

Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Genetically Modified Microorganisms

Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Foods Derived from Biotechnology

*World Health Organization, Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland
24–28 September 2001*

Correspondence to: J. Schlundt, Food Safety Programme, World Health Organization, 20, Avenue Appia CH-1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland. E-mail: schlundtj@who.int

Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease 2001; 13: 197–211

Summary

Microorganisms have a long history of use in food production, e.g. in the production of sausages, cheeses, etc. Roughly one quarter of all food products rely on microbiological processes, and the safe use of microorganisms for food production is essential. The transfer of novel traits to food microorganisms through recombinant gene technology will result in new potential food safety issues. This requires the elaboration of criteria for safety assessment of foods derived from genetic microorganisms.

This joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation was convened to consider criteria for the safety and risk assessment of food and food ingredients produced with the aid of, or containing, viable or non-viable genetically modified microorganisms (GMMs). The outcome is meant to contribute to safety and regulatory considerations by Member States and to support the development of international safety assessment guidelines for food produced with the aid of GMMs (GMM food) by the Codex *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology.

The Consultation concluded that the safety and risk assessment of GMM foods should proceed on a case-by-case basis considering both safety and nutritional aspects. The assessment should use the concept of *substantial equivalence* as a starting point, identifying differences and similarities between GMM foods and their conventional counterpart. While these differences guide the assessment, a number of additional issues require special consideration. Examples are the potential persistence of the GMM in the host gut and its interaction with the endogenous microflora, including the transfer of new genes to the gut microflora. Likewise the interaction of new genetic material with human cells in the gut, including the immune system, should be considered.

The assessment of GMM foods take into consideration the history of safe use of microorganisms used in the construction. The genetic stability and pathogenic potential of the strains, as well as possible secondary effects of the genetic modification on metabolism, including the concentration of critical nutrients, antinutrients, etc. are important factors to consider. Antibiotic resistance marker genes should be avoided and their absence from the final GMM food ensured.

In order to provide the basis for improved safety and risk assessment of GMM food, the Consultation recommends strengthening the capability to analyze the complex ecosystem in the human gastrointestinal tract, including work on colonization, persistence, gene transfer and host interactions. New technologies, such as molecular profiling, are developing rapidly with a potential to enhance the assessment of GMMs. The Consultation encourages further development and validation of such methods.

Fermentation provides a simple technology used globally to produce food of high nutritional and hygienic quality; a technology, which is especially important in developing countries. The Consultation recommends capacity-building efforts to support the needs of developing countries in improving and evaluating this technology and its potential also in relation to GMM use.

To enable efficient interaction and transparency in the safety and risk assessment of GMM food, FAO and WHO is urged to coordinate efforts to enhance the communication of safety and risk assessment principles of GMM food to all stakeholders including the public.

INTRODUCTION

A Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Foods Derived from Biotechnology—Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Genetically Modified Microorganisms (GMMs), was held at the Headquarters of the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva from 24 to 28 September 2001. A total of 27 experts, including authors of discussion papers, participated in the Consultation. The complete list of participants is given in Appendix 1.

Ms Ann Kern, Executive Director, Cluster of Sustainable Development and Healthy Environments, opened the Consultation on behalf of Director-General of WHO and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United

Nations (FAO). Ms Kern stated that WHO and FAO have been organizing Consultations of this kind since 1990 to provide scientific and technical guidance to Member States and to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Ms Kern also expressed the appreciation of the two Organizations to the Government of Japan for its generosity in supplying additional funding for this Consultation. She acknowledged the interest of Member States in these sometimes hotly debated issues, and the need for sound scientific advice developed and formulated by the Expert Consultations upon which Governments can base their discussions. Clear assessment and communication of scientific data is becoming increasingly important so that the scientific risk assessment

process is accurately reflected in the risk management process. Ms Kern suggested that the issues of safety and nutritional assessment of foods derived from biotechnology would be even more important in the near future with the rapid development of new foods with potential benefits related to health.

The Consultation elected Dr Ian Munro as Chairperson and Dr Bodil Lund Jacobsen, Professor Ingolf Nes, Dr Ruud Valyasevi and Dr Christopher Viljoen as Rapporteurs. The Consultation also decided to ask all participants to assist Rapporteurs by drafting each of the sections of the report of the Consultation. Dr Thomas Cebula and Dr James Maryanski (USA) and Dr William Yan (Canada) took part in the discussions through teleconference from their countries.

All participants completed a Declaration of Interest as defined by FAO and WHO.

BACKGROUND

The FAO and WHO have embarked on an initiative to organize a series of scientific Expert Consultations to provide scientific and technical advice to their Member States. The scientific advice derived from the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultations can be used by the Member States of the FAO and WHO directly. It will also serve as the scientific foundation for the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in their deliberation on safety assessment guidelines for foods derived from biotechnology presently being developed by the Codex *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology.

The FAO and WHO have to date organized two Expert Consultations. The first Consultation held in Geneva in June–July 2000 addressed the overall aspects of safety assessment of genetically modified foods of plant origin and responded to five specific questions raised by the First Session of the Task Force (1). The second Consultation held in Rome in January 2001 specifically addressed the allergenicity of foods derived from biotechnology (2).

At the 24th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission held in July 2001, it was decided that the Task Force expand its work in starting the work on drafting a Proposed Draft Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Modified Microorganisms in Food and established a new Working Group to prepare a draft document on this. The FAO and WHO at that time announced that they would jointly convene a third joint Consultation to consider the scientific aspects of the safety assessment of genetically modified microorganisms in foods in support of this new work.

The FAO and WHO convened this Consultation to evaluate the build on experience gained since the previous two FAO/WHO Consultations and to assess whether cur-

rently available approaches for assessing the safety of foods and food ingredients derived from genetically modified plants could be applied to GMMs. The Consultation examines unique aspects to be considered in the safety assessment of foods produced with the aid of GMMs.

The safety and risk assessment of foods, including genetically modified foods, are generally considered within a framework of risk analysis. Within this framework, reference can be made to the use of precaution in risk management and risk assessment. Ongoing discussions within the Codex system will help guide these considerations further.

SCOPE

The Consultation was convened to consider criteria for the safety assessment of food derived from microorganisms that have been genetically modified using recombinant DNA techniques. Specifically, the Consultation was requested to provide the FAO, WHO and their Member Countries with scientific advice in relation to the safety assessment of GMMs in food.

The Consultation agreed to the following definitions for its purposes.

“Genetically modified microorganisms” (GMMs) means:

Bacteria, yeasts or filamentous fungi in which the genetic material has been changed through modern biotechnology in a way that does not occur naturally by multiplication and/or natural recombination.

“Modern biotechnology”* means the application of:

- *In vitro* nucleic acid techniques†, including recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) and direct injection of nucleic acid into cells or organelles, or
- Fusion of cells‡ beyond the taxonomic family that overcome natural physiological, reproductive or recombination barriers and that are not techniques used in traditional breeding and selection.

The Consultation agreed to confine its discussion to food produced with the aid of GMMs, namely:

- Foods and food ingredients consisting of or containing viable GMMs.

* This definition is based on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

† These include but are not limited to: recombinant DNA techniques that use vector systems and techniques involving the direct introduction into the organism of hereditary materials prepared outside the organism such as microinjection, macroinjection, chemoporation, electroporation, microencapsulation and liposome fusion.

‡ Including protoplast fusion and hybridization.

- Foods and food ingredients consisting of or containing non-viable GMMs.
- Foods and food ingredients produced by fermentation using GMMs and from which the GMM has been removed.

The Consultation did not consider highly purified products such as food additives, enzymes, polysaccharides, flavors etc. derived from GMMs. The Consultation noted that such purified food additives have been produced and permitted in a number of countries for over a decade (e.g. chymosin) and the safety of many has been assessed by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (3). However, the Consultation agreed that if viable GMMs and/or microbial components are present in such products, the general principles for the safety assessment of foods derived from GMMs outlined in this report could be applied.

The Consultation agreed that, although beyond its scope, the concepts and principles described in this report are equally applicable to all foods produced with the aid of microorganisms.

The report does not specifically address the presence of GMMs used for agricultural purposes such as microbial plant protection agents, feed additives, bio-fertilizers etc. that may find their way into food. However, the Consultation agreed that the general principles for the safety assessment of foods produced with the aid of GMMs could be applied in such cases.

The Consultation also recognized safety issues that exist in relation to the exposure of workers (occupational health) involved in the production of the food using GMMs but found that this issue was not within the scope of this Consultation.

The Consultation did not consider environmental safety issues related to the release of GMMs into the environment as these were outside its defined scope. Similarly, it did not consider socioeconomics, risk management and public perception issues.

As a background to its discussions, the Consultation received papers and/or presentations on:

1. General consideration of the safety assessment of GMMs in foods, including:
 - Use of living microorganisms in food and perspectives on the application of genetic modification in such microorganisms.
 - Methodologies available for the safety assessment of the GMMs.
 - Conventional safety assessment methodologies used for foods derived from biotechnology including foods of plant origin.
 - Issues specific to foods produced with the aid of GMMs.
2. Other specific topics arising in relation to the safety assessment of GMMs in food, including:

- Gene transfer.
- Genetic familiarity and stability of microorganisms.
- Colonization and persistence of microorganisms in the gut and their impact on the gut ecosystem with special reference to effects on human health.
- Genetic basis of pathogenicity of microorganisms and its possible change by genetic modification.
- Nutritional and toxicological aspects of bacterial or fungal metabolites and their possible alteration by genetic modification.
- The allergenicity of microorganisms and its potential for induction or change by genetic modification.
- Survival/propagation of microorganisms, including GMMs, in the environment and the implications to public health.

A list of agenda items and documents is given in Appendix 2.

SAFETY ASSESSMENT

General approach to safety evaluation

Roughly one-quarter of food production involves microbial fermentation processes. This includes foods such as bread, sour dough, sour milk and cream, yogurt, cheese, sour vegetables, fermented meat, vinegar, wine and beer. Fermentation provides a simple technique to produce food of high nutritional and hygienic quality. This technology has a long history of food use and is especially important in developing countries. The influence of microorganisms is thus of great importance for the safety and nutritional status of food. The introduction of foods produced with the aid of GMMs into the food supply brings potentially new issues of food safety. This section outlines general principles for the safety assessment of GMMs in food with reference to the established principles applied to the safety assessment of genetically modified plants and food safety issues specific to the nature and use of microorganisms in food.

Several international organizations have already addressed the issues associated with the safety assessment of novel foods including genetically modified plants and microorganisms (4–9). It is generally agreed that such an assessment requires an integrated and stepwise, case-by-case approach using the concept of *substantial equivalence* (see ‘Application of the concept of *substantial equivalence* to GMMs’) that is directed by the results of a comparison between the genetically modified plant or microorganism and its conventional counterpart. The FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Safety Aspects of Genetically Modified Foods of Plant Origin (1) provides important recommendations on the use of *substantial equivalence* as a concept to guide the further safety assessment process. Some authorities have developed decision trees to assist in determining the extent of testing required in specific cases (9–11).

The following general principles are important to consider in the safety evaluation of food produced from GMMs:

- The safety assessment should address the health aspects for the whole population, including immuno-compromised individuals, infants and the elderly.
- The safety assessment should be based on sound scientific data and should use the most appropriate safety assessment methods. If new information becomes available, the safety assessment may need to be revised.
- The safety assessment should involve the characterization of the genetic modification, including deletion or insertion of DNA sequences, characterization of recipient microorganisms, the ultimate donor organism, the vector(s) used in the construction of the GMM, the construct and the GMM itself.

Other important considerations in the safety assessment of food produced with the aid of GMMs include:

- Information on the direct and indirect exposure§ of humans to the food or to the GMM itself. This should also consider the potential level of intake and dietary impact of the GMM.
- Possible secondary effects from expression of the inserted gene or the disruption of host DNA or metabolic pathways, including composition of critical macro- and micronutrients, antinutrients, endogenous toxicants, allergens, and physiologically active substances.
- The inherent differences between microbes and plants and the influence of the food matrix on the GMM should be taken into consideration when applying the concept of *substantial equivalence* (discussed in 'Application of the concept of *substantial equivalence* to GMMS').

In addition, the following elements should be taken into account in the safety assessment. This list is not exhaustive and, in some cases, not all elements mentioned are relevant.

- Techniques used for genetic modification.
- Strain identification and characterization (recipient, donor [if appropriate] and the GMM itself).
- Natural habitat.
- History of use.
- Gene transfer.
- Genetic stability.
- Pathogenic potential.
- Characterization and verification of the expected protein expression product of the novel DNA.

- Composition of the food containing the GMM.
- Safety and nutritional assessment (including potential toxicity and nutritional aspects).
- Interactions between the GMM, the gastrointestinal flora and the mammalian host.
- Impact on the immune system.
- Effects of processing, cooking and storage.

Aspects specific to microorganisms

The genetic modification of microorganisms involves similar recombinant DNA techniques to those used in the production of GM plants. However, there are distinct genetic characteristics of microorganisms that require specific aspects of their safety to be addressed. Microorganisms that are used in food production include gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria, yeasts and filamentous fungi. The genome structures and the available genetic technologies differ for bacteria, yeasts and filamentous fungi, although some common techniques are used.

The ready exploitation of homologous recombination in bacteria is a major advantage that facilitates good control over genetic modification procedures. Integration sites can be used by design and unwanted DNA can be removed with relative ease. Systems for the selection and maintenance of introduced DNA can be designed using homologous genes and selection methods developed that are compatible with safe food use.

Microbial genomes are relatively small and several bacterial genomes and some yeast genomes have been sequenced including that of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. The acquisition of the complete genome sequence for a particular bacterial species is now a realizable scientific objective. The availability of such genome sequence data greatly enhances the knowledge base that is available to support safety evaluation. Post-genomic analytical techniques provide a valuable opportunity to analyze gene expression at the level of the entire genome. DNA microarray technology involves the use of nucleic acid probes for all the genes in the genome. This can be used to compare the presence of individual genes in different strains and gene expression in different strains and different environments. Proteomics separates proteins isolated from the whole cell using two-dimensional gel electrophoresis and allows comparisons to be made between strains and different environments. Individual proteins can be identified using mass spectrometry to relate separated protein spots to specific genes.

Microorganisms used in food may remain viable during food production and following their consumption. For this reason, they have a potential to interact with the consumer both directly and indirectly. It is important to ensure that the recipient microorganisms are not pathogenic, toxigenic or allergenic and that the genetic modification does nothing to compromise this status. Also, the fate of consumed

§ Direct exposure refers to GMMs used in food production, processing or consumed as such while indirect exposure refers to exposure encountered through the application of GMMs elsewhere in the food chain (e.g. animal feeds).

GMM and its impact on both the gastro-intestinal (GI) tract and its microflora need to be considered.

Application of the concept of substantial equivalence to GMMs

The concept of *substantial equivalence* was developed by the WHO, OECD and FAO following recognition of the limitations of conventional toxicology for the safety evaluation of novel foods. Quoting the OECD publication (1993), the concept 'embodies the idea that existing organisms used as food or as a source of food can be used as the basis for comparison when assessing the safety of human consumption of a food or food component that has been modified or is new'.

The FAO/WHO report on 'Safety aspects of genetically modified food of plant origin' (2000) addressed criticism of the application of the concept of *substantial equivalence* and reaffirmed its usefulness. It emphasized that the determination of *substantial equivalence* is not in itself an end-point but rather the starting point for safety evaluation.

The concept of *substantial equivalence* is also of value for the safety assessment of GMMs. Microbial genomes have natural genetic plasticity and this may become apparent in foods or during food processing and where complex communities are involved. In addition, the gene expression of a microorganism is expected to vary according to its environment. This is especially pertinent for safety assessment where a variety of data might be gathered under *in vitro* laboratory conditions, in a food matrix, or in the GI tract following consumption. These constraints suggest that the concept of *substantial equivalence* should be applied both to the GMM itself and food produced with its aid. In applying this concept, it is important to remember that minor differences can separate pathogenic strains from non-pathogenic strains of microorganisms.

The FAO/WHO report (1) recognized the need to keep abreast of developments in genetic modification technology and noted that new methodologies, such as molecular profiling techniques, may provide a more detailed analytical comparison. The concept of *substantial equivalence* involves a targeted analysis of the composition and phenotype of the GMM compared with its conventional counterpart. Molecular profiling provides a non-targeted and more holistic approach to this analysis. Microorganisms are especially amenable to the use of DNA microarrays and proteomics. Metabolic profiling has advanced, using a range of analytical techniques, and it may be of special value in the assessment of GMMs where metabolic rerouting is the intended outcome. The major limitation of profiling is the need to accommodate the background of normal variation and the need to interpret the significance of any differences that are detected. Several steps must be taken before the

full potential of these techniques can be realized in routine safety assessments. First, the methodologies must be validated to ensure their reproducibility and robustness. Then, agreement must be reached in assessing their performance. That is, what is the range of differences in a given array or profile that will be considered as "normal variation". Any profile differences considered not to be within this normal variation must be evaluated from a safety perspective.

SPECIFIC FOOD SAFETY ISSUES

Introduction

This section deals with specific issues that are relevant to the safety of foods produced with the aid of GMMs. These issues include the potential of gene transfer between the GMM and other organisms found in food and the GI tract. Also, the safety of genetic markers used for selection (such as antimicrobial resistance genes), and the potential of GMM interaction with the intestinal microflora and the immune system are evaluated. The discussion that follows provides an appraisal of existing knowledge on these topics and suggests scientific approaches that may be used to assess possible health risks.

Techniques for genetic modification

In general, the techniques for genetic modification of microorganisms are better understood than in plants. For example, in bacteria, the inserted gene recombinant constructs can be integrated at specific sites on the chromosome or on plasmids. However, the techniques for genetic modification applied to GMMs remain an important safety consideration. The factors to be considered are discussed below.

Bacteria

Host. The host microorganism should have a history of safe consumption either as a food or as a food component or its safety must otherwise be established.

Inserted gene. The inserted gene(s) may be sourced from the same microbial species or from evolutionarily more distant organisms. The gene product or any inserted gene(s) should have a history of safe use in food or its safety should otherwise be established. The food safety evaluation will be facilitated by reducing to a minimum any extraneous DNA sequences.

Vector and construct. The DNA sequence of the whole vector should be characterized, including replicons, promoters, selective markers, linkers, and any foreign DNA, in case the vector is part of the GMM. It is recommended that vectors consisting only of nucleotide sequences from microorganisms with a history of safe use in food should be used. Any selectable markers should be carefully chosen and based on safe use, information on the sequence similarities and the protein function of

the selective marker should be available to assess any safety hazard. In particular, antimicrobial resistance markers should be avoided and should not be present in the final GMM. Several techniques are available to remove selectable markers in GMMs, such as sequence specific recombination.

Methods of DNA transfer to the host. Methods of transfer of DNA into microorganisms can involve physical, chemical or biological approaches. DNA transformation methods that minimize major genetic rearrangement in the host genome should be used. When the inserted gene is integrated into the genome, the nucleotide sequence of the flanking regions at the integration site of the chromosome should be characterized.

Yeast and filamentous fungi. Most methods of genetic manipulation for bacterial systems can also be applied to yeast and filamentous fungi used in food production, thus similar safety considerations as in bacteria should be applied. Specific cloning vectors (e.g. centromeric plasmids, yeast artificial chromosomes, plasmids based on killer factor determinants etc.) have also been constructed. Reliable methods are available in certain species for directed integration of *in vitro* modified or composed gene constructs into specific chromosomal sites and for deletion of genes. Transgenic constructs made by these methods are highly stable during vegetative propagation of cells. They can, however, recombine at mating with related strains of the native mycoflora. In species with less developed genetics, there is insufficient information available on the recombinant processes to precisely predict the mechanism and the site of integration of novel genes. For this reason, methods currently used for genetic manipulation of yeast and filamentous fungi may allow integration at variable sites, resulting in transgenic strains with variable biotechnological performance and genetic stability.

Strain identification and characterization

First and foremost, the host microorganism should be safe, well characterized and stable. The origin of the strain should be known. Proper state-of-art taxonomy should be applied to describe the strain. Although many genotypic and phenotypic methods exist, each with its own merits and limitations, the Consultation recognized the need for the host microbial strain to be adequately characterized from a scientific, manufacturing, and safety perspective. This currently includes DNA/DNA hybridization and 16S rRNA sequence the determination, which provide crucial information on taxonomic classification of the organism. Standard physiological/biochemical methods for phenotypic characterization are commercially available and are commonly used. Information on pathogenic traits within the host genus can also provide important guidance for the characterization.

Secondly, the GMM strain produced should be as safe as the host organism. The novel status of the GMM strain, including its phenotypic and genotypic characteristics, should be characterized in order to assess its safety. Existing molecular techniques provide precise tools for such characterization and for the comparison of microorganisms at species and strain level. Comparative assessment of the GMM strain with its host strain can be undertaken using approaches such as restriction analysis, random amplified polymorphic DNA analysis (RAPD-PCR), amplified fragment length polymorphism analysis (AFLP), protein profiling, etc. Further analysis can extend to genome sequencing.

Additionally, the effects of the genetic modification on the properties of the host organism, the desired stability of the genetic system, and the desired functional properties of the gene construct are important factors that should be considered in the GMM.

Gene transfer

Bacteria. Prokaryotic microorganisms have developed a variety of mechanisms by which they can transfer DNA to other cells. This can result in the transfer of heritable traits. These transfer mechanisms allow bacteria to respond to environmental changes by acquiring new genetic information that might provide a selective advantage under changed environmental conditions. An example would be the worldwide spread of antimicrobial resistance genes among microorganisms since the introduction of antimicrobial agents in human health care, veterinary medicine and agriculture. One mechanism of gene transfer, termed *conjugation*, relies on a plasmid (autonomously replicating DNA molecule) in the donor cell or the presence of conjugative transposons in the chromosome. These genetic elements direct cell-to-cell contact during which a copy of the plasmid or the transposon is transferred to the recipient cell. Various types of plasmids have been identified in bacteria and some of them can elicit the transfer of other plasmids that do not have capability for their own transfer (12).

In nature, bacterial populations and communities often contain considerable fractions of cells with plasmids, and several different plasmids may be present in the same cell. Plasmids and transposons may confer new properties to the cells. Conjugative gene transfer from bacteria to eukaryotic cells, including plant cells, yeast, filamentous fungi and animal cells, has been observed (in nature or in experimental systems).

Natural transformation is another gene transfer process that involves the active uptake of extracellular DNA by bacteria into their cytoplasm. This process has so far been identified in a limited number of bacteria belonging to major trophic and taxonomic groups (13). DNA uptake occurs mostly during a specific growth phase of

cells (*competence*). Both chromosomal DNA fragments and plasmids can be taken up. Under particular physical or chemical conditions, DNA may enter bacteria that do not actively take up DNA (a type of transformation often used in gene technology).

Finally, transfer of bacterial genes can also occur by *transduction*, wherein transfer is mediated by bacterial viruses that have incidentally packaged DNA of the last host cell instead of viral DNA (14).

Conjugative processes, transformations and transduction may occur within members of a species but also between members of different species and genera. Extensive studies, including whole genome sequence analyses, have indicated that horizontal gene transfers have strongly contributed to the genomic structure of bacterial species. Other studies provide evidence that various gene transfer mechanisms are active in natural habitats of bacteria including soil, sediment, river epilithon, rhizosphere, phylloplane, foodstuffs, intestine, mammalian oral cavity (15–18).

DNA transferred to a new host cell may establish by genomic integration (e.g. homologous recombination; (19)) or by plasmid formation (e.g. when an origin of replication is present). Establishment may be inhibited, for example, by lack of nucleotide sequence homology or the presence of restriction endonucleases (17, 20). When the new genetic information provides a selective advantage to the cell, the trait may become fixed in the population when selection pressure prevails long enough. Gene transfer processes must be considered as part of the nature of prokaryotic organisms (21). Clearly, the spread of a gene or a gene assembly, as well as the formation of new gene assemblies, in the microbial community is mainly driven by the selection pressure in the habitat (22).

In order to reduce the potential for the spread of a recombinant construct, its chromosomal integration may be preferable to localization on a plasmid. To limit the selection of bacterial strains coexisting with the GMM into which the recombinant construct has been unintentionally transferred, genes in the construct that could provide a selective advantage under certain conditions should be avoided (e.g. antimicrobial resistance determinants). Finally, to limit the chance of unintended integration into other genomes, any sequences that would stimulate such integration should be avoided in the construct.

Yeast and filamentous fungi. Due to the more complex structure of the eukaryotic microorganisms, the processes for gene transfer in yeast and filamentous fungi are different than bacteria. Natural cell-hybridization and genetic recombination occur frequently in species that have sexual (mating, meiosis and sporulation) or parasexual

(anastomosis, nuclear fusion and haploidization by gradual loss of chromosomes) life cycles. In certain genera, interspecific hybridization can also occur between closely related species.

Synthetic gene transfer from yeast to mammalian cells has also been successfully demonstrated using yeast artificial chromosomes (YACs) which have significant potential as gene therapy vectors (23, 24).

Genetic stability

The chromosomes of microorganisms are generally much more fluid than the chromosomes of higher eukaryotes. They grow faster and are required to adapt rapidly to changing environments. They are consequently more prone to genetic change than higher organisms. In bacteria, various mechanisms of horizontal gene transfer have been identified and are frequently seen. Further, mobile genetic elements are actively involved in reorganization of the genetic material of bacteria, and this may result in new phenotypic properties, gene inactivation, destabilization of the integrity of the genetic material, and gene loss. Mobile DNA elements include insertion sequences (IS), transposons, plasmids and prophages. Many bacteria have large numbers and different types of IS elements and some of these are very active in transposition. Such genetic changes often happen in a non-random way and may include participation of specific DNA sequences.

Genomes of certain yeasts and filamentous fungi are also prone to undergoing rearrangements. These changes take place during cultivation and are probably due to spontaneous transpositions of mobile elements (e.g. Ty retrotransposons) and chromosomal segments (manifested in chromosomal length polymorphism).

The genetic plasticity of microorganisms (25–27) may influence the fate of the recombinant DNA in GMM and, therefore, this has to be taken into consideration when the stability of a GMM is evaluated.

The genetic stability of the recombinant DNA molecule is also dependent on the localization of the cloned gene(s), whether it is on the chromosome or on a plasmid. Plasmids can be lost by segregation or integrated into the chromosome or other plasmids. If the vector system is chosen carefully, one will expect that in either of the two cases—high copy number vector and chromosomally integrated insert DNA—the stability of the new genetic information will follow basic biological mechanisms and the stability of the transferred genes should be comparable with that of host genes. If high stability is required, one should not include DNA sequences that may represent a risk for stability, sites for known transposons and IS element insertions, or attachment sites for temperate phages.

Pathogenic potential

Microorganisms used for the production of fermented food (e.g. acetic, propionic, and lactic acid bacteria, yeasts and certain filamentous fungi) have a long history of safe use. Although some enteric lactic acid bacteria have, in rare instances, been identified as the cause of bacteremia or endocarditis in patients with severe underlying disease, they can be no means be regarded as food-borne pathogens (28).

Food-borne pathogens are either invasive and/or toxigenic in the food or in the human intestine. Opportunistic pathogens in food may not be hazardous for the healthy consumer, but may pose a threat to some health-compromised persons. The genomes of many of the important food-borne pathogens and of some opportunistic pathogens have been fully sequenced, and the genes responsible for pathogenicity traits have been identified (29, 30). This opens the way to identify similar genetic information in the genomes of microorganisms used in food fermentation. Of the several genomes of microorganisms used in food fermentation that have been completely sequenced, two examples (*S. cerevisiae* and *Lactococcus lactis*) have been published and reported to be free of known pathogenicity traits. If strains of species known to carry potential toxin genes are subjected to genetic modification, they must not carry such genetic information.

The long history of safe use and the available genetic evidence suggest that the genetic background of the majority of microorganisms used for food fermentation is free from pathogenicity islands and other pathogenicity determinants.

In addition to this, the following need to be considered:

- The genetic modification could produce a metabolic imbalance that may enhance the level of common metabolites that are normally not toxicologically significant in food to levels that are unacceptable (e.g. formic acid, acetaldehyde, biogenic amines in lactic acid bacteria or yeast; cyclopiazonic acid or roquefortin in *Penicillium camemberti/roqueforti*).
- The genetic modification could switch on genes coding for normally unexpressed toxins in the microorganism.
- The genetic modification (i.e. the expression of new protein(s)) could change the ‘cross-talk’ between the microbe and the intestinal immune system of the consumer leading, for example, to an undesirable immune reaction or undesirable reactions with other cells (e.g. enterocytes) of the GI tract.

The first and second of these points may be addressed with *in vitro* studies. The third point may need to be addressed by *in vivo* studies in suitable animal models or human volunteers. If required, such studies will need to be carried out in accordance with good practice guidelines and ethical standards.

Safety and nutritional assessment

As highlighted in ‘Application of the concept of *substantial equivalence* to GMMs’, the assessment of the safety and nutritional aspects of GMMs should take into consideration the outcome of comparisons according to the concept of *substantial equivalence*. When deemed appropriate, animal studies may be used to evaluate the safety of GMMs where the recipient organism, donor organism or gene or gene product do not have a history of safe use in food. However, as previously noted, animal studies have both strengths and weaknesses (1). While animal studies may be useful for identifying potential hazards in food produced with the aid of GMMs, and in certain cases to establish dose–response relationships, the major limitation is that the response in the animal has to be correlated with that in humans. Often, differences in the anatomy and physiology of animals and humans lead to substantial differences in dose relationships between the two and this needs to be taken into consideration in the interpretation and assessment of the relevance of animal studies on food produced with the aid of GMMs. In general, the need to use experimental animals should be carefully evaluated, taking into consideration the potential to obtain meaningful information, as well as data from other relevant test method alternatives.

The safety of GMMs intended for use in food should be evaluated in terms of the food matrix in which they are consumed and this raises issues regarding the safety assessment of whole foods using animal safety studies. Guidance regarding the role of animal studies in assessing the safety of whole food products has been provided by previous consultations (1, 4). Further advice concerning the role of animal studies in the safety assessment of whole foods has been given by the Scientific Committee for Food (9) and the UK ACNFP (10, 31).

In the use of animal studies, it is important that the experimental design addresses the specific safety issue under investigation. The following considerations (*inter alia*) should be taken into account when designing animal feeding studies:

- The use of appropriate and relevant control groups.
- Dose to be administered.
- Endpoints to be measured (for example the impact on the microflora and the GI tract).
- Statistical power.
- Duration of the test.
- Rigorous control of confounding factors.

Previous recommendations with regard to animal testing are not specific for GMMs and it is, therefore, recommended that guidelines be established to assess when and what kinds of animal studies are appropriate for testing GMMs.

Interactions between the GMM, the intestinal flora and the mammalian host

Throughout adult life, the human gastrointestinal (GI) tract is populated by a huge number (up to 10^{14}) of live microorganisms, outnumbering the number of somatic cells by 1–2 orders of magnitude. The exact composition of the flora, estimated to consist of at least 400 species, is poorly known, as the majority of species cannot be routinely analyzed by commonly used cultivation methods or molecular biology techniques. The flora fluctuates qualitatively and quantitatively from the oral cavity (dominated by lactic acid bacteria, streptococci and certain anaerobic species), to the stomach (transient acid-tolerant organisms), to the small intestine (with a transition to colon-like flora), to the colon where bacterial densities up to 10^{12} per g dry weight are reached. The colonic microflora is dominated by anaerobes like *Bifidobacterium*, *Eubacterium*, and *Clostridium*, while the counts of microaerophilic microorganisms and facultative anaerobes such as Lactobacilli, Enterococci and coliforms usually are 3–4 orders of magnitude lower (32, 33). Throughout the GI tract, the endogenous microflora represents the main barrier against exogenous microbes (colonization resistance (34)).

At any time after birth, the qualitative and quantitative composition of GI microflora depends on previous and ongoing exposure to and interactions with environmental factors (diet, antimicrobial therapy, disinfectants, food additives, occupation, climate, etc.), factors associated with the mammalian host (age, gender, intestinal motility, transit time, pH, bile acids defensins, etc.), and factors associated with flora itself (competition for nutrients, oxygen, H^+ acceptors/receptors, production of antimicrobials, organic acids, NH_3 , H_2S , etc.). The relative importance of these factors in the formation of GI ecosystems(s) has not yet been elucidated.

The GI flora may interfere with various mammalian host-associated structures and functions in a compartmentalized way and at an organ, cell, and molecular level (35–37). Some important interactions include:

- Role of enterocytic mitosis.
- Intestinal motility.
- Development of gut-associated immune system (GALT).
- Interference with enterohepatic circulation.
- Production of organic acids, nucleotides etc.
- Prokaryotic–eukaryotic cross-talk at the cellular level.

The relative importance of these interactions may vary according to the age and health status of the individual. The ability of an exogenous microbe (including a GMM) to survive in the GI tract depends on its ability to tolerate and adapt to the various microflora and host-associated factors mentioned above (survival being defined as the

detection of a microorganism for a limited period to time where the growth rate is lower than the rate of elimination (38)). In relation to colonization resistance, other strain-specific properties necessary for survival are not very well understood (39). The strain may even leave the gut lumen and end up elsewhere by mechanisms usually termed translocation. Consequently, simple *in vitro* trials are not sufficient to predict the intestinal survival and suitable animal models, simulated human GI systems, and human trials may be required. Reliable strain identification is also essential for these studies.

A GMM that survives ingestion may only be a transient passenger or may establish itself for a variable time in the GI system. Colonization has been defined as the detection of a microorganism for a relevant period of time at a constant level (38).

While a permanent, life-long colonization of an adult by an exogenous microorganism is apparently a rare event, experiences with certain probiotic strains have shown that strains can be recovered in the feces and colonic mucosa for weeks after discontinuation of oral administration (40). The term ‘persistence’ has been introduced to describe the survival of a microorganism in the GI tract for longer than two intestinal transit times (11).

Whether the GMM is established in the GI tract or not, the possibility remains that it might influence the microflora or the mammalian host. The effects on the flora might partly depend on the functions expressed by the GMM (phenotypic expression), and potentially on horizontal gene transfer. The influences on the host can be direct or indirect. A direct effect can take place on all structures and functions listed previously, and indirect effects can be mediated through interference with the active part of endogenous flora. Even non-viable microorganisms are known to retain functional properties (i.e. cell adhesion, binding of chemicals, immunomodulating activities), which can have direct or indirect on both microflora- and host-associated functions (reviewed by (41)). Additional liberation of biologically active compounds (toxins, enzymes, etc.) may take place.

Conjugative transfer between microorganisms in the gut is known to occur. It is reasonable to assume that its probability depends both on the relatedness of the GMM to the intestinal microflora and on its residence time in the GI tract, this being more likely with a persistent or colonizing strain than with a transient strain. The possibility of transfer of DNA from lysed GMMs should not be overlooked, since bacterial transformation in the human oral cavity has been demonstrated (18). Furthermore, the work of Schubbert et al. (42) indicated measurable persistence of DNA in the intestinal tract, and studies on the fate of DNA from food in the mammalian GI tract showed that plant and recombinant DNA could enter the blood stream, tissue cells and even nuclei (42–44).

Exposure

The degree of intake of food GMMs needs to be considered in the pre-market safety evaluation and for monitoring any impact in the food chain.

The following factors should be considered when assessing exposure to such food GMMs:

- The food matrices in which the GMM or components thereof are consumed.
- Whether the exposure is to viable or non-viable GMMs, genes or gene products.
- The dose and duration of exposure (in assessing the potential hazard).
- Exposure should be assessed within the entire population, taking into consideration special population groups (e.g. immune-deficient individuals, children and the elderly) and different geographical regions.
- Exposure to GMMs and their components during their production and preparation in the food chain.

As GMMs gain use in the food supply, consideration needs to be given to methods that measure the potential effects of exposure on the general population. The issues relating to conducting health surveillance for genetically modified foods have been dealt with by a previous Consultation who found that: "The change in nutrient levels in a particular crop plant may impact on overall dietary intake. In such cases, it is important to determine alterations in nutrient content and bio-availability, and their stability with time, processing and storage, as well as to monitor changes in dietary patterns as a result of the introduction of the genetically modified food and evaluate its potential effect on nutritional and health status of consumers. However, an assessment of the impact on nutritional status of consumers is important for all significant dietary changes and not specific to the introduction of genetically modified foods" (1).

As noted by a previous Consultation (2), very little is known about the potential long-term health effect of any food and this situation is compounded by the wide genetic variability in human populations. Given the complexity of monitoring the effects of human exposure to food produced with the aids of GMMs, it is recognized that it would be difficult to identify any effects against the background of conventional foods, unless studies were designed to answer very specific questions. Nevertheless, it is also recognized that it is important to develop methods to monitor (trace) exposure to GMMs.

Impact on the immune system

To assess the immune-modulating potential of a transgene in a GMM, a case-by-case consideration is recommended. A separate Consultation dealing with allergenicity in terms of genetically modified organisms has already made several recommendations in this regard (2).

It must be noted that interactions of gut microflora with the immune system occur. Gut-associated lymphoid tissue (GALT) has important interactions with the immune system and it is well established that microbial stimuli are the main antigenic forces in the development and maintenance of GALT and acquired immunity. It should be emphasized that GMMs, in contrast to food derived from GM plants, may establish themselves within the GI tract, thereby prolonging potential immune-modulating effects.

CONCLUSIONS

- (i) The Consultation agreed that the safety assessment of GMMs should proceed on a case-by-case basis aided by a series of well-defined questions. The Consultation confirmed that a comparative approach, using the concept of *substantial equivalence*, provided a practical means of identifying similarities and differences between food produced with the aid of GMMs and their appropriate comparators. These differences would then be the focus of the safety evaluation.
- (ii) The Consultation noted that there are intrinsic properties of microorganisms that require special consideration in the application of the concept of *substantial equivalence*. In particular, it noted that the food matrix in which GMMs may be consumed could influence its safety, thus the impact of the food matrix needs to be considered. It may, therefore, be necessary to apply the concept of *substantial equivalence* both to the GMM and to the food produced with the aids of GMMs. In doing this, it may be necessary to examine additional parameters such as pathogenicity and persistence in the mammalian host GI tract.
- (iii) The Consultation noted that the potential range of GMMs in food included viable and non-viable microorganisms that may be consumed as such or may be integral components of foods. The Consultation noted that because of the wide range of products involved, the safety assessment needed to take into consideration the specific uses and exposures to the GMM being considered.
- (iv) The Consultation noted that the use of microorganisms in food production is of great importance to the nutritional quality and safety of the food supply. Therefore, the evaluation of GMMs should encompass both safety and nutritional aspects.
- (v) The Consultation noted that microorganisms in the GI tract exert important effects on the immune system. While previous recommendations (2) relating to the allergenicity of new proteins expressed in GM plants can be used in the safety assessment of foods produced with the aids of GMMs, it must be noted that the possible effect of GMMs or their com-

ponents on the immune system in the mammalian host requires additional consideration.

- (vi) The Consultation noted that genetic material from food has the potential to transfer to gut microflora and to cells of the mammalian host *in vivo*. The safety concerns of such gene transfer need careful evaluation based on the properties of the GMM and its components.
- (vii) The Consultation concluded that in developing a GMM for use in food production, vectors should be used which consist only of nucleotide sequences from microorganisms with a history of safe use in food. Any selectable markers should be carefully chosen and based on safe use. In particular, antimicrobial resistance marker genes should be avoided and not be present in the final GMM.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) It is recognized that the complex ecosystem of the human gastrointestinal tract is subject to increasing and successful analysis. It is recommended that this analysis should be enhanced, including examination of the ecological components of the GI tract, the prevailing selective conditions, and the effect of nutritional conditions and host factors on the interactions. These studies would provide the basis for improved risk assessment.
- (ii) While a permanent life-long colonization of an adult by an exogenous microbe is apparently a rare event, strains can be recovered from the intestinal tract for weeks after the discontinuation of exposure through food. Whether a GMM is established in the GI tract or not, the possibility remains that it might influence the microflora and/or the mammalian host. The effects on the flora might relate to functions expressed or to horizontal gene transfer. There is a need to improve the methods for evaluating the function of microorganisms in the GI tract.
- (iii) Fermentation provides a simple technique to produce food of high nutritional and hygienic quality. This technology is used globally and is especially important in developing countries. The continued improvement of such technologies could involve the use of GMMs. The Consultation recommended that the FAO/WHO promote capacity-building efforts to support the needs of developing countries in improving and evaluating this technology.
- (iv) The Consultation recognized the need for efficient communication of issues related to the development and safety evaluation of GMM food. Specific communication of the principles guiding the safety assessment to the public etc. would enable efficient interaction and transparency in the evaluation process. The Consultation recommended that the FAO/WHO coordinate the efforts to achieve this.
- (v) The Consultation noted that specific methodologies are available which enhance the safety of GMMs through an improved understanding of the biology of microorganisms. New technologies are developing rapidly with a potential to enhance the safety evaluation of GMMs, especially bacteria. These are described within the report and include molecular profiling. The Consultation encourages further development and validation of such methods.
- (vi) The Consultation identified a number of aspects that it recommends should be taken into account in assessing the safety of food produced with the aid of GMMs. Details of these are given in the body of the report and include:
 - application of the concept of *substantial equivalence* to the GMM and foods produced from the GMM;
 - consideration of the techniques used for the development of the GMM—especially the history of safe use of host microorganisms and also of the microorganisms from which inserted gene(s) and vector(s) are derived—and avoidance of the use of antimicrobial resistance marker genes;
 - strain identification and characterization;
 - transfer of genetic material from the food to the gut microflora and mammalian host cells;
 - genetic stability of the GMM;
 - pathogenic potential of the GMM;
 - impact of the GMM on the human immune system; and
 - human exposure to the GMM and the effects of food processing, production and storage.

REFERENCES

1. FAO/WHO. Safety aspects of genetically modified of plant origin. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2000.
2. FAO/WHO. Evaluation of the allergenicity of genetically modified foods. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2001.
3. JECFA, Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. FAO Food and Nutrition Papers 52 Addendums 1–8. 1999.
4. FAO/WHO. Strategies for assessing the safety of foods produced by biotechnology. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1991.
5. OECD. Safety evaluation of foods derived by modern biotechnology: concepts and principles. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1993.
6. WHO. Application of the principle of substantial equivalence to the safety evaluation of foods for food components from plants derived by modern biotechnology. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1995.
7. FAO/WHO. Biotechnology and food safety. FAO Food

- and Nutrition Paper 61. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 1996.
8. ILSI. The safety assessment of novel foods. Brussels: International Life Sciences Institute, Europe, 1995.
 9. Commission of the European Communities, Commission recommendation of 29 July 1997 concerning the scientific aspects and presentation of information necessary to support applications for the placing on the market of novel foods and novel food ingredients and the preparation of initial assessment reports under regulation (EC) No 258/97 of the European Parliament and of the Council; Official Journal of the European Communities L253/1–36, 1997.
 10. UK ACNFP. Structured approach to safety assessment of novel foods and processes. Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes, Annual Report for 1994. London: Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food, 1995.
 11. ILSI. The safety assessment of viable genetically modified microorganism used as food. Brussels: International Life Sciences Institute, Europe, 1999.
 12. Clewell DB. Bacterial Conjugation. New York: Plenum Publishing Press, 1993.
 13. Lorenz MG, Wackernagel W. Bacterial gene transfer by natural genetic transformation in the environment. *Microbiol Rev* 1994; 58: 563–602.
 14. Masters M. Generalised transduction. In: Neidhart FC, ed. *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella*. Washington, DC: ASM Press, 1996: 2421–41.
 15. Lorenz MG, Wackernagel W. Bacterial gene transfer in the environment. In: Wöhrmann W, Tomiuk J, eds. *Transgenic Organisms, Risk Assessment of Deliberate Release*. Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser, 1993: 43–64.
 16. Bräutigam M, Hertel C, Hammes WP. Evidence for natural transformation of *Bacillus subtilis* in foodstuffs. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 1997; 155: 93–8.
 17. Davison J. Genetic exchange between bacteria in the environment. *Plasmid* 1999; 42: 73–91.
 18. Mercer D, Scott K, Melville C, Glover A, Flint H. Transformation of a oral bacterium via chromosomal integration of free DNA in the presence of human saliva. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2001; 200: 163–7.
 19. de Vries J, Meier P, Wackernagel W. The natural transformation of the soil bacteria *Pseudomonas stutzeri* and *Acinetobacter* sp. by transgenic plant DNA strictly depends on homologous sequences in recipient cells. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2001; 195: 211–5.
 20. Majewski J. Sexual isolation in bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 2001; 199: 161–9.
 21. Syvanen M, Kado CI. Horizontal Gene Transfer. London: Chapman and Hall, 1998.
 22. Lawrence J, Roth J. Roles of horizontal gene transfer in bacterial evolution. In: Syvanen M, Kado CI, eds. *Horizontal gene transfer*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1998: 208–25.
 23. Giraldo P, Montoliu L. Size matters: use of YACs, BACs, and PACs in transgenic animals. *Trans Res* 2001; 10: 83–103.
 24. Fabb SA, Ragoussis J. Yeast artificial chromosome vectors. *Mol Cell Biol (Hum Dis Ser)* 1995; 5: 104–24.
 25. Stibitz S, Yang MS. Genomic plasticity in natural populations of *Bordetella pertussis*. *J Bacteriol* 1999; 181: 5512–5.
 26. Brunder W, Karch H. Genome plasticity in Enterobacteriaceae. *Int J Med Microbiol* 2000; 290 (2): 153–65.
 27. Le Bourgeois P, Daveran-Mingot ML, Ritzenthaler P. Genome plasticity among related *Lactococcus* strains: identification of genetic events associated with macrorestriction polymorphisms. *J Bacteriol* 2000; 182: 2481–91.
 28. Gasser F. Safety of lactic acid bacteria and their occurrence in human clinical infection. *Bull Inst Pasteur* 1994; 92: 45–67.
 29. Finlay BB, Cossart P. Exploitation of mammalian host cell functions by bacterial pathogens. *Science* 1997; 276: 718–25.
 30. Morschhauser J, Kohler G, Ziebuhr W, Blum-Oehler G, Dobrindt U, Hacker J. Evolution of microbial pathogens. *Phil Trans R Soc London* 2000; 355: 695–704.
 31. UK ACNFP. The role of toxicological studies in assessing the safety of novel foods for humans. Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes, Annual Report for 1998. London: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, 1999.
 32. Mikkelsaar M, Mändar R, Sepp E. Lactic acid microflora in the human microbial ecosystem and its development. In: Salminen S, von Wright A, eds. *Lactic Acid Bacteria: Microbiology and Functional Aspects*. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc, 1997: 279–342.
 33. Willis CL, Gibson GR. The natural microflora of humans. In: Robinson RK, Batt CA, Patel PD, eds. *Encyclopaedia of Food Microbiology*. London: Academic Press, 2000: 1351–5.
 34. Araneo BA, Cebra JJ, Beuth J, Fuller R, Heidt PJ, Midtvedt T, Nord CE, Nieuwenhuis P, Manson WL, Pulverer G, Rusch VC, Tanala R, van der Waaij D, Walker RI, Wells CL. Problems and priorities for controlling opportunistic pathogens with new antimicrobial strategies: an overview of current literature. *Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie* 1996; 283: 431–65.
 35. Falk PG, Hooper LV, Midtvedt T, Gordon JI. Creating and maintaining the gastrointestinal ecosystem: what we know and need to know from gnotobiology. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 1998; 62: 1157–70.
 36. Midtvedt T. Microbial functional activities. In: Hansson LAA, Yolken RH, eds. *Probiotics, Other Nutritional Factors, and Intestinal Microflora*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott-Raven Publisher, 1999: 79–96.
 37. Moreau MC, Gaboriau-Ruthiau V. Influence of resident intestinal microflora on the development and functions of the gut-associated lymphoid tissue. *Microb Ecol Health Dis* 2001; 13: 65–86.
 38. Benbadis L, Cohen PS, Contrepoint M, Conway P, Duval-Flah Y, Gasson MJ, Blix, Gundersen W, Hentges DJ, Jacobsen BL, Klemm P, Krivan H, Krogfeldt KA, Lintermanns P, Nielsen Møller E, Norin E, Schlundt J, Saadbye P, Vuust J. Microbial colonisation of the body. *Microbiol Ecol Health Dis* 1995; 8 (Suppl 1):S33–S34.
 39. Cesena C, Morelli L, Alander M, Siljander T, Tuomola E, Salminen S, Mattila-Sandholm T, Vilpponen-Salmela T, von Wright A. *Lactobacillus crispatus* and its nonaggregating mutant in human colonisation trials. *J Dairy Sci* 2001; 84: 1001–10.
 40. von Wright A, Salminen S. Probiotics: established facts and open questions. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1999; 11: 1195–8.
 41. Ouwehand A, Salminen S. The health effects of cultured milk products with viable and non-viable bacteria. *Int Dairy J* 1998; 8: 749–58.
 42. Schubbert R, Renz D, Schmidt B, Dorfler W. Foreign (M13) DNA ingested by mice reaches peripheral leukocytes, spleen and liver via the intestinal wall mucosa and can be covalently linked to mouse DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1997; 94: 961–6.

43. Einspanier R, Klotz A, Kraft J, Aulrich K, Poser R, Schwägele F, Jahreis G, Flachowsky G. The fate of forage plant DNA in farm animals: a collaborative case-study investigating cattle and chicken fed recombinant plant material. *Eur Food Res Technol* 2001; 212: 129–34.
44. Hohlweg U, Doerfler W. On the fate of plant or other foreign genes upon the uptake of food or after intramuscular injection in mice. *Mol Genet Genomics* 2001; 265: 225–33.

APPENDIX 1: List of participants

Experts

****Dr Thomas A. Cebula**, Division of Molecular Biology (HFS-234), Office of Applied Research & Safety Assessment, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Food and Drug Administration, 200 C Street, S.W., Washington DC 20204, USA. Tel.: +1-202-205-4217; fax: +1-202-401-1105, E-mail: tac@cfsan.fda.gov

Associate Professor Dr G. Candan Gürakan (Gültekin), Food Engineering Department Middle East Technical University, 06531 Ankara, Turkey. Tel.: +90-312-2105642; fax: +90-312-2101270, E-mail: candan@metu.edu.tr

Dr Alexander G. Haslberger, Institute for Microbiology and Genetics; University of Vienna, Dr. Bohrgasse 9, A-1030 Vienna Austria. Fax: +43-17189470-1690, E-mail: hasil@via.at

Dr Mae-Wan Ho, Biology Department, Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, K7 6AA, UK. Tel.: +44-1908-274066; fax: +44-1908-653744, E-mail: ho_mae_wan@hotmail.com

Dr Shizunobu Igimi, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Department of Biomedical Food Research, Laboratory of Food Microbiology, 1-23-1, Toyama, Shinjuku-Ku, Tokyo 162-8640, Japan. Tel.: +81-3-5285-1111; fax: +81-3-5285-1176, E-mail: igimi@nih.go.jp

Dr Agustín López Munguía, Instituto de Biotecnología-UNAM (IBT/UNANM), Apartado Postal 510-3, Cuernavaca, Morelos, 62271 Mexico. Tel.: +52-5-622-7637; fax: +52-7-317-2388/2399, E-mail: agustin@ibt.unam.mx

Dr Bodil Lund Jacobsen, Institute of Food Safety and Toxicology, Division of Microbial Safety, Danish Veterinary and Food Administration, Mørkhøj Bygade 19, 2860 Søborg, Denmark. Tel.: +45-33-95-6186; fax: +45-33-95-6698, E-mail: bbj@fdir.dk

Dr Charles F. Mugoya, Uganda National Council for Science and Technology PO Box 6884, Kampala, Uganda. Tel.: +256-41-250499; fax: +256-41-234579, E-mail: bioearn@infocom.co.ug

Dr Ian Munro, Professor, Department of Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Canada. Tel.: +1-905-542-2900; fax: +1-905-542-1011, E-mail: imunro@cantox.com

Professor Ingolf F. Nes, Laboratory of Microbial Gene Technology, Department of Chemistry and Biotechnology, PO Box 5051, N-1432 ÅS, Norway. Tel.: +47-64-94-9471; fax: +47-64-94-1465, E-mail: ingolf.nes@ikb.nlh.no

Dr Son Radu, Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Food Science and Biotechnology, University Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. Tel.: +60-3-89486101x8361; fax: +60-3-89423552, E-mail: son@fsb.upm.edu.my

Professor Matthias Sipiczki, Department of Genetics, University of Debrecen, Egyetem-ter 1, PO Box 56, H-4010 Debrecen, Hungary. Tel.: +36-52-316-666; fax: +36-52-533-690, E-mail: lipovy@tigris.klte.hu

Dr Ruud Valyasevi, National Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, National Science and Technology Development Agency, 73/1 Rama 6 Road, Rajathevee, Bangkok 10400, Thailand. Tel.: +66-2-644-815090x507; fax: +66-2-644-8107, E-mail: valy@biotec.or.th

Dr Christopher Viljoen, GMO Testing Facility, Dept. of Botany and Genetics, University of the Free State, PO Box 339, Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa. Tel.: +27-51-401-2776; fax: +27-51-448-8772, E-mail: viljoecd@sci.uovs.ac.za

Dr Gun-Jo Woo, Director, Division of Food Microbiology & GMO, Korea Food & Drug Administration, 5 Nokbun-dong Eunpyung-gu, Seoul 122-704, Republic of Korea. Tel.: +82-2-380-1681, E-mail: gjwoo@kfda.go.kr

****Dr William Yan**, Head, Office of Food Biotechnology, Food Directorate, Health Canada, 4th Floor, Banting Research Center, Tunney's Pasture, A.L. 2204a1, Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0L2. Tel.: +1-613-941-5535; fax: +1-613-952-6400, E-mail: william_yan@hc-sc.gc.ca

****Participated by teleconference.**

Authors of Working Papers (FAO/WHO Advisers)

Dr Michael Teuber, ETH Institute of Food Science, ETH Zentrum, LFO G 18, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland. Tel.: +41-1-632-3333; fax: +41-1-632-1266, E-mail: teuber@ilw.agrl.ethz.ch (Topic 1)

Professor Dr Walter. P. Hammes, University of Hohenheim, Institute of Food Technology, Garbenstrasse 28, D-70599 Stuttgart, Germany. Tel.: +49-711-459-2305; fax: +49-711-459-4199, E-mail: hammeswp@uni-hohenheim.de (Topic 2a)

Dr Wilfried Wackernagel, University of Oldenburg, Institute of Genetics, PO Box 2503, D-26111 Oldenburg, Germany. Tel.: +49-441-798-3298; fax: +49-441-798-3250, E-mail: wilfried.wackernagel@uni-oldenburg.de (Topic 4)

Professor Tore Midtvedt, Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Karolinska Institute, SE-171 77 Stockholm, Sweden. Tel.: +46-8-728-6720; fax: +46-8-31-3918, E-mail: tore.midtvedt@cmb.ki.se (Topic 5b)

***Dr Eric Johnson**, Professor, Department of Food Microbiology & Toxicology, Food Research Institute, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 1925 Willow Drive, Madison, WI 53706–1187, USA. Tel.: +1-608-263-7944; fax: +1-608-263-1114, E-mail: eajohnso@facstaff.edu (Topic 7)

***Dr Gary Saylor**, Center for Environmental Biotechnology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1605, USA. Tel.: +1-865-974-8080; fax: +1-865-974-8086, E-mail: sayler@utk.edu (Topic 9)

Professor Michael Gasson, Department of Genetics and Microbiology, Institute of Food Research, Norwich Research Park, Colney, Norwich, NR4 7UA, UK. Tel.: +44-1603-255-248; fax: +44-1603-507-723, E-mail: mike.gasson@bbsrc.ac.uk (Topic 2b)

Professor Atte von Wright, University of Kuopio, PO Box 1627, FIN-70211, Kuopio Finland. Tel.: +358-17-162087; fax: +358-17-163322, E-mail: atte.vonwright@uku.fi (Topic 5a)

*These experts could not participate due to an unexpected incident but kindly submitted papers.

Observers

Dr Mitsuhiro Ushio, Head, Secretariat of the Codex Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology, 1-2-2 Kaumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8916, Japan. Tel.: +81-3-3595-2326; fax: +81-3-3503-7965, E-mail: ushio-mitsuhiro@mhlw.go.jp

Dr Anne Kackenzie, Chairperson of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 59 Camelot Drive, Nepean, Ont. K1A 0Y9, Canada. Tel.: +1-613-225-2342x4188; fax: +1-613-228-6638, E-mail: amackenzie@em.agr.ca

****Dr James Maryanski**, Office of Regulation and Policy, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Food and Administration (HFS-13), 200 C St., S.W., Washington, DC 20204, USA. Tel.: +1-202-205-4359; fax: +1-202-401-2893, E-mail: james.maryanski@cfsan.fda.gov

****Participated by teleconference**
Secretariat

Dr Jørgen Schlundt, Coordinator, Food Safety Program, WHO, Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland. Tel.: +41-22-791-3445; fax: +41-22-791-4807, E-mail: schlundtj@who.int

Dr Yoshiko Saito, Scientist, Food Safety Program, WHO, Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland. Tel.: +41-22-791-4324; fax: +41-22-791-4807, E-mail: saito@who.int

Dr Dennis Bittisnich, Scientist, Food Safety Program, WHO, Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland. Fax: +41-22-791-4807, E-mail: bittisnichd@who.int

Dr David Jonas, Temporary Adviser, WHO, Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland. E-mail: davidjonas1@compuserve.com

Dr Jean-Louis Jouve, Chief, Food Standard and Quality Service, Food and Nutrition Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla-00100, Rome, Italy. Tel.: +39-06-570-55858; fax: +39-06-570-54796, E-mail: jeanlouis.jouve@fao.org

Mr Yoshihide Endo, Food Standards Officer, Food and Nutrition Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla-00100, Rome, Italy. Tel.: +39-06-570-54796; fax: +39-06-570-54593, E-mail: yoshihide.endo@fao.org

APPENDIX 2: Agenda Items and List of Consultation Room Documents

Document No.	Agenda	Titles
Biotech 01A/01	Agenda Item 3	Provisional agenda and timetable
Biotech 01A/02	Agenda Item 3	Provisional annotated agenda
Biotech 01A/03	Agenda Item 4	Use of living microorganisms in food and perspectives on the application of genetic modification in such microorganisms
	Topic 1	
Biotech 01A/04	Agenda Item 4	Conventional safety assessment methodologies used for foods derived from biotechnology including foods of plant origin
	Topic 2-a	
†	Agenda Item 4	Issues specific to foods using genetically modified microorganisms
	Topic 2-b	
†	Agenda Item 4	Genetic stability of microorganisms and their familiarity
	Topic 3	
Biotech 01A/07	Agenda Item 4	Gene transfer
	Topic 4	
Biotech 01A/08	Agenda Item 4	Intestinal flora and gut ecosystems
	Topic 5-a	
Biotech 01A/09	Agenda Item 4	Gut colonization and effects on health (beneficial and adverse)
	Topic 5-b	
Biotech 01A/10	Agenda Item 4	Genetic determinants pathogenicity of microorganisms and its possible change by genetic modification
	Topic 6	Published paper: (29)
Biotech 01A/11	Agenda Item 4	Nutritional and toxicological aspects of bacterial or fungal metabolites, their possible alternations by genetic modification
	Topic 7	
†	Agenda Item 4	Allergenicity of microorganisms and its possible induction or change by genetic modification
	Topic 8	
Biotech 01A/12	Agenda Item 4	Survival/propagation of microorganisms including GMM in the environment and its implication on public health

* denotes agenda item consisted of submitted paper only.

† denotes no paper was submitted against this agenda item.