DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Food and Drug Administration

GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE *(GRAS)* NOTICE

Form Approved: OMB No. 0910-0342; Expiration Date: 02/29/2016
(See last page for OMB Statement)

FDA USE ONLY

GRN NUMBER 689	DATE OF RECEIPT
ESTIMATED DAILY INTAKE	INTENDED USE FOR INTERNET
NAME FOR INTERNET	
KEYWORDS	

Transmit completed form and attachments electronically via the Electronic Submission Gateway *(see Instructions)*; OR Transmit completed form and attachments in paper format or on physical media to: Office of Food Additive Safety *(HFS-200)*, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740-3835.

PART I – INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUBMISSION

1. Type of Submission *(Check one)*

☒ New ☐ Amendment to GRN No. _____ ☐ Supplement to GRN No. _____

2. ☒ All electronic files included in this submission have been checked and found to be virus free. *(Check box to verify)*

3a. For New Submissions Only: Most recent presubmission meeting *(if any)* with FDA on the subject substance *(yyyy/mm/dd)*: _____

3b. For Amendments or Supplements: Is your amendment or supplement submitted in response to a communication from FDA? *(Check one)* ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, enter the date of communication *(yyyy/mm/dd)*: _____

PART II – INFORMATION ABOUT THE NOTIFIER

1a. Notifier

Name of Contact Person	Position
Janet Oesterling	Regulatory Specialist III

Company *(if applicable)*: Novozymes North America

Mailing Address *(number and street)*: 77 Perrys Chapel Church Road

City	State or Province	Zip Code/Postal Code	Country
Franklinton	North Carolina	27525	United States of America

Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-Mail Address
9194943187		jao@novozymes.com

1b. Agent or Attorney *(if applicable)*

Name of Contact Person	Position

Company *(if applicable)*:

Mailing Address *(number and street)*:

City	State or Province	Zip Code/Postal Code	Country

Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-Mail Address

PART III – GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

1. Name of Substance

Phospholipase C from Bacillus thuringiensis produced by a genetically modified strain of Bacillus lincheniformis

2. Submission Format: *(Check appropriate box(es))*

☒ Electronic Submission Gateway

☐ Paper

☐ Electronic files on physical media with paper signature page

If applicable give number and type of physical media

3. For paper submissions only:

Number of volumes _____

Total number of pages _____

4. Does this submission incorporate any information in FDA's files by reference? *(Check one)*

☐ Yes *(Proceed to Item 5)* ☒ No *(Proceed to Item 6)*

5. The submission incorporates by reference information from a previous submission to FDA as indicated below *(Check all that apply)*

☐ a) GRAS Notice No. GRN _____

☐ b) GRAS Affirmation Petition No. GRP _____

☐ c) Food Additive Petition No. FAP _____

☐ d) Food Master File No. FMF _____

☐ e) Other or Additional *(describe or enter information as above)* _____

6. Statutory basis for determination of GRAS status *(Check one)*

☒ Scientific Procedures *(21 CFR 170.30(b))* ☐ Experience based on common use in food *(21 CFR 170.30(c))*

7. Does the submission (including information that you are incorporating by reference) contain information that you view as trade secret or as confidential commercial or financial information?

☐ Yes *(Proceed to Item 8)*

☒ No *(Proceed to Part IV)*

8. Have you designated information in your submission that you view as trade secret or as confidential commercial or financial information *(Check all that apply)*

☐ Yes, see attached Designation of Confidential Information

☐ Yes, information is designated at the place where it occurs in the submission

☐ No

9. Have you attached a redacted copy of some or all of the submission? *(Check one)*

☐ Yes, a redacted copy of the complete submission

☐ Yes, a redacted copy of part(s) of the submission

☐ No

PART IV – INTENDED USE

1. Describe the intended use of the notified substance including the foods in which the substance will be used, the levels of use in such foods, the purpose for which the substance will be used, and any special population that will consume the substance *(e.g., when a substance would be an ingredient in infant formula, identify infants as a special population).*

The active enzyme is phospholipase C (EC 3.1.4.3), commonly known as PLC. PLC will be used in degumming of vegetable oils intended for human consumption. Degumming is the first step in the refining of crude oil. The subsequent steps include bleaching and deodorization. In the standard degumming procedure, water and acid are used to remove phospholipids. In enzymatic degumming, PLC will be added to the crude oil under conditions commonly used in the refining of edible oils. Under these conditions, PLC will hydrolyse the major oil phospholipids, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine. The resulting esters, phosphorylcholine and phosphorylethanolamine, will be solubilised in water and removed from the oil by centrifugation

2. Does the intended use of the notified substance include any use in meat, meat food product, poultry product, or egg product? *(Check one)*

☐ Yes ☒ No

000002

PART V – IDENTITY

1. Information about the Identity of the Substance

	Name of Substance[1]	Registry Used *(CAS, EC)*	Registry No.[2]	Biological Source *(if applicable)*	Substance Category *(FOR FDA USE ONLY)*
1	phospholipase C	EC	3.1.4.3		
2					
3					

[1] Include chemical name or common name. Put synonyms *(whether chemical name, other scientific name, or common name)* for each respective item (1 - 3) in Item 3 of Part V *(synonyms)*

[2] Registry used e.g., CAS *(Chemical Abstracts Service)* and EC *(Refers to Enzyme Commission of the International Union of Biochemistry (IUB), now carried out by the Nomenclature Committee of the International Union of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (IUBMB))*

2. Description

Provide additional information to identify the notified substance*(s)*, which may include chemical formula*(s)*, empirical formula*(s)*, structural formula*(s)*, quantitative composition, characteristic properties *(such as molecular weight(s)),* and general composition of the substance. For substances from biological sources, you should include scientific information sufficient to identify the source *(e.g., genus, species, variety, strain, part of a plant source (such as roots or leaves), and organ or tissue of an animal source)*, and include any known toxicants that could be in the source.

Classification: phosphodiesterases
IUBMB nomenclature: phosphatidylcholine cholinephosphohydrolase
EC No.: 3.1.4.3
CAS No.: 9001-86-9
Specificity: catalyzes the hydrolysis of phospholipids
PLC enzyme preparation contains: enzyme solids, glycerol, water, sodium benzoate and potatssium sorbate.
A search for homology of the phospholipase sequence from MaTa176 to known toxins was assessed on the basis of the information present in the UNIPROT database (11-Feb-2016). No significant homology to any toxin sequence was found.

3. Synonyms

Provide as available or relevant:

1	PLC
2	
3	

000003

PART VI – OTHER ELEMENTS IN YOUR GRAS NOTICE

(check list to help ensure your submission is complete – check all that apply)

- ☒ Any additional information about identity not covered in Part V of this form
- ☒ Method of Manufacture
- ☒ Specifications for food-grade material
- ☒ Information about dietary exposure
- ☒ Information about any self-limiting levels of use *(which may include a statement that the intended use of the notified substance is not-self-limiting)*
- ☒ Use in food before 1958 *(which may include a statement that there is no information about use of the notified substance in food prior to 1958)*
- ☒ Comprehensive discussion of the basis for the determination of GRAS status
- ☒ Bibliography

Other Information

Did you include any other information that you want FDA to consider in evaluating your GRAS notice?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Did you include this other information in the list of attachments?

☒ Yes ☐ No

PART VII – SIGNATURE

1. The undersigned is informing FDA that Novozymes North America *(name of notifier)*

has concluded that the intended use*(s)* of Phospholipase C from Bacillus thuringiensis produced by a genetically modified strain of Bacill *(name of notified substance)*

described on this form, as discussed in the attached notice, is (are) exempt from the premarket approval requirements of section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act because the intended use(s) is (are) generally recognized as safe.

2. ☒ Novozymes North America *(name of notifier)* agrees to make the data and information that are the basis for the determination of GRAS status available to FDA if FDA asks to see them.

Novozymes North America *(name of notifier)* agrees to allow FDA to review and copy these data and information during customary business hours at the following location if FDA asks to do so.

77 Perrys Chapel Church Rd, Franklinton, NC 27525 *(address of notifier or other location)*

Novozymes North America *(name of notifier)* agrees to send these data and information to FDA if FDA asks to do so.

OR

☐ The complete record that supports the determination of GRAS status is available to FDA in the submitted notice and in GRP No. ---------- *(GRAS Affirmation Petition No.)*

3. Signature of Responsible Official, Agent, or Attorney	**Printed Name and Title**	**Date (mm/dd/yyyy)**
janet oesterling Digitally signed by janet oesterling Date: 2017.01.16 13:53:29 -05'00'	Janet Oesterling	01/17/2017

000004

PART VIII – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

List your attached files or documents containing your submission, forms, amendments or supplements, and other pertinent information. Clearly identify the attachment with appropriate descriptive file names (or titles for paper documents), preferably as suggested in the guidance associated with this form. Number your attachments consecutively. When submitting paper documents, enter the inclusive page numbers of each portion of the document below.

Attachment Number	Attachment Name	Folder Location (select from menu) (Page Number(s) for paper Copy Only)
	DecisionTree_PhospholipaseCproducedbyBacilluslicheniformis_2017-01-17	Administrative
	Part 1_PhospholipaseCproducedbyB.licheniformis_01-17-17	Administrative
	Safetyof MicrobialEnzymePreps_ParizaandJohnson_April2001	Administrative
	SummaryofToxicologyData_Phospholipase C_2016-12-15	Administrative
	GRASNotification_PhospholipaseCproducedbyBacilluslicheniformis_2017-01-17	Submission

Appendix 3- This Phospholipase C from *Bacillus thuringiensis* produced by a genetically modified strain of *Bacillus licheniformis* was evaluated according to the decision tree published in Pariza and Johnson, 2001 [(1)].

The result of the evaluation is presented below.

Decision Tree

1. Is the production strain genetically modified?
   YES
   If yes, go to 2*.*

2. Is the production strain modified using rDNA techniques?
   YES
   If yes, go to 3.

3. Issues relating to the introduced DNA are addressed in 3a-3e.
   a. Does the expressed enzyme product which is encoded by the introduced DNA have a history of safe use in food?
      YES, *go to 3c.*

   c. Is the test article free of transferable antibiotic resistance gene DNA?
      YES, go to 3e.

   e. Is all other introduced DNA well characterized and free of attributes that would render it unsafe for constructing microorganisms to be used to produce food products?
      YES*, go to 4**.***

4. Is the introduced DNA randomly integrated into the chromosome?
   NO*, go to 6**.***

6. Is the production strain derived from a safe lineage, as previously demonstrated by repeated assessment via this evaluation procedure?
   YES. ***If yes the test article is ACCEPTED****.*

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Pariza, M.W. and Johnson, E.A. Evaluating the Safety of Microbial Enzyme Preparations Used in Food Processing: Update for a New Century. Reg. Tox and Pharm 33: 173-186, 2001.

PART 1: Signed statement of the conclusion of GRAS (Generally Recognized as Safe) and certification of conformity to 21 CFR §170.205-170.260.

§170.225(c)(1) – Submission of GRAS notice:

Novozymes North America Inc. is hereby submitting a GRAS (Generally Recognized as Safe) notice in accordance with subpart E of part 170.

§170.225(c)(2) - The name and address of the notifier:

Novozymes North America Inc.
77 Perry Chapel Church Rd., Box 576
Franklinton, NC 27525

§170.225(c)(3) – Appropriately descriptive term:

The appropriately descriptive term for this notified substance is Phospholipase C from *Bacillus thuringiensis* produced by a genetically modified strain of *Bacillus licheniformis.*

§170.225(b) – Trade secret or confidential:

This notification does not contain any trade secret or confidential information.

§170.225(c)(4) – Intended conditions of use:

The phospholipase C enzyme (PLC) will be used in degumming of vegetable oils intended for human consumption. The enzyme preparation is used at minimum levels necessary to achieve the desired effect and according to requirements for normal production following Good Manufacturing Practices. The "general" population is the target population for consumption.

§170.225(c)(5) - Statutory basis for GRAS conclusion:

This GRAS conclusion is based on scientific procedures.

§170.225(c)(6) – Premarket approval:

The notified substance is not subject to the premarket approval requirements of the FD&C Act based on our conclusion that the substance is GRAS under the conditions of the intended use.

§170.225(c)(7) – Availability of information:

This notification package provides a summary of the information which supports our GRAS conclusion of the notified substance. Complete data and information that are the basis for this GRAS conclusion is available to the Food and Drug Administration for review and copying during customary business hours at Novozymes North America, Inc. or will be sent to FDA upon request.

§170.225(c)(8) - FOIA (Freedom of Information Act):

Parts 2 through 7 of this notification do not contain data or information that is exempt from disclosure under the FOIA (Freedom of Information Act).

§170.225(c)(9) – Information included in the GRAS notification:

To the best of our knowledge, the information contained in this GRAS notification is complete, representative and balanced. It contains both favorable and unfavorable information, known to Novozymes and pertinent to the evaluation of the safety and GRAS status of the use of this substance.

(b) (6)

1/16/17

Janet Oesterling Date
Regulatory Affairs Specialist III

Pages 000010-000023 have been removed in accordance with copyright laws. The removed reference citation can be found on page 000007.

Toxicology & Product Safety

Date: December 15, 2016
File: 2016-30506-02
Ref.: BTR

SUMMARY OF TOXICITY DATA

Phospholipase, batch PPW40598, from *Bacillus licheniformis*

Authors:
Birgitte Thue Ravn
Trine Østergaard Lund
Franziska Kramer Birkved

Issued by:
Novozymes A/S
Krogshoejvej 36
DK-2880 Bagsvaerd
Denmark

CONTENT

PAGE

1. ABSTRACT

The below series of toxicological studies were undertaken to evaluate the safety of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598.

All studies were carried out in accordance with current OECD guidelines and in compliance with the OECD principles of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP). The studies were performed at Envigo (UK) and Covance (UK) during the period March 2016 to December 2016.

The main conclusions of the studies can be summarized as follows:

- Phospholipase, batch PPW40598, was tested in a Neutral Red Uptake assay applying the BALB/c 3T3 cell line as test system and an IC_{50} of 3.97 mg/mL was determined.
- Phospholipase, batch PPW40598, did not induce gene mutations in the Ames test, in the absence or presence of a rat liver metabolic activation system (S-9).
- Phospholipase, batch PPW40598, did not induce micronuclei in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes following treatment in the absence and presence of a rat liver metabolic activation system (S-9).
- In a 13-week oral toxicity study in rats Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 was well tolerated and did not cause any toxicologically significant changes at any dose level tested.

2. TEST SUBSTANCE

The testsubstance is a phospholipase, (E.C. 3.1.4.3).

2.1 Characterization

The toxbatch Phospholipase, batch PPW40598, was used for the conduct of all the toxicological studies. The characterization data of the toxbatch is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Characterization data of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598

Batch number	PPW40598
Activity	7010 PLC(S)/g
N-Total (% w/w)	0.97
Water (KF) (% w/w)	88.0
Dry matter (% w/w)	12.0
Ash (% w/w)	1.5
Total Organic Solids (TOS[1]) (% w/w)	10.5
Specific gravity (g/mL)	1.046

[1] % TOS is calculated as 100% - % water - % ash - % diluents.

3. MUTAGENICITY

3.1 Bacterial Reverse Mutation assay (Ames test)

Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 was assayed for mutation in four histidine-requiring strains (TA98, TA100, TA1535 and TA1537) of *Salmonella typhimurium*, and one tryptophan-requiring strain (WP2 uvrA pKM101) of *Escherichia coli*, both in the absence and presence of metabolic activation by an Aroclor 1254-induced rat liver post-mitochondrial fraction (S-9), in two separate experiments. A 'treat and plate' procedure was used for all treatments in this study as Phospholipase, batch PPW40064 is a high molecular weight protein (which may cause artefacts through growth stimulation in a standard plate-incorporation test).

All Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 treatments in this study were performed using formulations prepared in water for irrigation (purified water).

Experiment 1 treatments of all the tester strains were performed in the absence and in the presence of S-9, using final concentrations of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 at 5, 16, 50, 160, 500, 1600 and 5000 µg TOS/mL, plus vehicle and positive controls. Following these treatments, no clear evidence of toxicity was observed.

Experiment 2 treatments of all the tester strains were performed in the absence and in the presence of S-9 with the maximum test concentration of 5000 µg TOS/mL retained for all strains. Narrowed concentration intervals were employed covering the range 160-5000 µg TOS/mL, in order to examine more closely those concentrations of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 approaching the maximum test concentration and therefore considered most likely to provide evidence of any mutagenic activity. Following these treatments, no clear evidence of toxicity was observed.

The test article was completely soluble in the aqueous assay system at all concentrations treated, in each of the experiments performed.

Vehicle and positive control treatments were included for all strains in both experiments. The mean numbers of revertant colonies all fell within acceptable ranges for vehicle control treatments and were elevated by positive control treatments.

Following Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 treatments of all the test strains in the absence and presence of S-9, no increases in revertant numbers were observed that were ≥2-fold (in strains TA98, TA100 and WP2 uvrA pKM101) or ≥3-fold (in strains TA1535 and TA1537) the concurrent vehicle control. This study was considered therefore to have provided no evidence of any Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 mutagenic activity in this assay system.

It was concluded that Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 did not induce mutation in four histidine-requiring strains (TA98, TA100, TA1535 and TA1537) of Salmonella typhimurium, and one tryptophan-requiring strain (WP2 uvrA pKM101) of Escherichia coli when tested under the conditions of this study. These conditions included treatments at concentrations up to 5000 µg TOS/mL (the maximum recommended concentration according to current regulatory guidelines) in the absence and in the presence of a rat liver metabolic activation system (S-9) using a modified ‘Treat and Plate’ methodology.

3.2 *In vitro* Micronucleus Test In Cultured Human Lymphocytes

Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 was tested in an *in vitro* micronucleus assay using human lymphocyte cultures prepared from the pooled blood of two male donors.

Treatments covering a broad range of concentrations, separated by narrow intervals, were performed both in the absence and presence of metabolic activation (S-9) from Aroclor 1254-induced rats. The substance was formulated in purified water.

A single experiment was performed. Treatments were conducted 48 hours following mitogen stimulation by phytohaemagglutinin (PHA). Sets of duplicate cultures were exposed to the test substance for 3 hours in the presence and absence of S-9 and harvested 21 hours after removal of the test substance (3+21 hour treatment). Additionally, a continuous 24-hour treatment without S-9 mix was included with harvesting 24 hours after removal og the test substance (24+24 hour treatment).

The test substance concentrations for micronucleus analysis were selected by evaluating the effect of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 on the replication index (RI). Concentrations were tested either up to 5000 µg TOS/mL (3+21 hour treatments), or up to a concentration inducing 56% cytotoxicity (24+24 hour -S-9 treatment) as per current regulatory guidelines for the *in vitro* micronucleus assay.

Appropriate negative (vehicle) control cultures were included in the test system under each treatment condition. The proportion of micronucleated binucleate (MNBN) cells in the vehicle cultures fell within current 95th percentile of the observed historical vehicle control (normal) ranges. Mitomycin C (MMC) and Vinblastine (VIN) were employed as clastogenic and aneugenic positive control chemicals respectively in the absence of rat liver S-9. Cyclophosphamide (CPA) was employed as a clastogenic positive control chemical in the presence of S-9. Cells receiving these were sampled in the Micronucleus Experiments at 24 hours (CPA, MMC) or 48 hours (VIN) after the start of treatment. All positive control compounds induced statistically significant increases in the proportion of cells with micronuclei. All acceptance criteria were considered met and the study was therefore accepted as valid.

Treatment of cells with Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 in the absence and presence of S-9 resulted in frequencies of MNBN cells which were similar to and not significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher than those observed in concurrent vehicle controls for all concentrations analysed. The MNBN cell frequency for the majority of all treated cultures fell within the normal ranges with no concentration related increase in MNBN cell frequency apparent.

It is concluded that Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 did not induce micronuclei in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes following treatment in the absence and presence of a rat liver metabolic activation system (S-9).

4. GENERAL TOXICITY

4.1 *In Vitro* Cytotoxicity Test: Neutral Red Uptake in BALB/c 3T3 Cell Culture

The aim of this study was to evaluate the cytotoxicity of Phospholipase, Batch PPW40598, using a Neutral Red Uptake (NRU) assay in 3T3 cells.

The growth of 3T3 cells treated with a range of concentrations of the test item was compared with vehicle control cultures after 48 hours exposure both visually and using neutral red uptake.

Phospholipase was very toxic at the highest two concentrations, 30 and 10 mg/mL giving 3% and 4% viability respectively, according to the neutral red uptake results. It was slightly toxic at the third concentration, 3 mg/mL, giving 73% viability and non-toxic at the lowest five concentrations, 0.01 – 1 mg/mL. A visual assessment of the cell monolayers showed that the test item produced very rounded and sparse cells that appeared dead at the highest two concentrations. Confluency was approximately 20%-30% at the third concentration, 30% confluency at the fourth concentration and 40%-50% confluency at the lower four concentrations. The vehicle control produced approximately 50% confluency. The IC50 was calculated to be 3.97 mg/mL.

The IC50 value of the positive control, sodium lauryl sulphate, was calculated to be 91.32 µg/mL which lay within the historical control range of this laboratory.

It was concluded that Phospholipase demonstrated cytotoxicity compared to the vehicle control in the concentration range 3 – 30 mg/mL, with no toxicity observed at the lower concentrations of 0.01 – 1 mg/mL.

4.2 Toxicity Study by Oral Gavage Administration to Han Wistar Rats for 13 Weeks

The objective of this study was to assess the systemic toxic potential of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 (an enzyme used in the food industry), when administered orally by gavage to Han Wistar rats for 13 weeks. Three groups, each comprising 10 males and 10 females, received doses of 10, 25 or 65% of the Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 (equivalent to 109.8, 274.6 or 713.9 mg TOS/kg body weight/day, or 7332.5, 18331.2 or 47661.0 PLC(S)/kg body weight/day). A similarly constituted control group received the vehicle (reverse osmosis water) at the same volume-dose (10 mL/kg body weight).

During the study, clinical condition, detailed physical and arena observations, sensory reactivity, grip strength, motor activity, body weight, food consumption, water consumption (by daily visual observation), ophthalmic examination, haematology (peripheral blood), blood chemistry, organ weight, macropathology and histopathology investigations were undertaken.

General appearance and behaviour, sensory activity, grip strength and motor activity were not affected by treatment and there were no test item-related deaths during the treatment period. There was no effect of treatment on bodyweight gain or on food or water consumption.

There were no treatment-related ophthalmic findings.The haematology and blood chemistry investigations did not identify any toxicologically significant differences from controls.

Organ weights were unaffected and there were no treatment related macroscopic or microscopic findings.

It is concluded that the oral administration of Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 to Han Wistar rats at doses up to the highest dose tested, 65% of the Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 for 13 weeks was well-tolerated and did not cause any adverse change. The no-observed adverse-effect level (NOAEL) was considered to be the highest dose tested, 65% of the Phospholipase, batch PPW40598 (equivalent to 713.9 mg TOS/kg body weight/day or 47661.0 PLC(S)/kg body weight/day).

5. REFERENCES

5.1 Study reports

Envigo: Study No.: KL90JN; Novozymes Reference No.: 20166030: Phospholipase, PPW40598: 3T3 Neutral Red Uptake test. (May 2016). LUNA file: 2016-07827.

Covance: Study No.: 8338681; Novozymes Reference No.: 20166017. Phospholipase, batch PPW40598: Bacterial Reverse Mutation Assay using a Treat and Plate Modification. (June 2016). LUNA file: 2016-10028.

Covance: Study No.: 8338682; Novozymes Reference No.: 20166018: Phospholipase, Batch PPW40598: *In vitro* Human Lymphocyte Micronucleus Assay. (August 2016). LUNA file: 2016-12761.

Envigo: Study No.: JL29DD; Novozymes Reference No.: 20166021: Phospholipase, Batch PPW40598: Toxicity Study by Oral Gavage Administration to Han Wistar Rats for 13 Weeks. (December 2016). LUNA file: 2016-30500.

Phospholipase C from *Bacillus thuringiensis* Produced by a Genetically Modified Strain of *Bacillus licheniformis*

Janet Oesterling, Regulatory Affairs, Novozymes North America, Inc., USA

January 2017

PART 2 - IDENTITY, METHOD OF MANUFACTURE, SPECIFICATIONS AND PHYSICAL OR TECHNICAL EFFECT OF THE NOTIFIED SUBSTANCE

2.1 IDENTITY OF THE NOTIFIED SUBSTANCE

The subject of this notification is a phospholipase C enzyme preparation, hereby known as PLC, produced by submerged fermentation of a genetically modified *Bacillus licheniformis* microorganism carrying the gene coding for phospholipase C from *Bacillus thuringiensis.*

Key enzyme and protein chemical characteristics of the PLC are given below:

Classification:	phosphodiesterases
IUBMB nomenclature:	phosphatidylcholine cholinephosphohydrolase
EC No.:	3.1.4.3
CAS No.:	9001-86-9
Specificity:	catalyzes the hydrolysis of phospholipids
Amino acid sequence:	the total nucleotide and amino acid sequences have been determined

2.2 IDENTITY OF THE SOURCE

2.2(a) Production Strain

The *Bacillus licheniformis* production strain, designated MaTa176, was derived via the recipient strain, MaTa157, from a natural isolate of *Bacillus licheniformis* strain DSM 9552.

This genetically modified production organism complies with the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) criteria for GILSP (Good Industrial Large Scale Practice) microorganisms (1). It also meets the criteria for a safe production microorganism as described by Pariza and Foster (2) and later Pariza and Johnson (3) and several expert groups (4) (5) (6) (1) (7) (8) (9).

The PLC expression plasmid, used in the strain construction, pMRT363, contains strictly defined chromosomal DNA fragments and synthetic DNA linker sequences. The DNA sequence for the introduced PLC gene is based on the sequence of the lip gene encoding a phospholipase C from *Bacillus thuringiensis*.

2.2(b) Recipient Strain

The recipient strain MaTa157 used in the construction of the *Bacillus licheniformis* production strain was modified at several chromosomal loci during strain development to inactivate genes encoding a number of proteases. Also, the ability to sporulate was eliminated by deleting a gene essential for sporulation. Additionally, genes encoding

unwanted proteins that can be present in the culture supernatant were deleted. The absence of these represents improvements in the product purity, safety and stability.

2.2(c) PLC Expression Plasmid

The expression plasmid, pMRT363, used to transform the *Bacillus licheniformis* recipient strain MaTa157 is based on the well-known *Bacillus* vectors pE194 (10) and pUB110 (11) from *Staphylococcus aureus*. No elements of these vectors are left in the production strain. The introduced DNA consist of a fragment of a hybrid *Bacillus* promoter with promoter elements from *B. licheniformis*, *B. amyloliquefaciens* and *B. thurigiensis,* the PLC coding sequence (*lipBt1.s*) and a transcriptional terminator.

The PLC gene *(lipBt1)* is a synthetic gene encoding a variant of the wild-type PLC from *Bacillus thuringiensis* with a single amino acid residue difference compared to the wild-type sequence. The gene has been codon optimized for expression in *Bacillus licheniformis* resulting in the *lipBt1.s* gene.

Following the terminator, a non-coding DNA sequence is inserted to enable targeted integration of the transforming DNA into the genome of the recipient strain. Only the expression cassette with elements between the promoter fragment and the terminator are present in the final production strain. This has been confirmed by Southern blot analysis and PCR analysis followed by DNA sequencing.

2.2(d) Construction of the Recombinant Microorganism

The production strain, *Bacillus licheniformis* MaTa176, was constructed from the recipient strain MaTa157 through the following steps:

1) Plasmid pMRT363 was integrated into three specific loci in strain MaTa157 by targeted homologous recombination to these loci using a two-step integration approach. Targeted integration of the expression cassettes at these loci allows the expression of the PLC gene *lipBt1.s* from the promoter.

2) The resulting PLC strain containing one copy of the *lipBt1.s* gene at each of the three target loci was named MaTa176.

Sequence confirmation of the inserted expression cassettes and the flanking regions at each of the integration loci was performed in the production strain.

2.2(e) Stability of the Introduced Genetic Sequences

The genetic stability of the introduced DNA sequences was determined by Southern hybridization. The transforming DNA is stably integrated into the *Bacillus licheniformis* chromosome and, as such, is poorly mobilized for genetic transfer to other organisms and is mitotically stable.

2.2(f) Antibiotic Resistance Gene

No functional antibiotic resistance genes were left in the strain as a result of the genetic modifications. The absence of these genes was verified by genome sequence analysis.

2.2(g) Absence of Production Organism in Product

The absence of the production organism is an established specification for the commercial product. The production organism does not end up in food and therefore the first step in the safety assessment as described by IFBC (4) is satisfactorily addressed.

2.3 METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

This section describes the manufacturing process for the PLC enzyme which follows standard industry practices (12) (13) (14). The quality management system used in the manufacturing process for the enzyme preparation complies with the requirements of ISO 9001. It is manufactured in accordance with current Good Manufacturing Practices, using ingredients that are accepted for general use in foods, and under conditions that ensure a controlled fermentation. These methods are based on generally available and accepted methods used for production of microbial enzymes.

The enzyme preparation complies with the purity criteria recommended for enzyme preparations as described in the Food Chemicals Codex (15). It also conforms to the General Specifications for Enzyme Preparations Used in Food as proposed by JECFA (16).

2.3(a) Raw Materials

The raw materials used in the fermentation and recovery process for the enzyme concentrate are standard ingredients used in the enzyme industry (12) (13) (14). The raw materials conform to Food Chemicals Codex specifications except those raw materials which do not appear in the FCC. For those not appearing in the FCC, internal specifications have been made in line with FCC requirements. On arrival at Novozymes A/S, the raw materials are sampled by the Quality Control Department and subjected to the appropriate analyses to ensure their conformance to specifications.

Any antifoams or flocculants used in fermentation and recovery are used in accordance with the Enzyme Technical Association submission to FDA on antifoams and flocculants dated April 10, 1998. The maximum use level of the antifoams and or flocculants, if used in the product, is not greater than 1%.

2.3(b) Fermentation Process

The PLC enzyme preparation is produced by pure culture submerged fed-batch fermentation of a genetically modified strain of *Bacillus licheniformis* as described in Part 2. All equipment is carefully designed, constructed, operated, cleaned, and maintained so as to prevent contamination by foreign microorganisms. During all steps of fermentation, physical and chemical control measures are taken and microbiological analyses are done to ensure absence of foreign microorganisms and confirm strain identity.

2.3(c) Production Organism

Each batch of the fermentation process is initiated with a stock culture of the production organism, *Bacillus licheniformis,* described in Part 2. Each new batch of the stock culture is thoroughly controlled for identity, absence of foreign microorganisms, and enzyme-generating ability before use.

2.3(d) Criteria for the Rejection of Fermentation Batches

Growth characteristics during fermentation are observed both macroscopically and microscopically. Samples are taken from both the seed fermenter and the main fermenter before inoculation, at regular intervals during cultivation, and before transfer/harvest. These samples are tested for microbiological contamination by microscopy and by plating on a nutrient agar followed by a 24-48-hour incubation period.

The fermentation is declared "contaminated" if one of the following conditions are fulfilled:

1) Contamination is observed in 2 or more samples by microscopy

2) Contamination is observed in two successive agar plates at a minimum interval of 6 hours

Any contaminated fermentation is rejected.

2.3(e) Recovery Process

The recovery process is a multi-step operation designed to separate the desired enzyme from the microbial biomass and partially purify, concentrate, and stabilize the enzyme.

2.3(f) Purification Process

The enzyme is recovered from the culture broth by the following series of operations:

1) Pretreatment - pH adjustment and flocculation (if required)

2) Primary Separation – vacuum drum filtration or centrifugation

3) Concentration - ultrafiltration and/or evaporation

4) Pre- and Germ Filtration - for removal of residual production strain organisms and as a general precaution against microbial degradation

5) Final concentration – evaporation and/or ultrafiltration.

6) Preservation and stabilization of the liquid enzyme concentrate

The enzyme concentrate is stabilized with glycerol. The liquid product is formulated by addition of water and preserved with potassium sorbate and sodium benzoate. See Table 1 below.

2.4 COMPOSITION AND SPECIFICATIONS

The final products are analyzed according to the specifications given below.

2.4(a) Quantitative Composition

The PLC enzyme preparation is sold in a liquid form. Table 1 below identifies the substances that are considered diluents, stabilizers, preservatives and inert raw materials used in the enzyme preparations. Also, the enzyme preparation, that is the subject of this notification, does not contain any major food allergens from the fermentation media.

Table 1. Typical compositions of the enzyme preparations

Substance	Approximate Percentage
Enzyme Solids (TOS*)	9%
Glycerol	>50%
Water	40 - 50%
Sodium Benzoate	<0.5%
Potassium Sorbate	<0.5%

**Total Organic Solids, define as: 100% - water – ash – diluents.

2.4(b) Specifications

The PLC enzyme preparation complies with the recommended purity specification criteria for "Enzyme Preparations" as described in *Food Chemicals Codex* (15). In addition, it also conforms to the General Specifications for Enzyme Preparations Used in Food Processing as proposed by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives in Compendium of Food Additive Specifications (16).

This is demonstrated by analytical test results of three representative enzyme batches in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Analytical data for three food enzyme batches

Parameter	Specifications	PPW41025	PPW41051	PPW42690
PLC activity	PLC(S)/g	12900	11900	17400
Total viable count	Upper limit 50,000	<100	<100	<100
Lead	Not more than 5 mg/kg	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
Salmonella sp.	Absent in 25 g of sample	ND	ND	ND
Total coliforms	Not more than 30 per gr	< 4	< 4	< 4
Escherichia coli	Absent in 25 g of sample	ND	ND	ND
Antimicrobial activity	Not detected	ND	ND	ND

2.5 PHYSICAL OR TECHNICAL EFFECT

2.5(a) Mode of Action

The active enzyme is phospholipase C (EC 3.1.4.3), commonly known as PLC. PLC will be used in degumming of vegetable oils intended for human consumption. Degumming is the first step in the refining of crude oil. The subsequent steps include bleaching and deodorization. In the standard degumming procedure, water and acid are used to remove phospholipids. In enzymatic degumming, PLC will be added to the crude oil under conditions commonly used in the refining of edible oils. Under these conditions, PLC will hydrolyse the major oil phospholipids, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine. The resulting esters, phosphorylcholine and phosphorylethanolamine, will be solubilised in water and removed from the oil by centrifugation (17).

The benefits of the action of the food enzyme in oil processing are improved oil yield due to degumming process.

2.5(b) Use Levels

The PLC enzyme preparation will be added to crude vegetable oils, such as soybean, corn, canola, rape, and sunflower at levels no higher than necessary to achieve an intended effect, and according to requirements for normal production following cGMP.

The dosage applied in practice by a food manufacturer depends on the particular process. It is based on an initial recommendation by the enzyme manufacturer and optimised to fit the process conditions.

The maximum recommended use level is 1000 PLC(S) per kilo of oil.

2.5(c) Enzymes Residues in the Final Food

After the degumming reaction has been completed, the aqueous phase containing PLC, is separated from the oil by centrifugation. The subsequent steps used in refining, i.e., repeated washing of the oil with hot water, bleaching, and deodorization, will remove the residual enzyme.

PART 3 - DIETARY EXPOSURE

In order to provide a “worst case” scenario for the calculation of the possible daily human exposure an assumption was made that all the enzyme product is retained in the final food product. The general population is the target population for consumption. There is no specific subpopulation.

The PLC has an average activity of 14066 PLC(S)/g approximately 9% TOS (Total Organic Solids) content.

This corresponds to an activity/TOS ratio of 156.28 PLC(S)/mg TOS.

3(a) Assumptions in Dietary Exposure

The assumptions are highly exaggerated since the enzyme protein and the other substances are diluted or removed in certain processing steps. Furthermore, all processed foods and beverages produced with the enzyme are not always produced with the maximum recommended dosage. Therefore, the safety margin calculation derived from this method is highly conservative.

The exposure assessment represents a “maximum worst case” situation of human consumption. Overall, the human exposure to the PLC will be negligible because the enzyme preparation is used as a processing aid and in very low dosages therefore the safety margin calculation derived from this method is highly conservative.

3(b) Food Consumption Data

The average daily consumption for added fats and oils is taken from the USDA-ERS Food Availability per capita consumption report for 2006-2011 (18). The estimate of 104.1g/person/day was calculated from the 2010 consumption of 83.8 pounds per annum of vegetable derived added oils and fats on a total fat content basis.

The average weight of 88.8kg was used and was taken from the CDC Vital Health and Statistics anthropometric reference data. It is based on the mean of adult males over the age of 20 (19).

The PLC has an average activity of 14066 PLC(S)/g and approximately 9% TOS (Total Organic Solids) content.

This corresponds to an activity/TOS ratio of 156.28 PLC(S)/mg TOS.

The maximum recommended dosage is: 1000 PLC(S)/kg of oil

This will result in an exposure of:
6.39mg TOS/kg oil x 1.17g oil/kg bw/day / 1000 = 0.007mg/TOS/kg bw/day

The Total Maximum Daily Intake (TMDI) of the food enzyme by consumers is:
0.007mg/TOS/kg bw/day.

The safety margin calculation derived from this method is highly exaggerated.

Theoretical Maximum Daily Intake (TMDI)

The safety margin is calculated as dose level with no adverse effect (NOAEL) divided by the estimated human consumption. The NOAEL dose level in the 13-week oral toxicity study in rats conducted on PLC, PPW40598 was the highest dosage possible, 714 mg TOS/kg bw/day. See the *Summary of Toxicology Data* included in this submission and Table 3 below.

Table 3. NOAEL Calculation

NOAEL (mg TOS/kg bw/day)	714
*TMDI (mg TOS/kg bw/day)	0.007
Safety margin	102000

*based on the worst case scenario

PART 4 - SELF-LIMITING LEVELS OF USE

This part does not apply

PART 5 - COMMON USE IN FOOD BEFORE 1958

This part does not apply

PART 6 - NARRATIVE ON THE CONCLUSION OF GRAS STATUS

The information provided in the following sections is the basis for our determination of general recognition of safety of the PLC enzyme preparation. Our safety evaluation in Part 6 includes an evaluation of the production organism, the donor strain, the introduced DNA, the enzyme and the manufacturing process. Data and information cited in this notification is generally available and Part 6 does not contain any data or information that is exempt from disclosure under the FOIA.

An essential aspect of the safety evaluation of food components derived from genetically modified organisms is the identification and characterization of the inserted genetic material (4) (6) (1) (7) (8) (9). The methods used to develop the genetically modified production organism and the specific genetic modifications introduced into the production organism are described in Part 2.

6(a) Safety of the Production Organism

The safety of the production organism must be the prime consideration in assessing the probable degree of safety of an enzyme preparation intended for use in food (2) (3). The production organism for the PLC, *Bacillis licheniformis,* is discussed in Part 2 and also in this Part.

Bacillis licheniformis has a long history of safe industrial use for the production of enzymes used in human food. It is widely recognized as a harmless contaminant found in many foods (20). *Bacillis licheniformis* is not a human pathogen and it is not toxigenic (21). If the organism is non-toxigenic and non-pathogenic, then it is assumed that food or food ingredients produced from the organism, using current Good Manufacturing Practices, is safe to consume (20). Pariza and Foster define a non-toxigenic organism as “one which does not produce injurious substances at levels that are detectable or demonstrably harmful under ordinary conditions of use or exposure” and a non-pathogenic organism as “one that is very unlikely to produce disease under ordinary circumstances”.

Bacillis licheniformis has been used in the fermentation industry for the production of enzymes, antibiotics, and other specialty chemicals. Various enzymes are produced by *Bacillis licheniformis* and are considered GRAS substances. See table 3 below. In addition, *Bacillis licheniformis* is classified as a Risk Group 1 organism according to the National Institutes of Health Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant Molecules. Risk Group 1 organisms are those not associated with disease in healthy adult humans.

- The *Bacillis licheniformis* recipient strain is derived from a safe strain lineage comprising production strains for more than ten enzyme preparations which have full toxicological safety studies (i.e. 13-week oral toxicity study in rats, Ames test and/or *In vitro* Micronucleus Test and NRU). See Table 3 below.

Table 3: Safe Strain Lineage

Enzyme	EC No.	Predecessor strain[1]	Donor strain	Safety studies[2]
Alpha-amylase (GRASP 0G0363)	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* Si3	*Bacillus stearothermophilus*	Yes
Alpha-amylase (GRN 22)	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* SJ1707	*Bacillus licheniformis*	Yes
Cyclodextrin glucanotransferase	2.4.1.19	*Bacillus licheniformis* SJ1707	*Thermoanaerobacter sp.*	Yes
Alpha-amylase	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* SJ1707	*Bacillus licheniformis*	Yes
Alpha-amylase	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* SJ1904	*Bacillus licheniformis*	Yes
Alpha-amylase	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* MDT223	*Bacillus stearothermophilus*	Yes
Alpha-amylase	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* MDT223	*Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*	Yes
Serine protease (GRN 564)	3.4.21.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* MDT223	*Nocardiopsis prasina*	Yes
Alpha-amylase	3.2.1.1	*Bacillus licheniformis* MDT223	*Bacillus licheniformis*	Yes
Xylanase (GRN 472)	3.2.1.8	*Bacillus licheniformis* MDT223	*Bacillus licheniformis*	Yes
Beta-amylase	3.2.1.1	Bacillus licheniformis PP3579	Bacillus flexus	Yes
Beta-galactosidase (GRN 572)	3.2.1.23	Bacillus licheniformis AEB1763	Bifidobacterium bifidum	Yes
Acetolactate decarboxylase (GRN 587)	4.1.1.5	Bacillus licheniformis AEB1763	Bacillus brevis	Yes
Pullulanase (GRN 645)	3.2.1.41	*Bacillus licheniformis* AEB1763	*Bacillus deramificans*	Yes

Table 3. Novozymes products derived from *B. licheniformis* strains [1]The predecessor strains show strains in the GM construction pathway that are in common with the recipient strain MaTa157 lineage. [2]At least the following: *in vitro* test for gene mutations in bacteria (Ames); *in vitro* test for chromosomal aberration or *in vitro* micronucleus assay; 13 week sub chronic oral toxicity study in rats

Novozymes has used *B. licheniformis* production strains for over 20 years. As shown (Table 3), safety studies have been performed for the same enzyme in different strains in the lineage, supporting the fact that the genetic modifications performed in the *Bacillis licheniformis* strain lineage of the recipient do not result in safety concerns. Additionally, no safety issues are observed when different products that are produced in the same strain (e.g., amylases and xylanases) are investigated, demonstrating that the safety of the strains in the lineage is not product-dependent.

Novozymes' has repeatedly used the procedures outlined by Pariza and Johnson and has used the decision tree (Appendix 1) as a basis for our safety assessment. The production strain is genetically modified by rDNA techniques as discussed in section 2. The expressed enzyme product is a phospholipase C. The enzyme preparation is free of DNA encoding transferable antibiotic resistance gene DNA. The introduced DNA is well characterized and safe for the construction of microorganisms to be used in the production of food grade products. The DNA is stably integrated into the chromosome at five specific sites in the chromosome and the incorporated DNA is known not to encode or express any harmful or toxic substances.

Novozymes has repeatedly used the procedures outlined by Pariza and Johnson 2001 (3) to evaluate the enzymes derived from *Bacillis licheniformis* production strains. Therefore, following the evaluation outlined in this section this production strain is considered to be derived from a safe lineage and is safe for use in the production of enzyme preparations for use in food.

An evaluation of the genetically modified *Bacillus licheniformis* production organism embodying the concepts initially outlined by Pariza and Foster, 1983 (2) and further developed by IFBC in 1990 (20), the EU SCF in 1991 (6), the OECD in 1992 (1), ILSI Europe Novel Food Task Force in 1996 (9), FAO/WHO in 1996 (8), JECFA in 1998 (16) and Pariza and Johnson in 2001, demonstrates the safety of this genetically modified production microorganism strain. The components of this evaluation: the identity of the recipient strain, a description of the incorporated DNA, the sources and functions of the introduced genetic material, an outline of the genetic construction of the production strain, and some characteristics of the production strain and the enzyme derived from it are given in Part 2.

Based on the information presented here it is concluded that the *Bacillus licheniformis* production strain is considered a safe strain for the production of PLC enzyme.

6(b) Safety of the Donor Organism

The donor organism of the PLC is *Bacillus thuringiensis*. As indicated in Part 2, the introduced DNA is well defined and characterized. Only well characterized DNA fragments, limited solely to the PLC coding sequence from the donor strain, are used in the construction of the genetically modified strain. The introduced DNA does not code for any known harmful or toxic substances.

6(c) Safety of the PLC Enzyme

As indicated in Part 2, the subject of this GRAS notification is a phospholipase, EC 3.1.4.3. Enzymes, including PLC, have a long history of use in food.

A wide variety of enzymes are used in food processing (2) (3). And, enzyme proteins do not generally raise safety concerns (3) (2). Phospholipase has been used safely in food production for decades and are widespread in nature being produced by a number of prokaryotic micro-organisms. Pariza and Foster (2) note that very few toxic agents have enzymatic properties. The safety of the PLC was assessed using the Pariza and Johnson, (2001) decision tree which is included in this submision.

6(d) Allergenic/Toxigenic Potential of the Phospholipase C Enzyme

The ingestion of a food enzyme protein is not considered a concern for food allergy. This is based on the following considerations:

1) Enzymes have a long history of safe use in food, with no indication of adverse effects or reactions.

2) The majority of proteins are not food allergens. A wide variety of enzyme classes and structures are naturally present in plant and animal based foods, and based on previous experience, food enzymes are not homologues to known allergens, which make it very unlikely that a new enzyme would be a food allergen.

3) Enzymes in foods are added in concentrations in the low range of parts per million. The enzyme is typically removed or denatured during food processing, and denatured protein has been shown to be very susceptible to digestion in the gastro-intestinal system. Moreover, a wide range of naturally occurring food enzymes have been shown to be very labile in the gastro-intestinal system even in the native unprocessed form.

The above statements are further supported by the publication: "Investigation on possible allergenicity of 19 different commercial enzymes used in the food industry" (Bindslev-Jensen *et al*, 2006) (22).

In order to further evaluate the possibility that the PLC will cross-react with known allergens and induce a reaction in an already sensitized individual, a sequence homology to known food allergens was assessed. Following the guidelines developed by FAO/WHO, 2001 (23) and modified by Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009 (24) the PLC was compared to allergens from the FARRP allergen protein database (http://allergenonline.org) as well as the World Health Organization and International Union of Immunological Societies (WHO/IUIS) Allergen Nomenclature Sub-committee (**http://www.allergen.org**).

A search for more than 35% identity in the amino acid sequence of the expressed protein using a window of 80 amino acids and a suitable gap penalty showed no matches. Alignment of the PLC to each of the allergens and identity of hits with more than 35% identity over the full length of the alignment was analyzed. No significant homology was found between the PLC and any of the allergens from the databases mentioned above. And, a search for 100% identity over 8 contiguous amino acids was completed. Again, no significant homology was found.

Also, a search for homology of the phospholipase sequence from MaTa176 to known toxins was assessed on the basis of the information present in the UNIPROT database (11-Feb-2016). This database contains entries from SWISSPROT and TREMBL. The homology among the emerging entries was below 25% indicating that the homology to any toxin sequence in this database is low and random.

Consequently, oral intake of the PLC is not anticipated to pose any food allergenic or toxin concerns.

6(e) Safety of the Manufacturing Process

This section describes the manufacturing process for the PLC which follows standard industry practices (14) (13) (12). The quality management system used in the manufacturing process for the PLC complies with the requirements of ISO 9001. It is manufactured in accordance with current Good Manufacturing Practices, using ingredients that are accepted for general use in foods, and under conditions that ensure a controlled fermentation. The enzyme preparation complies with the purity criteria recommended for enzyme preparations as described in the Food Chemicals Codex (15). It also conforms to the General Specifications for Enzyme Preparations Used in Food as proposed by JECFA (16).

6(f) Safety Studies

This section describes the studies and analysis performed to evaluate the safety of the use of the PLC.

The following studies were performed on test batch PPW40598 with favourable results:

- Reverse Mutation Assay (Ames test)
- *In vitro* Micronucleus Test
- In vitro Cytotoxicity Test: Neutral Red Uptake
- 13-week sub-chronic oral toxicity study

These tests are described in Appendix 2. Based on the presented toxicity data and the history of safe use for the strain it can be concluded that PLC represented by batch PPW40598, exhibits no toxicological effects under the experimental conditions described.

6(g) Results and Conclusion

Novozymes has reviewed the available data and information. We are not aware of any data and/or information that is, or appears to be, inconsistent with our conclusion of GRAS. Based on this critical review and evaluation, a history of safe use of *Bacillus licheniformis* and the limited and well defined nature of the genetic modifications, Novozymes concludes through scientific procedures that the subject of this notification; PLC enzyme preparation, meets the appropriate food grade specifications and is produced in accordance with current good manufacturing practices. Thus, it is generally recognized, among qualified experts, to be safe under the conditions of its intended use.

Part 7 – SUPPORTING DATA AND INFORMATION

All information indicated in the List of Appendices and References is generally available

APPENDICES

1. Pariza and Johnson Decision Tree Analysis

2. Summary of Toxicity Data, PLC PPW40598. 15 December 2016, LUNA No. 2016-30506-02.

REFERENCES

1. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Safety Evaluation of Foods Derived by Modern Biotechnology, 1993.

2. Pariza, M.W. and Foster, E.M.. Determining the Safety of Enzymes Used in Food Processing. Journal of Food Protection, 46:5:453-468, 1983.

3. Pariza, M.W. and Johnson, E.A.. Evaluating the Safety of Microbial Enzyme Preparations Used in Food Processing: Update for a New Century. Reg. Tox and Pharm 33: 173-186, 2001.

4. IFBC (International Food Biotechnology Council). Chapter 4: Safety Evaluation of Foods and Food Ingredients Derived from Microorganisms in Biotechnologies and Food: Assuring the Safety of Foods Produced by Genetic Modification. 1990, Vol. 12, pp. S1-S196.

5. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Biotechnology Program Under Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) Bacillus licheniformis Final Risk Assessment 1997. (http://epa.gov/oppt/biotech/pubs/fra/fra005.htm).

6. EU Scientific Committee for Food. Guidelines for the presentation of data on food enzymes. Reports of the Scientific Committee for Food, 27th series, 1991.

7. Berkowitz, D. and Maryanski, J.. Implications of biotechnology on international food standards and codes of practice. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Eighteenth Session, Geneva, July 3-12, 1989.

8. FAO/WHO. Biotechnology and Food Safety, Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Consultation. FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 61. Rome, Italy. 1996.

9. Jonas, D.A., et al. The Safety Assessment of Novel Foods, Guidelines prepared by ILSI Europe Novel Food Task Force, Food Chemical Toxicology, Vol. 34, 1996. pp. 931-940.

10. Horinouchi, S., and Weisblum, B.. Nucleotide sequence and functional map of pE194, a plasmid that specifies inducible resistance to macrolide, lincosamide and streptogramin type-b antibiotics. J. Bacteriol., 150, 804-814, 1982.

11. Gryczan, T.J., Contente, S., Dubnau, D. : Characterization of Staphylococcus aureus plasmids introduced by transformation into Bacillus subtilis. J. Bact. 134, 318-329 (1978).

12. Aunstrup, K., Andersen, O., Falch, E.A., and Nielsen, T.K.. Production of Microbial Enzymes in Microbial Technology, 2nd ed., Vol. I, Eds. Peppler, H.J. and Perlman, D., Chapter 9, pp.282-309, 1979.

13. Aunstrup, K.. Production, Isolation, and Economics of Extracellular Enzymes in Applied Biochemistry and Bioengineering, Volume 2, Enzyme Technology, Eds. Wingard, L.B., Katchalski-Katzir, E. And Goldstein, L, pp. 28-68, 1979.

14. Kirk, O., Damhus, T., Borchert, T. V., Fuglsang, C. C., Olsen, H. S., Hansen, T. T., et al. Enzyme Applications, Industrial. Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, Vol. 9, pp 566-620, 2000.

15. United States Pharmacopeial Convention. Food Chemical Codex. Edition 9. Monograph: Enzyme Preparations. United States Pharmacopeial Convention, Board of Trustees, 2014. Pg 410-415.

16. JECFA (Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. General Specifications and Considerations for Enzyme Preparations Used in Food Processing. Compendium of Food Additive Specifications, FAO FNP (Food and Nutrition Paper) 52, Add. 9, FAO, Rome 2001 and FAO JECFA Monographs 3 (2006).

17. Hodgson, A.S.,. Refining and bleaching. In: Hu, Y.H. (Ed.), Bailey's Industrial Oil and Fat Products, Vol. 4, Edible Oil and Fat Products: Processing Technology. Wiley, New York, pp. 168-171, 1996.

18. www.nass.usda.gov.

19. Center for Disease Control, Anthropometric Reference Data for Children and Adults: United States, 2007-2010.

20. IFBC (International Food Biotechnology Council). Chapter 4: Safety Evaluation of Foods and Food Ingredients Derived from Microorganisms in Biotechnologies and Food: Assuring the Safety of Foods Produced by Genetic Modification. 1990, Vol. 12, pp. S1-S196.

21. de Boer AS, Priest F, Diderichsen B. On the Industrial Use of Bacillus licheniformis: a review. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 40, 595-598, 1994.

22. Bindslev-Jensen C, Skov PS, Roggen EL, Hvass P, Brinch DS Investigation on possible allergenicity of 19 different commercial enzymes used in the food industry. Food Chem. Toxicol. 44, 1909-1915, 2006.

23. Evaluation of Allergenicity of Genetically Modified Foods (Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Allergenicity of Foods Derived from Biotechnology

22 25 January 2001), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, 2001.

24. Codex Alimentarius commission. Foods derived from modern biotechnology. FAO/WHO, Rome, pp.1-85, 2009.