



Contact Us

If you would like to become a AONH Member, upgrade to the Elite Membership, or register for our Annual Natural Health Care Conference, please email:

info@aonh.org or call
202-505-AONH (2664)

Upcoming Events

• AONH Monthly Webinar, Wed., Feb 13, 2013 at 8 pm EST/7 pm CST

AONH Members will receive an email invitation to join us for the AONH Monthly Webinar. Chad Turner, Natural Health Advocate, speaks on *“Addressing ADD & ADHD with Super-Foods-Detox the Body and Supercharge the Brain!”*



• AONH Monthly Webinar, Wed., March 13, 2013 at 8 pm EST/7 pm CST

AONH Members will receive an email invitation to join us for the AONH Monthly Webinar. Ellie Campbell, DO, energetic, practical and informational speaker shares her knowledge on *“Metabolic Syndrome: Gender Differences and Conventional vs Integrative Management”*



• AONH Annual Natural Health Care Conference, Nov. 7-9, 2013

The AONH Annual Conference joins health care advocates and providers for an enlightening program geared to the up-to-date natural health care practitioner. Registration for the event is normally \$350. **AONH ELITE MEMBERS \$250, SELECT MEMBERS \$280, ASSOCIATE MEMBERS \$315, NON-AONH MEMBERS \$350.** Registration Required. Event will be held in the Douglasville, Georgia.



ISSUE

04

FEB
2013

QUARTERLY
JOURNAL OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF
NATURAL HEALTH

AONH NEWS

this issue

Draft Guidance

GMP Under Scrutiny **P.1**

Support the Issue **P.2**

AONH Annual Conference **P.3**



The Mission of Your Association

AONH is dedicated to public education and the professional development of natural health care around the world. Our aim is to unite our like minded members and speak as one voice and with one purpose.

Getting Involved

Associate, Select, and Elite Memberships are available.

For further information on benefits you or your company can receive, please register for membership by visiting: www.aonh.org

Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) Under Scrutiny

It seems the FDA has shifted its attention. It was firmly on the proposed New Dietary Ingredient (NDI) Draft Guidance and now appears to be tackling good manufacturing practices (GMP) violations in the supplement industry.

Director of the FDA's Division of Dietary Supplement Programs, Dr. Daniel Fabricant, stated *“the FDA conducted 175 GMP inspections in 2011, more than double the 84 conducted in the previous year.”* Field inspections are only expected to increase as the agency targets GMP violators. Numerous warning letters have been issued to manufacturers failing to meet set standards. Such inspections may be the first step in clearing the name of responsible manufacturers. This is a positive step in holding manufacturers accountable. The media has tarnished the industry with blanket statements based on a few instances specific to certain manufacturers' violations. John Shaw, executive director of the Natural Products Association

stated, *“We face a constant barrage of media stories questioning the benefits of our products. We must anticipate news cycles and seize teachable moments in the media to drive our overall agenda (1).”*



Last year's FDA's acceptance to revise its draft guidance was met by the natural products manufacturing community with gratifying relief. They welcomed this action praising it as a partial victory in response to the concerns the draft raised initially. The verbiage was full of conflicting terminology and extremely



108 Buchanan St. N.
Bremen, GA 30110
ph 202-505-AONH
info@aonh.org
www.aonh.org



How Can You Support these Issues?

As this issue clearly shows, the future of natural supplements is in the balance. Perhaps the single most important thing a US citizen can do is write their state senator stating their support of natural health care. If you don't know who your representative is, or what his/her email is, go to: <http://www.house.gov/representatives/find/> Let them know what's on your mind and how they can help you!

You can make a difference by forwarding this newsletter and these links to all that you know. Be part of this most important of grass-roots movements.

* With regard to fighting the FRANKENFISH (Legalization of genetically modified Salmon): The public has until **FEB 26th to SEND COMMENTS TO THE FDA.** <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/ContactFDA/default.htm>



general definitions, which is why many such as Loren Israelsen, director of the United Natural Products Alliance (UNPA) believe determining the accurate definition is key to resolving industry concerns (1). Starting with the term new dietary ingredient (NDI) and whether it applies to a single substance or a finished product. While the FDA's revision to the supplement draft guidance is completed, related topics are at the forefront of local and international agendas.

Last month the Alliance of Natural Health represented US consumers at the International Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses in Germany. The Codex is an international guideline, or accepted model, that will likely be followed by federal agencies, on a global scale, as they develop their own regulations in their respective countries. The meeting raised several issues including mandatory labeling of Genetic Modified Organisms (GMOs) and retention of access to dietary supplements in high-nutrient-level dosages. During this meeting, committee members emphasized language indicating that food prevents disease is forbidden –and they are opposed to claims that may “mislead” even if the claim is true (5). The US delegation disagreed, stating, “While we have similar policies about food claims, by definition the nutrients in food prevent nutrient-related diseases (5)”.

The Codex committee adopted extremely low nutrient reference values for labeling purposes. These are far too

low to be effective in preventing disease, according to most natural health experts, with even higher nutrient values needed to optimize health. It was stressed, the actual values weren't important because they are “just for labeling purposes.” This of course, matters to us in terms of how it resonates with supplement dosage regulation. Whether or not the US adopts these values is to be determined at a future time, but differing values would create trade barriers between nations.

While a country may not be obligated to adopt a Codex standard into domestic law international trade pressures from powerful countries create political and economic pressure to do so. Access to high-level nutrients is not equal in all nations, but restricted to developed nations.

GMO acceptance is varied across borders, as some nations are more receptive to admission of such on store shelves. As of now, a decision on banning, or allowing, GMOs was not reached for “lack of science” though there were many to voice their support for GMOs. Europe is not as GMO-friendly as the US, and this in itself already impedes trade. As such, setting up an international gold standard for labeling GMOs is a significant challenge.

Last November proposition 37 was defeated by California voters as big firms including Monsanto, Nestle, Hershey, among others, raised \$46 million to fund opposition campaigns arguing mandatory labeling would hurt the economy by raising food prices. Four corporations headquartered in Minnesota funded opposition to California's proposition 37: General Mills, Inc. (\$519,401.17), Hormel Foods

Corporation (\$374,300.00), Cargail, Inc. (\$202,229.36) and Land-O-Lakes, Inc. (\$21,513.78). This January, Minnesota lobbyists will request legislators to mandate products containing GMOs to be labeled accordingly (2).

Efforts requiring GMO labeling have been rekindled after last year's initial rejection of a bill that would have required labeling for genetically modified food in a similar initiative in the state of Washington. Advocates of labeling requirements say the products have been a concern, in part, because the inserted DNA sometimes comes from animals, bacteria and viruses, not plants. Even plant sources pose a risk as cross-pollination from GMO plants to non-GMO crops could potentially lead to genetic mutations (3). If Washington's initiative (I-522) were rejected, it would be sent to the general ballot or pass an alternative, which would send both the initiative and the alternative to voters later this year (6).

There is clear evidence of growing pressure in vocal support of mandatory GMO labeling. This is largely because it is in the best economic interests of states in which unlabeled GMO wheat, apples and salmon could damage agricultural exports to countries that either forbid or require GMO labeling. Despite public opposition to genetically engineered salmon (the fish is designed to grow five times faster than normal and could be linked to food allergies!) the FDA announced in late December it would allow its commercialization.

In Alaska, GMO salmon must be labeled due to a state law passed in 2005. This exemplifies the impact voters can have on their state legislatures and perhaps the beginning of a ripple effect to neighboring states that might adopt the same policies thereby increasing the pressure on a national level.



Annual AONH Natural Healthcare Conference Registration Now Open

AONH MEMBERS ARE GIVEN A SOLID DISCOUNT ON UPCOMING AONH CONFERENCE

DATE: NOVEMBER 7-9, 2013 THURSDAY-SATURDAY
LOCATION: DOUGLASVILLE, GA
COST: SPECIAL DISCOUNT PRICING

AONH ELITE MEMBERS \$250
SELECT MEMBERS \$280
ASSOCIATE MEMBERS \$315
NON-AONH MEMBERS \$350

An amazing program is already shaping up for those who choose to be a part of the AONH Annual Natural Health Care Conference.



HOW DO YOU JOIN?

Act today!

Email us at info@aonh.org or call 202-505-AONH (2664)

Your membership is yearly and entitles you to many benefits.

Cover Article References

1. <<http://www.nutraingredients-usa.com/On-your-radar/NDI-draft-guidance/FDA-We-re-not-enforcing-NDI-draft-guidance-GMPs-are-the-biggest-issue>>
2. “GMO Labeling Debate...” KMSP-TV. N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.
3. <http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2020044923_gmo03m.html>
4. <<http://www.npainfo.org/NPA/Events/PAMarketPlace2012.aspx>>
5. “Related Articles.” The Alliance for Natural Health USA. N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.
6. “State May Vote on GMO Labeling.” Spokesman.com. N.p., n.d. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.