeting.

A.2.3. Endofeed® DC (endo-1,3(4)-beta-glucanase and endo-1,4-beta-xylanase) as a feed additive for chickens for fattening, laying hens, pigs for fattening and minor poultry and porcine species.

Following the discussion, supplementary information will be requested to the applicant.

A.2.4. Rovabio® Excel (endo-1,3(4)-beta-glucanase and endo-1,4-beta-xylanase) as a feed additive for chickens and turkeys for fattening, laying hens, piglets (weaned) and pigs for fattening, ducks, guinea fowls, quails, geese, pheasants and pigeons. Annex.

Following the discussion a new Annex will be submitted to a future meeting.
A.2.5. vitamin D3 (cholecalciferol) as a feed additive for pigs, piglets, bovines, ovines, calves, equines, chickens for fattening, turkeys, other poultry, fish and other animal species or categories, based on a dossier submitted by Fermenta Biotech Ltd.

The opinion was presented and a full discussion will be after the adoption of the last opinion on vitamin D3, as already decided in a previous meeting.

A.2.6. Brilliant Blue FCF (E133) as a feed additive for cats and dogs.

The opinion was presented and the full discussion will be after the adoption of the last opinion of the same group of feed additive.

A.2.7. Natugrain® TS (endo-1,4-beta-xylanase and endo-1,4-beta-glucanase) as a feed additive for pigs for fattening. Annex

Following the discussion, a draft Implementing Regulation will be proposed for possible vote at a future meeting.

A.2.8. AGal-Pro (alpha-galactosidase and endo-1,4-beta-glucanase) as a feed additive for chickens reared for laying and minor poultry species for fattening. Annex

Following the discussion, a draft Implementing Regulation will be proposed for possible vote at a future meeting.

A.2.9. Hostazym C (endo-1,4-beta-glucanase) as feed additive for chickens for fattening, all other birds for fattening and piglets (weaned)

Following the discussion, supplementary information will be requested to the applicant.

A.2.10. Carophyll® Red 10% (preparation of canthaxanthin) for all poultry for breeding purposes (chickens, turkeys and other poultry). Annex

Not discussed.

A.2.11. Pediococcus pentosaceus (DSM 14021, DSM 23688 and DSM 23689) as silage additives for all animal species. Annex

Not discussed.

A.2.12. L-threonine, technically pure for all species

Withdrawn as the EFSA opinion had not been published.

A.2.13. manganese compounds (E5) as feed additives for all species: manganous oxide and
A.2.14. manganese compounds (E5) as feed additives for all species: manganese chelate of amino acids, hydrate
The Committee took note of the two opinions in the margins of the re-evaluation of manganous compounds. They will be discussed once the pending opinions on manganese are available.

A.2.15. iron compounds (E1) as feed additives for all species: iron chelate of amino acids, hydrate

The Committee took note of the opinion in the margins of the re-evaluation of Iron compounds. It will be discussed once the pending opinions on Iron are available.

A.2.16. L-tyrosine for all animal species

Discussion on EFSA opinion including the different recommendations for the authorisation act. An annex entry will be prepared for the next meeting.

A.2.17. L-selenomethionine as feed additive for all animal species - Annex entry

Discussion of the proposed approval annex for this amino acid. A draft authorisation decision will be prepared for a future meeting.

A.03 Discussion of a draft Code of good labelling practice for compound feed for food producing animals as referred to in Article 25 of the Feed marketing Regulation (EC) N° 767/2009.

Several Member State representatives commented on the draft Code in detail. A scrutiny of the text will be undertaken in the next meeting in order to elaborate a constructive response to the initiators of the draft.


On request of one delegation, the status of used cooking oils depending on its origin was discussed. With reference to the definition of catering waste in Regulation (EU) N° 142/2011, all used cooking oils coming from restaurants or kitchens are to be considered under the scope of Regulation (EC) N° 1069/2009 and their feeding is consequently restricted to fur animals. This applies also to cooking oil of vegetable origin. Thus, it is not necessary to revise the list with prohibited and restricted materials in Regulation (EC) N° 767/2009.

A.05 Update and exchange of views on recent RASFF notifications with particular attention to the contamination of enzymes and enzyme preparations with chloramphenicol.

An overview of recent RASFF notifications as regards undesirable substances was provided and commented upon. The notifications related to:
non-dioxin like PCBs in iron carbonate from France. The level found was just above the maximum level. Compound feed produced with the contaminated iron carbonate before the contamination was known does consequently not need to be withdrawn. The source of contamination is possibly related to the food grade oil used for the crushing of the iron carbonate.

- mercury in mineral feed for poultry from Germany and in fish meal from Guatemala and from Spain.
- aflatoxin B1 in groundnuts for birdfeed from Brazil.
- free gossypol in cotton seeds from Greece.
- high content of cyanide in linseed cake meal from Germany.
- dioxins in natural mixed tocopherols from China. The Commission representative highlighted that already several times too high levels of dioxins were found in vitamins originating from China.
- dioxins in soybean meal produced in Italy. It was highlighted that it would be appropriate to refer to the number in the feed catalogue to unequivocally identify the feed material concerned as there was some confusion in the beginning as regards the exact nature of the feed material concerned. Furthermore investigations are still ongoing at which stage the contamination occurred.

Attention was paid to the alert notification as regards poisonous dried dog food from Spain having caused the death of dogs in France and Spain. The pet food is produced with 10 to 30% of cocoa and cocoa husks. Very high levels of theobromine were found in the feed, many times above the maximum level of 50 mg/kg of theobromine in dog food, established by Directive 2002/32/EC on undesirable substances in feed. In the EFSA scientific opinion on theobromine [1] , it is reported that dogs are very sensitive to the toxic effects of theobromine and that acute fatal intoxication could occur after single ingestion of theobromine at 80-300 mg/kg b.w. However further investigations are undertaken to confirm the cause of the death of the dogs.

Extensive attention was paid to the RASFF notifications related to the contamination of enzymes by chloramphenicol. End of July 2013, a high level of chloramphenicol has been detected in an enzyme preparation. Ranging between 0.13 and 14.9 µg/kg. Further investigations could relate the contamination to high levels of chloramphenicol in xylanase coming from Japan. Following a request, Japanese authorities have confirmed that the contaminated ingredient was originating from India. The Indian authorities have been requested to perform investigations to identify the source of contamination and to take measures to avoid such a contamination in the future. The Indian authorities have committed to investigate the contamination incident and to report the findings. However no information has yet been received from the Indian authorities.

Besides xylanase, also amylase, pectinase, glucanase, cellulase were found contaminated. Besides enzymes intended for feed also enzymes used in the food processing are affected by the contamination incident. All contaminated enzymes and enzyme preparations could be traced back to three companies in India, either directly or indirectly via Japan imported into the EU.

It was confirmed that the MRPL (Minimum Required Performance limit) of 0.3 µg/kg for chloramphenicol in food of animal origin, established by Commission Decision 2002/657/EC, is for the management of this contamination incident also to be applied
to enzymes, enzyme preparations, premixtures, compound feed, ingredients for food processing and food of non-animal origin. The enzymes, enzyme preparations, premixtures and food ingredients (semi-finished food products) in which the presence of chloramphenicol in quantifiable amounts have been analysed with a method of analysis able to quantify the presence of chloramphenicol at least at a level of 0.3 µg/kg (MRPL) cannot be used anymore for feed and food production, cannot be placed on the market and have to be withdrawn from the market. The same is applicable for compound feed and food ready for consumption but based on the information as currently available, the presence of chloramphenicol in quantifiable amounts (with a method of analysis able to quantify the presence of chloramphenicol at a level of 0.3 µg/kg) has not yet been observed in compound feed and food ready for consumption.

Following a request from a delegation as regards information which has been circulating between professional stakeholder organisations before being communicated to the competent authorities, the Commission representative clarified that a report of a meeting between Commission representatives and Belgian authorities have been more widely distributed than expected. Once this was realised, the information was immediately communicated to the competent authorities via the RASFF.

Clarification was requested as regards the implementation that contaminated enzymes/enzyme preparations can no longer be used for the production of feed but feed produced before the feed business operator was aware of the contamination can remain on the market and has not to be withdrawn. The Commission representative that the feed business operator have the legal obligation to immediately inform their customers of the contamination and is from that moment that the enzymes/enzyme preparations are no longer allowed to be used for the production of feed.

The Committee was furthermore informed that the JECFA method used to certify the absence of antimicrobial activity, is not suitable at all to detect levels of chloramphenicol. According to information received even high levels of chloramphenicol would not be detected with that method. The method to be used is an LC-MS/MS method. A delegation requested if there were reliable and sensitive rapid tests on the market which feed business operators could apply in their auto-control. The Commission representative indicated to provide an answer at the next meeting.


B.01 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation L-cystine as a feed additive for all animal species.

The draft proposes to authorise L-cystine as amino acid in feed. A short discussion took place with respect to the raw material of the cystine synthesis and the content of sulphur containing amino acids in the ration.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.
B.02 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation amending Regulations as regards the name of the holder of the authorisation of certain additives in animal feed.

The Regulation was drafted following a request from the applicant to change the name of the authorisation holder for the feed additive.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.03 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of endo-1,4-beta-xylanase produced by Trichoderma reesei (MUCL 49755) and endo-1,3(4)-beta-glucanase produced by Trichoderma reesei (MUCL 49754) as a feed additive for pigs for fattening and minor porcine species for fattening other than Sus scrofa domesticus (holder of authorisation Aveve N.V.).

The draft proposes to authorise a new use of the above additive as zootechnical additive in feed.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.04 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of Enterococcus faecium NBIMCC 8270 Lactobacillus acidophilus NBIMCC 8242, Lactobacillus helveticus NBIMCC 8269, Lactobacillus delbrueckii ssp. lactis NBIMCC 8250, Lactobacillus delbrueckii ssp. bulgaricus NBIMCC 8244, and Streptococcus thermophilus NBIMCC 8253 for suckling piglets (holder of authorisation Lactina Ltd.).

The draft proposes to authorise a new additive as zootechnical additive in feed.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.05 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of propionic acid, sodium propionate and ammonium propionate as a feed additive for all animal species.

The draft proposes to authorise a new use of the above additive as technological additive in feed.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.06 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of preparation of Enterococcus faecium NCIMB 10415 as a feed additive for calves, kids, cats and

The draft proposes a new use of the above additive and a re-authorisation as zootechnical additive in feed.

Vote taken: qualified majority (323 votes in favour, 29 votes abstention).

B.07 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of a micro-organism Coriobacteriaceae family DSM 11798 for pigs.

The draft proposes to authorise the above additive as technological additive in feed.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.08 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of bentonite as a feed additive for ruminants, poultry, and pigs and for all animal species.

The draft proposes to authorise a new use of the above additive and a re-authorisation as technological additive in feed.

Vote taken: qualified majority (316 votes in favour, 7 votes against, 29 votes abstention).

B.09 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of preparations of Lactobacillus plantarum NCIMB 40027, Lactobacillus buchneri CCM1819-DSM 22501, Lactobacillus buchneri CNIMB 40788-CNLM I-4323, Lactobacillus buchneri LN 40177-ATCC PTA-6138, and Lactobacillus buchneri LN 4637-ATCC PTA-2494 as feed additives for all animal species.

The draft proposes to authorise the use of the above additives as silage additives.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.10 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of Saccharomyces cerevisiae MUCL 39885 as a feed additive for cattle for fattening (holder of the authorisation Prosol SpA).

The draft proposes to re-authorise under the condition of Article 10.2 the above additive as zootechnical additive.
Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.11 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of fumaric acid as a feed additive for all animal species.

The draft proposes to re-authorise under the condition of Article 10.2 the above additive as zootechnical additive.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.

B.12 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation concerning the authorisation of a preparation of Enterococcus faecium DSM 7134 and Lactobacillus rhamnosus DSM 7133 as a feed additive for calves for rearing (holder of authorisation Lactosan GmbH &CoKG).

The draft proposes to re-authorise under the condition of Article 10.2 the above additive as zootechnical additive.

Vote taken: unanimous in favour.


Not discussed.

M.01 Any Other Business.

- Obligation to deliver mineral feed containing certain cobalt compounds in pelleted form.
- On request of one delegation the restriction that feed containing certain cobalt compounds must be placed on the market in pelleted form was discussed. Several Member States pleaded for a revision of provision because it would generally not improve the safety of the users. This was backed by some additional information from the concerned industry. Other Member States suggested that, apart from pelleting, the dusting potential can also be reduced by alternative means. The Commission representative invited the Committee to further reflect on the issue and to send in proposals how to tackle the issue.
- Classification of processed animal proteins (PAPs) as petfood.
- On request of one delegation, a Commission representative confirmed that the export of processed animal protein (PAP) is subject to a written agreement between the Member States of origin and the third country of destination according to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001. The competent authorities were
alerted to be vigilant that PAPs are not declared to be petfood in order to circumvent this requirement.

- Short discussion on the request to introduce a new functional group in the category of zootechnical additives to control the environmental conditions for the development of gut parasites in some animal categories. The subject will be further discussed at a future meeting.

- Short discussion on Annex IV of Regulation (EC) 183/2005 and in particular on the old additive category of "growth promoter" still present in the above Regulation. The subject will be further discussed at a future meeting.