

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND FOOD REGULATION MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

27 FEBRUARY 2009

FOOD MINISTERS REQUEST A REVIEW OF DRAFT STANDARD 2.10.3 – THAT HAS RESULTED FROM APPLICATION A577 – CALCIUM IN CHEWING GUM CONTAINING NO MORE THAN 0.2% RESIDUAL SUGARS

The Australia and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council (Ministerial Council) has requested that Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) review the draft standard 2.10.3 – that has resulted from Application A577 – Calcium in chewing gum containing no more than 0.2% residual sugars.

Application A577 seeks to include a Standard for chewing gum in Part 2.10 which permits the addition of calcium to chewing gum ($\leq 0.2\%$ residual sugars) at a maximum claim level of 200mg releasable calcium per serve.

The Criteria/Grounds for the review of the draft standard 2.10.3 are that:

- **it is not consistent with existing policy guidelines set by the Ministerial Council**

The proposed fortification of chewing gum ($\leq 0.2\%$ residual sugars) is contrary to the intent and spirit of the Policy Guideline for the *Fortification of Foods with Vitamins and Minerals*. The proposed fortification of chewing gum ($\leq 0.2\%$ residual sugars) could promote consumption patterns inconsistent with nutrition policies and guidelines of Australia and New Zealand.

- **it does not protect public health and safety**

Consumers may choose chewing gum as a substitute for nutritive high source calcium foods, such as dairy products. The amount of calcium that would be provided from fortified chewing gum would not have significant public health benefit.

- **it does not provide adequate information to enable informed choice**

There is potential for consumers to be misled by perceiving calcium fortified chewing gum as a good source of calcium. With the small quantity of calcium (i.e. 63 mg per reference serve) proposed, it is arguable that chewing gum with calcium provides no nutritional benefit to the consumer.

- **it is difficult to enforce or comply with in both practical and resource terms**

There is a potential problem with the compliance and enforcement of this Application in practical terms. There is no current nationally recognised or proven methodology for the analysis of the amount of releasable calcium in the product.

FSANZ has three months to review the draft standard and re-affirm, re-affirm with amendments, or withdraw its approval of the draft standard.

FOOD MINISTERS REQUEST A REVIEW OF VARIATION TO STANDARD 1.5.2 THAT HAS RESULTED FROM APPLICATION A614 – FOOD DERIVED FROM GLYPHOSATE-TOLERANT COTTON LINE GHB614

The Australia and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council (Ministerial Council) has requested that Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) review the draft standard 1.5.2 - that has resulted from Application A614 – Food derived from glyphosate-tolerant cotton line GHB614.

Application A614 seeks to amend Standard 1.5.2 – Food produced using Gene Technology, to include food derived from glyphosate-tolerant cotton line GHB614.

The Criterion/Ground for the review of draft Standard is that:

- **it does not protect public health and safety**

Clarification is sought regarding what is known about potential health implications of work establishing proof of principle for persistence and uptake of foreign DNA in and across the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) of mammals.

FSANZ has three months to review the draft standard and re-affirm, re-affirm with amendments, or withdraw its approval of the draft standard.

FOOD MINISTERS REQUEST A REVIEW OF VARIATION TO STANDARD 1.5.2 THAT HAS RESULTED FROM APPLICATION A615 – FOOD DERIVED FROM INSECT-PROTECTED COTTON LINE COT67B

The Australia and New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council (Ministerial Council) has requested that Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) review the draft standard 1.5.2 - that has resulted from Application A615 – Food derived from insect-protected cotton line COT67B.

Application A615 seeks to amend Standard 1.5.2 – Food produced using Gene Technology, to include food derived from insect-protected cotton line COT67B.

The Criterion/Ground for the review of draft Standard is that:

- **it does not protect public health and safety**

Clarification is sought regarding what is known about potential health implications of work establishing proof of principle for persistence and uptake of foreign DNA in and across the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) of mammals.

FSANZ has three months to review the draft standard and re-affirm, re-affirm with amendments, or withdraw its approval of the draft standard.