



INC Follow up Formula Update:

Jenny Reid

Growing and Protecting New Zealand



www.mpi.govt.nz



Review of Codex Standard on FUF

- Codex Standard on FUF developed in 1987 - outdated
- CCNFSDU (2012) agreed to review, confirmed at CAC (2013)
- eWG established – co- chaired by NZ, France and Indonesia



Terms of Reference

- Develop a draft discussion document for the review of the Standard for Follow-up Formula (CODEX STAN 156-1987) with an **initial focus on the essential composition** of Follow-up Formula for older infants and young children aged 6-36 months.
- Consider if any differences are required in the essential composition of Follow-up Formula for older infants (6-12 months) and young children (12-36 months)



TOR cont:

- Identify areas where additional **technical guidance** and expert advice will be required by the Committee
- **Collect data and information** on Follow-up Formula and **its role in the diet** that will assist the Committee with the review of the Follow-up Formula standard
- Develop a draft revised standard for consideration by the CCNFSDU at Step 2



eWG

- eWG: 25 member countries; EU and 10 observers accepted;
- 25 responded to first consultation document;
- First consultation focused on:
 - Compositional requirements
 - Role of FUF (evidence based)
 - Data gaps
 - Areas requiring technical guidance



eWG – second consultation

- Second consultation paper distributed 5/8/13
- Responses due 6/9/13
- Summarises general findings of first consultation
- Identifies common themes including technical data gaps
- Proposes options for a regulatory framework for FUF



Key themes:

- General agreement on the need to review evidence base for composition of FUF;
- Support for positions put forward in technical review of 6-12 months;
- Evidence review needed for 12 – 36 months;
- EU waiting on EFSA opinion – both essential composition and role/need in the diet



Key themes cont:

- Most supported separation of requirements for 6-12 and 12 – 36 months;
- Some concern with overlap of 6-12 months (ie IF and FUF)
- Some support one standard 0 – 12 months



Essential composition

- Review required of energy;
- protein (quantity and quality);
- fat (quantity and quality);
- fatty acids;
- iron; zinc; iodine; calcium and vitamins A,C and D



Energy

- Current FUF 60 -85 kcal per 100mls
- Current IF 60 – 70 kcal per 100 mls
- Human milk approx 65 kcal per 100mls

- Suggest support for lowering upper limit on FUF



Protein

- Current FUF too high
- relationship between early protein intake and obesity – intakes at or greater than 4g/kg/day for 8-24 month infants associated with overweight



Fat

- Need of scientific update
- Criteria for specific fatty acids
- similar provisions as the IF standard
- Total fat equivalent to 40 -55% of energy
- Inadequate essential fatty acids
- EHA and DHA parameters
- TFA
- Source of fat



Vitamins and minerals

- General agreement on the need for revision
- Accommodate regional differences/deficiencies
- Focus on micronutrients with reported deficiencies
- Should minimum be mandated?
- What is essential?



Maximum versus GUL

- Current FUF no max or GUL (IF does)
- Some support for similar approach
- Need to be wide to assist manufacturing processes
- ENA paper (6-12 m) max or GUL



Optional ingredients

- Issue of principles or permissions
- Current IF has principles (based on human milk)and some optional ingredients listed
- How do you update list?
- What is the basis of principles?



Role of FUF

- From 6m formula or BM up to 90% of energy
- FUF greater role – regional differences
- FUF 6-12 months replacing BM or IF
- FUF 12 -36 months replacing cows milk (not in addition to)
- Over time more consumption of FUF cf cows milk but not increase in overall total



Scope

- Majority favoured separate category for 6 -12 months and 12 -36 months
- Diff role in the diet
- physiological differences of the age group
- Issue of having 2 standards covering the 6 -12 month age group
 - Should it be captured in the IF standard?
 - Separate standard or category of FUF



0-6 vs 6 -12 months

- Are there different compositional requirements?
- Most countries had different compositional requirements for IF and FUF



6-12 vs 12 – 36 months

- Diff compositional requirements
- Technical guidance required
- ENA paper supported



Minimum essential composition

- IF: breast-milk substitute
- FUF: are not breast-milk substitutes and not be presented as such
- (note : discrepancy for the 6 -12 months)



WHO Position (July 2013)

- FUF is unnecessary. In addition , FUF is not a suitable substitute for BM due to its content.
- Also state that where FUF is represented as a BM replacement it falls within scope of the Code.



- Breast- milk is the reference for IF essential composition
- What should form the basis for essential composition of FUF?
- Essentiality and role in the diet



Conceptual Framework for FUF regulation

- Retain current scope (6 -36 months)
- Retain current scope with separate compositional criteria for 6-12m and 12-36m
- Divide standard into 2 parts (6 -12m and 12 – 36m)
- IF (0-12 m) FUF (12 – 36m)
- IF (0 – 12 m) no FUF standard
- FUF (6 – 12 m) no standard for 12 – 36 m



Next steps:

- Will develop a draft revised standard for FUF to present at the CCNFSDU meeting;
- Will supplement with discussion document;
- Will need to be decisions regarding structure and technical gaps;
- Will need discussion on rest of the standard including labelling



MPI Audit

- Integrity and credibility of NZ regulatory model
- As part of a wider audit, consideration of infant formula composition and labelling issues;
- Labelling activity mostly reactive in light of Std 2.9.1 review and development of Std 1.2.7;
- May result in a different approach to IF labelling as result of audit and potential for additional guidance provisions from MPI



contact

- jenny.reid@mpi.govt.nz
- 0298942582

