



Flexible Packaging Association

April 3, 2003

Dockets Management Branch
HFA-305
Food and Drug Administration
5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Re: Prior Notice of Imported Food Under the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002; Docket No. 02N-0278; 68 Fed. Reg. 5428 (Feb. 3, 2003)

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Flexible Packaging Association (FPA) appreciates this opportunity to provide comments regarding the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) proposed rule implementing section 307 of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 ("the Bioterrorism Act"). Pursuant to section 307 of the Bioterrorism Act, FDA is directed to issue regulations requiring that the agency be provided prior notice of the importation of articles of food into the United States. FDA issued a proposal to require prior notice of the importation of articles of food in the February 3, 2003 *Federal Register*.

FPA is the national trade association representing all segments of the flexible packaging industry. Flexible packaging, which combines the best qualities of paper, plastic film, foil, and other packaging materials, is used in packaging food, drugs, and cosmetics, among other consumer products, and also is used in agricultural, industrial, and institutional packaging applications. FPA's members include companies engaged in the manufacture of flexible packaging materials for sale to the users or distributors of such packaging for the production of finished packaging for foods and other consumer products, as well as a host of other products. FPA membership is also open to any operation engaged in the manufacture of materials, equipment, or supplies related to the flexible packaging industry. FPA's member companies account for more than half of the 20 billion dollars of flexible packaging produced in the United States each year.

02N-0278



C139

971 Corporate Boulevard • Suite 403 • Linthicum, Maryland 21090
phone: 410.694.0800 • fax: 410.694.0900 • e-mail: fpa@flexpack.org • web: www.flexpack.org

FDA is to be commended for its commitment to food security and its ongoing efforts to implement the food safety provisions of the Bioterrorism Act. FPA particularly appreciates the relatively short timeframe in which the agency must promulgate regulations to implement the Act, and the difficulty of this task. FPA strongly objects to FDA's prior notice proposal, however, to the extent that it may be interpreted to require prior notice of the importation of food packaging materials, *per se*. If applied in this manner, the proposal will impose a substantial burden on the food packaging manufacturing industry without providing a corresponding benefit to the safety and security of the food supply.

The Prior Notice Proposal

The Bioterrorism Act amended Section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), in relevant part, by requiring that the importer of an "article of food" submit prior notice of such importation before entry into the United States. In the agency's proposal to implement this section, FDA defines "food" to have the meaning given in section 201(f) of the FFDCA.^{1/} Section 201(f) provides that "food" means "(1) articles used for food or drink for man or other animals, (2) chewing gum, and (3) articles used for components of any such article."

The proposed regulations cite examples of articles that FDA has historically considered to be "food." Among the cited examples are "food and feed ingredients and additives, including substances that migrate into food from food packaging and other articles that contact food."^{2/} The preamble to the proposed regulations states that FDA considers "substances that migrate into food from food packaging" to include immediate food packaging (or components thereof), but not outer food packaging.^{3/} Thus, as drafted, the prior notice proposal could be interpreted to require prior notice of the importation of food packaging materials.

Subsequent to the *Federal Register* notice, at a February 12 outreach meeting, FDA attempted to clarify the intended scope of the registration proposal and its application to food packaging. Specifically, the agency explained its intent to apply the registration requirement to "finished food packaging" only. FDA further explained that a liner used to hold breakfast cereal would be covered by the proposed regulations, but an outer box used for the retail sale of such cereal would not.

^{1/} 68 Fed. Reg. at 5460 (proposed § 1.277(c)(3)).

^{2/} *Id.*

^{3/} 68 Fed. Reg. at 5382. It is factually inaccurate and inconsistent with FDA precedent to equate materials that merely contact food with "substances that migrate into food from food packaging." A substance that contacts food does not necessarily migrate into food. FPA also notes that the preamble to the proposal to require facility registration, which accompanied the prior notice proposal in the February 3 *Federal Register*, advises that "substances that migrate into food from food packaging" include immediate food packaging or components of immediate food packaging that are intended for food use. Presumably, this interpretation was intended to apply in the prior notice context as well, although the prior notice proposal draws no distinction between packaging materials used in direct and indirect contact with food.

The meaning of FDA's remarks regarding "finished food packaging" is unclear. The plain and commonly understood meaning of "finished food packaging" in the industry is packaging that is formed, filled, and sealed. Thus, FPA considers "finished food packaging" to be packaging that is formed, filled, and sealed, and ready for distribution to the intended consumer.^{4/} In FPA's view, liners and other packaging materials as such (i.e., materials manufactured, held, sold, or distributed prior to finished packaging) are not reasonably classified as "finished food packaging" because they will be subject to further handling, storage, and processing before they can serve the intended purposes. Most importantly, FPA concludes that Congress did not intend the prior notice requirement to apply to the food packaging manufacturing industry. As explained more fully below, this conclusion is based upon the plain language, framework, and legislative history of the Bioterrorism Act, as well as the apparent absence of any appreciable benefit to food security to be gained by the prior notice of importation of food packaging materials as such.

Adherence to Congressional Intent

As noted above, the Bioterrorism Act requires prior notice of the importation of an "article of food." FPA readily acknowledges that the definition of "food" set forth in the FFDCAs is broad, and appropriately so. FDA has long relied upon this definition, together with the statutory definition of "food additive," to regulate the safety of food-contact articles, including food packaging.^{5/} In the context of traditional food additive and related requirements, an expansive reading of the terms "food" and "food additive" is appropriate and necessary to ensure adequate protection of public health. FPA does not believe, however, that the term "food" must, or indeed should, be afforded the same meaning regardless of the context in which it is used.

In interpreting the meaning of "food" within the context of the prior notice provision, the agency is required to consider the intent of the provision, as expressed directly in the legislative history of section 307 and as established through the overall framework and purpose of the Bioterrorism Act. With regard to the latter, the Supreme Court has stated that "[i]t is a 'fundamental canon of statutory construction that the words of a statute must be read in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory scheme.'" ^{6/} A statute is to be interpreted "as a symmetrical and coherent regulatory scheme" in which all parts are to be fit, if possible, "into a harmonious whole."^{7/}

^{4/} The phrase "form, fill, and seal" is used throughout the packaging manufacturing, food packaging, and food processing industries.

^{5/} "Food additive" is defined to mean, in relevant part, "any substance the intended use of which results or may reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food . . ." FFDCAs § 201(s).

^{6/} *Food and Drug Administration v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 1291, 1301 (2000) (citations omitted) (interpreting the FFDCAs definition of "drug" and concluding that the framework of the Act demonstrates that Congress did not intend for tobacco to be regulated as a "drug").

^{7/} *Id.*

Applying these principles, the statutory reference to “food” in section 307 of the Bioterrorism Act cannot be assumed to have precisely the same meaning as the definition of “food” set forth in section 201(f) of the FFDCa: FDA must consider whether there is any statement of congressional intent to the contrary, and whether the structure and purpose of the relevant provisions dictate a more limited interpretation. Indeed, the legislative history and framework of the Bioterrorism Act make clear that Congress did not intend the prior notice requirement to apply shipments of food packaging materials, *per se*. Moreover, FPA does not believe that application of the prior notice requirement to packaging materials would serve the statute’s intended purpose to enhance food security.

First, Congress specifically addressed the status of food packaging materials in the legislative history of the prior notice provision. To clarify the reach of the provision, the Committee of Conference for the bill (H.R. 3448) instructed that—

The Managers intend that the requirements of this section should not be construed to apply to packaging materials if, at the time of importation, such materials will not be used for, or in contact with, food as defined under Section 201 of the FFDCa.^{8/}

The Managers further advised that—

Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or amend the regulatory treatment of food packaging materials or food contact substances under the FFDCa.^{9/}

Finally, to confirm Congress’s intent with regard to the prior notice requirement, Representative John Shimkus (R-Ill.), a member of the Conference Committee for the bill, entered the following remarks into the May 24, 2002 Congressional Record:

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my statement for the record on May 22, 2002 during floor consideration of H.R. 3448, let me clarify that language included in the Conference Report regarding Section 307 as it relates to food packaging materials. Section 307 dealing with prior notice of imported food shipments should not be construed to apply to food packaging materials or other food contact substances if, at the time of importation, they are not used in food.^{10/}

^{8/} H.R. CONF. REP. NO. 107-481, at 137 (May 21, 2002).

^{9/} *Id.*

^{10/} 148 Cong. Rec. E916 (daily ed. May 24, 2002).

This important legislative history demonstrates that Congress did not intend for packaging materials or other food-contact substances to be subject to the prior notice obligation. More specifically, it demonstrates that the prior notice requirement applies not to food packaging imported as such, but to packaging in its “finished” form (i.e., packaging that has been formed, filled, and sealed). A food packaging material is not “at the time of importation . . . used in food” unless it has been formed, filled, and sealed.

It is also telling that Congress specifically stated that the prior notice provision should not be construed to “alter or amend the regulatory treatment of food packaging materials” under the FFDCA. If FDA were to require prior notice of the importation of unfinished food packaging materials (e.g., bags, pouches, other empty containers, or other materials that have not been formed, filled, and sealed), such a requirement clearly would “alter or amend” the regulatory treatment of packaging materials under the FFDCA by imposing new requirements.

Second, where Congress intended to include food packaging materials within the requirements established in the Bioterrorism Act, it did so expressly. In the recordkeeping provisions of section 306 of the Bioterrorism Act, Congress authorized FDA to establish—

requirements regarding the establishment and maintenance . . . of records by persons who manufacture, process, pack, transport, distribute, receive, hold, or import food, which records are needed . . . to allow the Secretary to identify the immediate previous sources and the immediate subsequent recipients of food, *including its packaging*, in order to address credible threats of serious adverse health consequences or death to humans or animals.^{11/}

This language is reasonably interpreted to require any “person” that manufactures, processes, packs, transports, distributes, receives, holds, or imports “food” to keep records relating to the immediate previous source and immediate subsequent recipient of the article of food, and if from a different source, the materials used to package the food. If the term “food” included packaging regardless of context, there would have been no reason for Congress to call out packaging specifically in this provision.

The specific reference to packaging in section 306, when coupled with the lack of any such references in other provisions of the statute, necessarily means (based on appropriate statutory construction) that such other provisions do not encompass “packaging” materials as such. Moreover, Congress’s use of the adjective “its” as a modifier to the noun “food” similarly reflects an understanding that “packaging” is not “food” for purposes of the Bioterrorism Act. This statutory framework reflects a judgment by Congress that packaging materials should be traceable to the immediate previous source, but need not be subject to the prior notice requirements established by the Bioterrorism Act. It also demonstrates that registration of food

^{11/} Bioterrorism Act § 306(a) (adding FFDCA § 414) (emphasis added).

packaging manufacturing and related facilities would do little to enhance food security, as the “immediate previous source” of food packaging materials will be readily available to the agency through registered facilities that use such materials in the production of finished packaging and finished food products.

Third, it is unclear how prior notice of the importation of food packaging materials would further the objectives of the Bioterrorism Act. Congress intended the prior notice requirement to assist FDA in inspecting imported food and responding to threats to food safety that may involve such food.^{12/} In recognition of this intent, FDA states in the preamble to its prior notice proposal that “[s]ection 801(m)(1) of the act makes clear that a primary purpose of prior notice is to enable inspections or other FDA action upon arrival of food in the United States to protect consumers in the United States from food imports that may be at risk of intentional adulteration or that may pose other risks.”^{13/} FPA is aware of no appreciable food security benefit to be gained by such prior notice applying to packaging materials as such, nor are any packaging-specific benefits described by FDA in the proposal. FPA finds it noteworthy that three recent reports addressing the potential vulnerability of the food supply to bioterrorism and related threats make no mention of packaging as a vehicle for the intentional contamination of food.^{14/}

To the extent that FDA believes that packaging materials may pose food security concerns, such concerns would be most relevant and credible at the point that the packaging materials are transformed into “finished food packaging”—packaging that has been formed, filled with a food product, and sealed. Prior to this point, the security risk posed by packaging materials is extremely remote, and even if intentional acts of tampering did occur, any affected unfinished packaging materials would be subject to further handling, processing, and examination that would provide ample opportunity to detect evidence of contamination.

Moreover, in the unlikely event of an intentional attack on the food supply, and in the even less likely event that such an attack involves food packaging materials, FDA will be able to readily identify affected food packaging industry facilities through traceback records that will be required pursuant to the Bioterrorism Act. The agency’s source of such records will be food processors and packers that will be registered with the agency and that will be required to maintain records of the “immediate previous source” of the food, including its packaging, handled therein. Indeed, in FPA’s experience, food processors and packers already keep such records and are currently able to trace supplied packaging materials to the source. In light of the minimal risk posed by food packaging materials and the traceback capability that will be

^{12/} 148 Cong. Rec. H2857-8 (daily ed. May 22, 2002).

^{13/} 68 Fed. Reg. at 5433.

^{14/} GAO, Rep. No. GAO-03-342, *Food Processing Security: Voluntary Efforts Are Under Way, but Federal Agencies Cannot Fully Assess Their Implementation* (Feb. 2003); National Resource Council of the National Academies, *Making the Nation Safer: The Role of Science and Technology in Countering Terrorism* (June 2002); Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Public Health Assessment of Potential Biological Terrorism Agents, Emerging Infectious Diseases* (Feb. 2002).

mandated by the Bioterrorism Act, it is not clear how application of the facility registration requirement to the food packaging manufacturing industry will enhance food security.

FPA believes strongly that FDA and industry resources will be most effective in protecting food security if such limited and finite resources are focused on those industry segments that produce food intended for consumption and intentional components of such food. Extending the prior notice requirement to food packaging manufacturing and related packaging industry facilities adds to the burden faced by both industry and FDA, but does not enhance food security in any meaningful way.


Summary and Recommendations

Based upon the legislative history, framework, and purpose of the Bioterrorism Act, FPA believes that Congress did not intend for packaging materials to be subject to the prior notice requirement established in the legislation. Application of the requirement to shipments of packaging materials would impose substantial burdens on both industry and FDA, without providing any corresponding benefit to food security. The agency is urged to revise the definition of "food" in proposed 21 C.F.R. § 1.277 to specifically exclude food-contact articles as such, including food packaging and components thereof.

* * * * *

FPA appreciates this opportunity to provide comments concerning FDA's proposal to require prior notice of imported articles of food. FPA looks forward to working cooperatively with the agency on this and other food security proposals and initiatives. Please do not hesitate to contact us if it would be desirable to discuss these comments or if FPA may provide additional information.

Respectfully submitted,



Marla Donahue
President