NOSB NATIONAL LIST FILE CHECKLIST

PROCESSING

MATERIAL NAME:	#5 Enzymes: mold/fungal, yeast	
_	NOSB Database For	m
	References	
	MSDS (or equivalent	t)
	FASP (FDA)	
	TAP Reviews from:	Joe Montecalvo, Rich Theuer, William Zimmer, Steve Taylor

NOSB/NATIONAL LIST COMMENT FORM PROCESSING

Material Name: #5 Enzymes: mold/fungal, yeast

Please use this page to write down comments	, questions, and your	· anticipated vote(s).
---	-----------------------	------------------------

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

1. In my opinion, this material is: Synthetic Non-synthetic.
2. Should this material be allowed in an "organic food" (95% or higher organic
ingredients)? Yes No
(IF NO, PROCEED TO QUESTION 3.)
3. Should this substance be allowed in a "food made with organic ingredients" (50% or
higher organic ingredients)? Yes No

This file is due back to us by: Aug. 5,1996
Name of Material: Enzymes: mold/fungal, yest Reviewer Name: Steve L Taylor RECEIVED AUG 0 5 1996
Is this substance Synthetic or non-synthetic? Explain (if appropriate) Most are Non-synthetic
If synthetic, how is the material made? (please answer here if our database form is blank) Genetically engineered enzymes should be considered synthetic But should not be allowed on National 4st
This material should be added to the National List as:
Synthetic Allowed Prohibited Natural
or, Non-synthetic (Allowed as an ingredient in organic food) Non-synthetic (Allowed as a processing aid for organic food)
or, this material should not be on the National List Genetically Engineered only Are there any use restrictions or limitations that should be placed on this material on the National List?
Please comment on the accuracy of the information in the file:
Any additional comments? (attachments welcomed)
Do you have a commercial interest in this material? Yes; No
Signature Stree Taylor Date 8/5/96

Please address the 7 criteria in the Organic Foods Production Act: (comment in those areas you feel are applicable)

(1) the potential of such substances for detrimental chemical interactions with other materials used in organic farming systems;

None

(2) the toxicity and mode of action of the substance and of its breakdown products or any contaminants, and their persistence and areas of concentration in the environment:

None

(3) the probability of environmental contamination during manufacture, use, misuse or disposal of such substance;

None

(4) the effect of the substance on human health;

None

- (5) the effects of the substance on biological and chemical interactions in the agroecosystem, including the physiological effects of the substance on soil organisms (including the salt index and solubility of the soil), crops and livestock;
- (6) the alternatives to using the substance in terms of practices or other available materials; and
- (7) its compatibility with a system of sustainable agriculture.

This file is due back to us by: Aug. 5,1996
Name of Material: Enzymes: mold/fungal, yest Reviewer Name: Received Aug 0 5 1996
Is this substance Synthetic or non-synthetic? Explain (if appropriate) ALS SUBSTANCE IS MANY; Some ARE If synthetic, how is the material made? (please answer here if our database form is blank)
This material should be added to the National List as:
Synthetic Allowed Prohibited Natural
or, Non-synthetic (Allowed as an ingredient in organic food) Non-synthetic (Allowed as a processing aid for organic food)
or, V this material should not be on the National List WITHOUS FURTHER DEFINITION AND SPECIFICATION
Are there any use restrictions or limitations that should be placed on this material on the National List?
Please comment on the accuracy of the information in the file: NADEQUATE TO JUDGE MY SPECIFIC DIZYME Any additional comments? (attachments welcomed)
Do you have a commercial interest in this material? Yes; No Signature Date 5/96
Signature / Ch Weller Date / 3/76

USDA/TAP REVIEWER COMMENT FORM

Original mailing date: 7 Jan 1995.

Name of Materials: Enzymes, bacterial Reviewer Name: Richard C. Theuer

NOTE: "Bacterial enzymes" is not a single substance. Many bacterial enzymes are allowed for use in food with the physical or technical functional effect described as "enzymes" in Section 21CFR170.3(o)(9). A bacterial enzyme can be judged "natural" or "synthetic" only if its source and method of manufacture are identified. Existing NOSB motions have defined any product of a genetically engineered organism to be synthetic. It is critical for a TAP reviewer to know the precise nature of the bacteria that produces an enzyme.

Several enzymes used as food processing aids could not be located in the list of Generally Recognized As Safe food additives. These include pectinase, pullanase and glucanase.

Bacterial enzymes currently allowed in food are:

```
21CFR184.1027 - mixed carbohydratase/protease; B. licheniformis
21CFR184.1372 - insoluble glucose isomerase; various bacteria.
21CFR184.1388 - lactase; Kluyveromyces lactis
21CFR184.1685 - chymosin; nonpathogenic Escherichia coli
21CFR184.1924 - urease (wine); Lactobacillus fermentum
21CFR173.110 - amyloglucosidase; Rhizopus niveus
21CFR173.120 - carbohydratase/cellulase; Aspergillus niger
21CFR173.130 - carbohydratase; Rhizopus oryzae
21CFR173.135 - catalase; Micrococcus lysodeikticus
21CFR173.140 - esterase/lipase; Mucor miehei
21CFR173.145 - alpha-galactosidase; Mortierella vinaceae
21CFR173.150 - milk-clotting enzymes; various bacteria.
21CFR173.160 - aqueous citric acid fermentation; Candida
                   quilliermondii
21CFR173.165 - citric acid fermentation from normal alkanes
                   (paraffins); Candida lipolytica
```

Note that the last item in this list is the bacterium that ferments paraffins to citric acid. In previous discussions the NOSB considered this process synthetic and non-allowable. In contrast, the bacterium listed just before this one ferments carbohydrate to citric acid. The NOSB deemed this citric acid process acceptable for an ingredient in organic foods. This reviewer previously judged citric acid produced by aqueous fermentation to be natural.

Note that enzymes of plant and animal origin also are used in food (e.g., papain and rennet, respective examples).

It is the position of this TAP reviewer that no universal recommendation can be made for the class "bacterial enzymes." Specific bacterial preparations differ technically from each other; each must be evaluated on its individual characteristics.

This file is due back to us by: Aug. 5, 1996				
			mold/fungal, y ca.	st
	iewer Name:	JOE Montecalvo	RECEIVED AUG 0 5 1996	
	opriate)	Synthetic or non-synt	•	otu:)
	If synthetic, how	ained from Natural organisms is the material made? (pleas bio-Engineered - Should Not b	e answer here if our database	
	then dehydrated t		Extracellular Enzymes in broth culture which wateral Coryanic Cormost the Enzymeproper	
This	material shou	ald be added to the	National List as:	
	Synthetic	Allowed Cifpunified with	Prohibited Natural	
			ent in organic food) only if he NAlus	RAL DONNET
		thetic (Allowed as a processi		TOCKY
Are plac	there any use ed on this ma	restrictions or limita	on the National List is bional tions that should be all List? There chemical modification for treatments	·
	VCI. MANINE LINE	inches have by med south to Cate	THER CHEM CIET THOUT (TENTON) OR TREATHER	16 7 4
Plea	very general -	he accuracy of the infor	mation in the file:	
Any	additional co	mments? (attachment	s welcomed)	
+	his is a very diff purified indifferer	icult one to Evaluate becaust navs. Manu (actually pro	ice the endumes can be Evienctal airectic Critical Cor its Caturgory place	nd Ement
Do y	ou have a comm	ergial interest in this ma	iterial? Yes;No	
	nature <u>//</u> //////////////////////////////////	In Malering D.		

Please address the 7 criteria in the Organic Foods Production Act: (comment in those areas you feel are applicable)

(1) the potential of such substances for detrimental chemical interactions with oth	ıer
materials used in organic farming systems;	

nonc

(2) the toxicity and mode of action of the substance and of its breakdown products or any contaminants, and their persistence and areas of concentration in the environment;

MONE

(3) the probability of environmental contamination during manufacture, use, misuse or disposal of such substance;

porce

(4) the effect of the substance on human health;

Morif.

- (5) the effects of the substance on biological and chemical interactions in the agroecosystem, including the physiological effects of the substance on soil organisms (including the salt index and solubility of the soil), crops and livestock;
- (6) the alternatives to using the substance in terms of practices or other available materials; and not many other choices, Critical Issue is how many other and prepared.
- (7) its compatibility with a system of sustainable agriculture.

 only is rytended in Natural Corm.

This file is due back to us by: Aug. 5,1996
Name of Material: Enzymes: mold/fungal, yeas
Reviewer Name: William A- Zimmer D.V.M.RECTIVED JUL 3
Is this substance Synthetic or non-synthetic? Explain (if appropriate) Non Synthetic. If synthetic, how is the material made? (please answer here if our database form is blank)
This material should be added to the National List as: Synthetic Allowed Prohibited Natural
Synthetic Allowed Prohibited Natural
or, Non-synthetic (Allowed as an ingredient in organic food) Non-synthetic (Allowed as a processing aid for organic food)
or, \swarrow this material should not be on the National List
Are there any use restrictions or limitations that should be placed on this material on the National List? Natural fermentation products should not need to be on list, but genetically engineered sources of enzymes meet prohibited status due to wide availability of naturally produced sources Please comment on the accuracy of the information in the file: I imited to frocessing.
Any additional comments? (attachments welcomed) Uses - feed additive, digestion of animal, human feeds. Production, performance improvements.
Do you have a commercial interest in this material? Yes; No
Signature William Office 1 18 - 96

Please address the 7 criteria in the Organic Foods Production Act: (comment in those areas you feel are applicable)

(1) the potential of such substances for detrimental chemical interactions with other materials used in organic farming systems;

None under nomal conditions

- (2) the toxicity and mode of action of the substance and of its breakdown products or any contaminants, and their persistence and areas of concentration in the environment;

 One will assume contains
- (3) the probability of environmental contamination during manufacture, use, misuse or disposal of such substance;
- (4) the effect of the substance on human health;

susitive effects on digestion, pysiological processes.

- (5) the effects of the substance on biological and chemical interactions in the agroecosystem, including the physiological effects of the substance on soil organisms (including the salt index and solubility of the soil), crops and livestock;

 I we have improved digestive organism performance, ingroved feel upilizables
- (6) the alternatives to using the substance in terms of practices or other available materials; and

 materials forms are common limit organic use to these natural

forms/sources as chemical or reumbinant DNG sources.

(7) its compatibility with a system of sustainable agriculture.

Compatible

NOSB Materials Database

<u>Identification</u>

Common Name

Enzymes: mold/fungal, yeast

Chemical Name

Other Names

Code #: CAS

Code #: Other

N. L. Category

Non-agricultural

MSDS

o yes ⊚ no

Chemistry

Family

Composition

Biologically active proteins which are sometimes conjugated with metals, carbohydrates and/or lipids. Whole cells, parts of cells, or cell-free extracts.

Properties

Activity measured according to reaction catalyzed by individual enzymes.

How Made

Derived from microbial sources by controlled fermentation: Carbohydrase from Aspergillus niger var., Aspergillus oryzae var., Rhizopus oryzae var., Saccharomyces species, or Trichoderma reesei var.; Carbohydrase & Protease mixed from Bacillus licheniformis and Bacillus subtilis; Catalase from Aspergillus niger var., and Micrococcus lysodeikticus; Glucose isomerase from Actinoplanes missouriensis and many others; Glucose Oxidase from Aspergillus niger var.; Lipase from Aspergillus niger var. and Aspergillus oryzae var., Protease from Aspergillus niger var., and Aspergillus oryzae var.; and Rennet (Microbial) from Endothia parasitica and Mucor species. A few may be genetically engineered.

Type of Use

Processing

<u>Use/Action</u>

Specific Use(s)

Carbohydrase: preparation of starch syrups, alcohol, beer, fruit juices, chocolate syrups, bakery products, liquid coffee, wine, dextrose, dairy products, candy and ice cream; Pectinase: clarification of wines and fruit juices. Catalase: manufacture of cheese; Glucose isomerase: manufacture of high fructose corn syrup; Glucose Oxidase: removal of sugar from liquid eggs, deoxygenation of citrus beverages; Lipase: hydrolysis of lipids (fish oil concentrates); Protease: chillproofing of beer, bakery products, meat tenderizing, production of protein hydrolysates; and Rennet: manufacture of cheese.

Action

Enzymes as biocatalysts accelerate the rate of specific chemical reactions. Each

enzyme is highly specific as to the reaction it effects.

Combinations

<u>Status</u>

OFPA

N. L. Restriction EPA, FDA, etc

Directions

Safety Guidelines

Historical status InternationI status

NOSB Materials Database OFPA Criteria

2119(m)1: chemical interactions

2119(m)2: toxicity & persistence

2119(m)3: manufacture & disposal consequences

Some enzymes are genetically engineered and such sources will become more common. Rennet (chymosin) is available as genetically engineered, as natural microbial enzyme, and as extract from calf stomach. (ST).

2119(m)4: effect on human health

None, because they are naturally present in foods. Used in tiny amounts; easily digested.

2119(m)5: agroecosystem biology

2119(m)6: alternatives to substance

Usually alternative is natural fermentation but this is not always possible to use. Some enzymes have chemical alternatives, although the chemicals are not as specific and not as easily controlled.

2119(m)7: Is it compatible?

References

AU: Valjakka,-T.T.; Ponte,-J.G.-Jr.; Kulp,-K.

TI: Studies on a raw-starch digesting enzyme. I. Comparison to fungal and bacterial enzymes and an emulsifier in white pan bread.

SO: Cereal-chem. St. Paul, Minn.: American Association of Cereal Chemists, 1924-. Mar/Apr 1994. v. 71 (2) p. 139-144. CN: DNAL 59.8-C33

SO: International Conference on UHT Processing and Aseptic Packaging of Milk and Milk Products, November 27-29, 1979: proceedings / sponsored by Department of Food Science, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, and Dairy Research, Inc., U.D.I.A. International Conference on UHT Processing and Aseptic Packaging of Milk and Milk Products, November 27-29, 1979: proceedings / sponsored by Department of Food Science,