

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

FAQ document on the draft regulatory measures on mineral oil hydrocarbons (MOHs) in food

Scope

In this document a reply is given to questions and comments from stakeholders on the draft proposals for mineral oil hydrocarbons (MOHs) in food under the legislative framework on contaminants in food.

Questions/ comments on toxicological aspects

Why are all mineral oil aromatic hydrocarbons (MOAH) treated in the same way, while not all MOAH are equally toxic? Can it be considered that 1-2-ring MOAH are safe and do not raise health concerns?

The group of MOAH concerns various types of substances with varying degrees of toxicity, the most toxic ones being genotoxic carcinogens. At the moment it is not possible to distinguish the different MOAH on the basis of their individual toxicological properties. Genotoxicity and carcinogenicity are associated with MOAH with three or more aromatic rings. For 1-2 ring MOAH several studies point towards adverse effects such as mutagenicity and carcinogenicity, however the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) did not have sufficient toxicological data available for a full risk assessment. This does not mean that 1-2 ring MOAH can be considered to be safe. On the basis of the available data and taking into account the data gaps, EFSA concluded that current exposure of EU consumers to total MOAH raises a possible concern for human health. Therefore the regulatory measures and enforcement will be focussed on total MOAH.

In case of MOAH containing foods, is it possible, to carry out a refined risk assessment and to declare them safe for human health, when they only contain 1-2 ring MOAH?

No this approach is not appropriate. EFSA considered the exposure to total MOAH to be of health concern, so the fact that only 1-2 ring MOAH is present, is not a valid reason to declare certain products to be safe and to apply a different risk management approach. Products containing only 1-2 ring MOAH in concentrations above the ML cannot be placed on the market.

Polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) fall under the MOAH hump and cannot be excluded from the analytical result for total MOAH. How to deal with this?

PAHs are also MOAH, so they were taken into account for the EFSA risk assessment and they should be quantified together with the other MOAH substances. The regulatory measures will also apply to the PAHs, which fall under the MOAH hump.

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

Can mineral oils that pass the IP346 test be considered safe?

This test is not appropriate to ensure the absence of MOAH. EFSA concluded that the DMSO affinity decreases with an increasing degree of alkylation, which means that highly alkylated MOAH with more than three aromatic rings may not be extracted into DMSO. Therefore there is no guarantee on the safety of mineral oils that pass the IP346 test as regards the absence of MOAH.

The proposed maximum levels (MLs) for MOAH in food will lead to shortages for certain products, because a big part of the supply chain is contaminated.

The products get contaminated at different steps of the supply chain and this contamination is avoidable. The occurrence data are taken into account for the establishment of MLs. Where the largest part of the production contains concentrations of MOAH below the limit of quantification (LOQ), it is clear that this should also be achievable for the rest of the production. For products for which a large part of the production contains MOAH in quantities above the LOQ, it will be discussed whether temporary higher MLs could be considered, in order to give the food business operators (FBOs) some more time to implement the required mitigation measures.

Questions/comments on the draft MLs for MOAH in food.

An impact assessment is needed before establishing MLs for MOAH in food.

For setting MLs for contaminants in food evidence and input from stakeholders are taken into account, in order to understand the specific production conditions of the different sectors. MLs are proposed for which compliance can be ensured for all foods. Because MLs will be set, which can be achieved by applying the appropriate mitigation measures, the expected economic impacts are minimal. According to the Commissions' Better Regulation Guidelines therefore no further impact assessment is needed.

Should MLs be set for raw agricultural commodities or only for products placed on the market for the final consumer?

In many cases the MOHs that are quantified in products placed on the market for the final consumer originate from a contamination of the raw agricultural commodities. As in most cases the MOHs cannot be removed or can only be partially removed during the production process, the only way of avoiding the contamination of the final product is to avoid the contamination of the raw agricultural commodity. Only by establishing MLs for the raw agricultural commodities can one push the producers of those products to apply the necessary mitigation measures. Therefore, the MLs should apply to raw agricultural commodities, products placed on the market for the final consumer and all intermediate products.

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

Transitional measures are needed before applying the MLs for MOAH in food.

Already in 2017 the Commission issued a Recommendation on the monitoring of Mineral Oil Hydrocarbons (MOH) in Food (Recommendation (EU) 2017/84¹) in which Member States and FBOs were asked to carry out controls on MOH in food and, where MOHs were quantified, to carry out investigations towards the sources of contamination and to apply mitigation measures. The food sector is already for many years aware of the issue of the occurrence of MOHs in food and had therefore sufficient time to start mitigating the sources of contamination. The comments from the different stakeholders as regards the need for deferred application dates and transitional measures for products placed on the market before the application date have been received in good order and they will be taken into account for the discussions with the Member States on the draft proposal. In any case possible transitional measures will not impact on the validity of the Joint statement of 21 April 2022 of the Member States regarding the presence of MOAH in food, including food for infants and young children (including the further clarifications of 19 October 2022)². This means that regardless of possible transitional measures, Member States will still be able to enforce large quantities of MOAH in food on the basis of Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002³.

MLs should be set on the basis of the 'As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA)' principle and not on the basis of the limit of quantification (LOQ).

In accordance with Article 2 of Regulation (EEC) No 315/93⁴, MLs for contaminants in food are set on the basis of the ALARA principle when following good practices at all stages of the production. From the occurrence data it is clear that, when following good practices, in most foods the concentrations of MOAH can be kept below the LOQ. Therefore in many cases 'ALARA' means below the LOQ. This is the reason why MLs are proposed at the level of the achievable LOQ.

On the basis of the occurrence data for specific products, ML above the LOQ should be established.

As indicated in the point above, the MLs for MOAH in food will be established in accordance with the ALARA principle, when following good practices at all stages of the production. For this the occurrence data will be taken into account, as well as the achievable LOQs. Where needed, in order not to hamper the food supply, it will be discussed whether for certain commodities it would be

¹ Commission recommendation (EU) 2017/84 of 16 January 2017 on the monitoring of mineral oil hydrocarbons in food and in materials and articles intended to come into contact with food (OJ L 312, 17.1.2017, p. 95, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reco/2017/84/oj>).

² https://food.ec.europa.eu/safety/chemical-safety/contaminants/catalogue_en#MOH

³ Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety (OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1–24, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj>).

⁴ Council Regulation (EEC) No 315/93 of 8 February 1993 laying down Community procedures for contaminants in food No 315/93 of 8 February 1993 laying down Community procedures for contaminants in food (OJ L 37, 13.2.1993, p. 1, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/1993/315/oj>).

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

appropriate to discuss a progressive time plan to achieve concentrations of MOAH in a certain period of time below the LOQ.

In option 2 of the ML proposal does ‘all food’ cover both ingredients and final products?

Indeed the different options for the current MLs proposals would cover all foods as defined in Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, so this means raw agricultural commodities, ingredients, products for the final consumer and all intermediate products.

‘Food’ (or ‘foodstuff’) means any substance or product, whether processed, partially processed or unprocessed, intended to be, or reasonably expected to be ingested by humans.

Furthermore Article 2(1) of Regulation (EU) 2023/915 states “the food listed in Annex I shall not be placed on the market and shall not be used as a raw material in food or as an ingredient in food where it contains a contaminant at a level which exceeds the maximum level set out in Annex I”.

In case higher MLs would be set for certain commodities, also higher MLs should apply to products in which these commodities are used as an ingredient.

Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2023/915⁵ will be applied for the MOAH MLs:

Where no specific Union maximum levels are set out in Annex I for food which is dried, diluted, processed or compound food (i.e. composed of more than one ingredient), the following aspects shall be taken into account when applying the maximum levels set out in Annex I to such food:

- (a) changes of the concentration of the contaminant caused by drying or dilution processes;*
- (b) changes of the concentration of the contaminant caused by processing;*
- (c) the relative proportions of the ingredients in the product;*
- (d) the analytical limit of quantification (LOQ).*

For certain commodities with large amounts of endogenous interfering substances, the achievable LOQs are higher than the proposed MLs.

The European Reference Laboratory will be consulted on the achievable LOQs for commodities with high amounts of endogenous interfering substances and this information will be taken into account for the discussions on the MLs.

⁵ Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/915 of 25 April 2023 on maximum levels for certain contaminants in food and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 (OJ L 119, 5.5.2023, p. 103, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/915/oj>).

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

For coffee, tea and herbal infusions transfer studies show that the transfer to the brew is very limited. Are MLs for these commodities necessary?

The results of the transfer studies will be discussed with the Member States in order to evaluate the need for MLs for MOAH in coffee, tea and herbal infusions.

Questions/comments on the draft monitoring Recommendation on the monitoring of MOHs in food and on indicative levels (ILs) for mineral oil saturated hydrocarbons (MOSH) in food.

EFSA concluded that the current consumer exposure to MOSH does not raise health concerns, so why are regulatory measures proposed for MOSH in food?

MOSH causes various adverse effects in humans, such as the accumulation in various organs. Indeed EFSA concluded that the current consumer exposure to MOSH does not raise health concerns, however the margin for a safe exposure is limited. This means that, in case all current mitigation measures would be dropped and the exposure to MOSH would further increase, the conclusions of the EFSA opinion might change. Therefore, the continued monitoring of MOSH in food and the application of mitigation measures against MOSH in food remain necessary. Therefore, the establishment of indicative levels for MOSH in food is appropriate.

While indicative levels (ILs) should not be used as thresholds for removing products from the market, some Member States might use them for this purpose.

Indicative levels should not be used as a threshold to remove products from the market, this is clearly indicated in the draft Recommendation. However, in case very high concentrations of MOSH would be quantified in food, Member States can always take enforcement action against MOSH in food on the basis of Art. 14 of the Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 following a case-by case risk assessment.

The Recommendation should include requirements for the confirmation and characterisation of total MOSH in suspect results, as indicated in the JRC Guidance.

The draft Recommendation refers to Regulation (EC) No 333/2007⁶. In the draft amendment to Regulation (EC) No 333/2007a reference is made to the JRC Guidance. This means that for the scope of the Recommendation, the requirements of the JRC Guidance will apply for MOSH and MOAH.

Questions/comments on analytical aspects

Are the MLs and ILs analytically achievable? Are validated/ standardised methods available?

⁶ Commission Regulation (EC) No 333/2007 of 28 March 2007 laying down methods of sampling and analysis for the control of levels of trace elements and processing contaminants in foodstuffs (OJ L 88, 29.3.2007, p. 29, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2007/333/oj>).

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

The Joint Research Centre of the European Commission has published a Guidance on the sampling, analysis and data reporting for the monitoring of mineral oil hydrocarbons in food and food contact materials,⁷ so a validated method is available. The proposed MLs and ILs take into account the JRC Guidance, so there are achievable LOQs for most commodities. It is acknowledged that not all laboratories can achieve these LOQs, so, where needed, FBOs should subcontract analyses to the state-of-the-art labs, which can achieve them. The other laboratories should optimise their methods as soon as possible. For certain commodities with a large quantity of endogenous interfering substances, the LOQs might be higher than those of the JRC Guidance. The European Reference Laboratory on Processing Contaminants will be consulted on these cases and, where needed, it will be discussed whether higher MLs might be appropriate, taking into account the achievable LOQs.

The MLs/ ILs cannot be achieved due to interferences with naturally occurring substances.

The Joint Research Centre provides specific guidance on sample preparations, to ensure that naturally present substances (for example olefins) do not interfere with the analysis. In case of doubt on the presence of endogenous interferences, a confirmatory analysis with two-dimensional gas chromatography (GC x GC) should be performed.

How to deal with diverging results by different laboratories of the same sample.

In several cases, where MOAH were quantified in food, the analysis results were confirmed by an independent laboratory. This shows that it is possible to carry out reproducible analyses. For products that contain endogenous substances that might interfere with the analysis, in case of doubt, a confirmatory analysis via GCxGC should be carried out by an accredited laboratory.

Are guidelines available on how the sum of MOAH should be determined?

The updated JRC Guidance explains how to integrate the MOAH fraction.

The draft Regulation on methods of analysis for MOH in food should also mention the need for a confirmatory analysis with GCxGC in some cases.

Those provisions will be added to the draft Regulation.

Questions/comments on sampling

Differences in sampling approaches can cause a divergence in the analytical results for the same lot. How can this be avoided?

The draft Regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 333/2007 as regards the methods of sampling and analysis for the control of levels of mineral oil hydrocarbons in foodstuffs will ensure that uniform sampling methods will be used, which ensure the reliability and consistency of official controls on MOHs in food. The general sampling requirements of Regulation (EC) No 333/2007 will apply to

⁷ <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/97cb92c2-d29e-11ed-a05c-01aa75ed71a1>

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

controls of MOHs in food. In addition, some specific additional requirements will be added to Regulation (EC) No 333/2007, in order to avoid the contamination of the samples with MOHs during the sampling procedure.

Is it really necessary to test each batch of sample containers on the presence of MOAH. It is much more cost-efficient to anneal all sample containers at high temperature, without carrying out tests on the presence of MOAH.

The updated JRC Guidance foresees the following:

Unpackaged food should be sampled in containers, which are inert for mineral oil. Only containers that do not release interfering substances and do not adsorb MOH should be used. Glass or polyethylene terephthalate (PET) containers have the identified properties and are most preferred. Each new batch of sample containers should be checked for mineral oil contamination. If a mineral oil contamination is detected, the containers should be washed before use with purified n-hexane and dried at the highest temperature possible. Glass sample containers could also be annealed, preferably at 400 °C. Mineral oil contamination of sample containers needs to be checked for each new batch after such treatment.

This text is not part of the draft Regulation on analytical methods for MOHs in food but, in the Regulation, reference is made to the JRC Guidance. The JRC guidance serves as a help for lowering the risk of contamination of the sample before analysis, in order to give reliable analytical results. However, it is up to the individual operator to decide how secure they want to be. If they do not properly check the sampling containers for MOH contamination, then there is a risk of non-compliance because of that.

It should be explained how it should be ensured that no contamination occurs during the sampling due to the use of personal care products.

The draft Regulation on the methods for the sampling and analysis of MOHs in food foresees that the detailed precautions for the sampling and analysis of MOHs in food from the JRC Guidance should be followed. The JRC Guidance foresees that the person that carries out the sampling, should take all necessary precautions, to avoid contamination of the sample. For example, the use of cosmetics (e.g. hand creams) should be avoided. The easiest way of doing so, is not to use personal care products, when sampling food for the analysis of MOHs in food.

[Questions/comments on enforcement](#)

Part of the measured MOAH might originate from authorised lubricants, food additives or food contact materials. Is MOAH contamination from such sources allowed?

EFSA recommended that the technical specifications of white mineral oils and waxes used as food additives and food packaging materials should be updated, with detailed information about the MOAH content and composition. The DG SANTE teams dealing with food additives and food contact

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

materials are currently discussing the appropriate regulatory measures for MOAH in food additives and food contact materials. In any case the regulatory measures for MOHs under the contaminants legislation will apply regardless of the source of the MOHs, even if the source is an authorised food additive or food contact material.

For certain methods the measurement uncertainty (MU) is quite high, which makes it difficult to draw conclusions on the compliance of a lot. How to deal with this?

In accordance with points D.1.3. and D.2. of the Annex to Regulation (EC) No 333/2007, decisions on the compliance of a lot need to be taken, taking into account the measurement uncertainty. This means that the measurement uncertainty of the method (as indicated on the analysis certificate) needs to be deducted from the analytical result. If the result of that subtraction is lower than or equal to the ML, the lot is compliant. This way it is ensured that an identified non-compliance is really an exceedance of the ML and that it is not due to the high measurement uncertainty.

Will the measurement uncertainty (MU) also be applied on results of auto-controls.

The provisions of Regulation (EC) No 333/2007 also apply to auto controls, so indeed the MU also needs to be applied to those results.

How can enforcement be done, when the LOQ of the method is higher than the ML?

For results from methods with an LOQ that is higher than the ML, when the result is below the LOQ, there are no guarantees on the compliance of the product. However, when with such a method a result above the LOQ and by consequence above the ML is obtained (corrected for the measurement uncertainty), the lot can be declared non-compliant.

Clear thresholds are needed above which market withdrawals and recalls should be done. The enforcement approaches of the Member States should be harmonised.

Under the current statement of the SC PAFF of 21 April 2022 the Member States enforce MOAH in food on the basis of a case-by-case risk assessment in accordance with article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002. Once maximum levels for MOAH in food will be established, there will be a clear threshold for enforcement.

Questions/ comments on awareness raising in third countries

It is difficult to reach FBOs in third countries and to convince them on the need to apply mitigation measures against MOHs in food. Can DG SANTE help in this regard?

DG SANTE prepared an information note on MOHs in food for third countries, which can be circulated by EU FBOs to their suppliers in third countries:

https://food.ec.europa.eu/document/download/073ffc30-a422-47e8-abdb-81028ce18295_en.

This document has not been adopted or endorsed by the European Commission. Any views expressed are the preliminary views of the Commission services and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the Commission.

The note has also been circulated to the EU delegations in third countries for circulation among third country competent authorities.

At the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food 17 under agenda item 21 on emerging issues the Codex members were informed on the issue of MOHs in food and on the need to apply mitigation practices in their production.

-Report CCCF17: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMee%252Fmeetings%252FCX-735-17%252FReport%252FFINAL%252FBREPORT%252FREP24_CF17e.pdf

-EU comments in CX/CF 24/17/19: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMee%252Fmeetings%252FCX-735-17%252FWorking%252Bdocuments%252Fcf17_19.pdf