When the Microbiome Becomes a Regulatory Endpoint

From EFSA's November 2026 scientific colloquium to defensible safety assessment of food ingredients, microbial technologies and chemical exposures

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

Biotechnology & Regulatory Science

Abstract

The European Food Safety Authority's scientific colloquium scheduled for 23–24 November 2026 places the microbiome at a difficult regulatory boundary. Gut microbial communities can modify chemical exposure, respond to food additives and contaminants, and mediate biological effects, yet their measurement is not equivalent to demonstrating harm or benefit. This article examines why taxonomic shifts, metagenomic signatures and metabolite changes cannot automatically serve as safety endpoints; how study design, causality, dose and host context determine interpretability; and what manufacturers of functional ingredients, fermentation products and food-processing technologies should do now. It distinguishes scientific debate from enforceable law and compares European Union, Spanish, British and United States pathways. A proposed research programme links-controlled perturbation experiments, exposure reconstruction, functional microbial readouts and preregistered decision criteria. Its purpose is not to market a new microbiome claim but to define when microbial evidence can genuinely improve a risk assessment without generating spurious regulatory obligations or unsupported health claims.

Keywords: *gut microbiome; regulatory toxicology; food additives; metagenomics; microbial metabolites; causal inference; novel foods; risk assessment*.

1. A timely scientific signal, not a new legal requirement

On 23–24 November 2026, EFSA is convening Scientific Colloquium 29, "Decoding the Microbiome: From Knowledge Gaps to Actionable Regulatory Science", in Brussels. The announced agenda explicitly addresses chemical exposures, food and feed additives, contaminants, pesticides and complex microbial-community products. EFSA acknowledges that existing guidance was not developed around microbiome endpoints and that consistent methods and data remain insufficient [1]. As of 20 November, the event is prospective. Neither its announcement nor anticipated discussion constitutes a binding change to authorisation requirements.

The scientific issue is more consequential than whether a microbiome graph appears in a dossier. Regulatory risk assessment requires a chain of inference from a defined exposure to an adverse outcome, with uncertainty characterised and competing explanations tested. Microbial communities are simultaneously exposure modifiers, biological responders and possible mediators. A shift in abundance can therefore be a consequence, a cause, a compensatory response or an incidental correlate. Treating all such shifts as adverse would inflate false alarms; treating microbial changes as irrelevant would overlook plausible mechanisms.

2. What, precisely, is the biological object?

2.1 Composition is not function

A microbiome is not a single organism or a fixed biomarker. Stool-based 16S rRNA profiling reports taxonomic composition with primer and reference-database biases; shotgun metagenomics adds genomic potential but does not necessarily demonstrate expressed metabolic activity. Metatranscriptomics, metaproteomics and metabolomics approach function more directly, yet each brings sampling, stability, annotation and batch-effect problems. None of these measurements independently proves an adverse host outcome. A rise in a named genus may conceal strain-level differences in toxin production, substrate use or immune interaction.

Relative abundance data are compositional: a taxon can appear to increase because another decreased, even if its absolute cell count is unchanged. Sequencing depth, DNA extraction, contamination, medication, age, geography, diet and stool consistency can all shift results. Absolute quantification, appropriate controls, repeated sampling and transparent bioinformatic pipelines are therefore indispensable when interpreting a treatment-associated signal [2,3].

2.2 The host cannot be edited out

Microbial effects are conditional on host physiology. A short-chain fatty-acid signal that accompanies beneficial fibre fermentation in one setting may not translate into an equivalent effect in patients with altered gut transit, inflammatory disease or different baseline diets. Interindividual heterogeneity is not merely statistical noise; it can represent biologically distinct exposure-response pathways. Regulatory studies must specify the population to which their conclusions are intended to apply.

3. The causality problem in ingredient safety

A credible causal claim requires more than a statistically significant beta-diversity difference. It should establish exposure chronology, dose-dependence where biologically expected analytical reproducibility, plausible mechanisms and an association with host-relevant endpoints. Randomised feeding trials can test intervention effects, but even randomisation does not establish that the microbiome mediates a host outcome. Mediation analysis requires strong assumptions; microbiota transfer experiments may support mechanistic hypotheses while introducing species-transfer limitations.

An adverse effect must also be defined. Lower microbial diversity is not universally harmful; diversity can increase with pathogen carriage or under ecological disturbance. The absence of a universal “healthy microbiome” reference range makes arbitrary diversity thresholds unsuitable as stand-alone safety limits. More defensible endpoints may involve demonstrable loss of colonisation

resistance, pathogen expansion with clinical consequences, formation of toxic metabolites, altered xenobiotic conversion or reproducible host inflammation, each under specified conditions [2,4].

The key distinction is between a biological observation and a decision-relevant adverse outcome. For a new food ingredient, a microbiome shift may justify targeted follow-up without being sufficient either to prohibit use or to establish a health benefit. Conversely, no detected shift in a small short-term study cannot rule out rare, delayed or subgroup-specific effects.

4. Microbial biotransformation changes the exposure calculation

Classical dietary exposure assessment often begins with the ingested parent compound. Microbial metabolism can modify its chemical identity, persistence and systemic availability, creating metabolites with different toxicological properties. Conversely, ingredients can change microbial enzyme expression and thereby alter the fate of other dietary chemicals. This creates two-directional causation: the ingredient affects the community, and the community affects the ingredient.

For safety dossiers, the relevant question is not whether “the microbiome is affected” but whether the resulting chemical exposure to host tissues changes materially. A robust programme would pair parent-compound mass balance with targeted metabolite identification, time-resolved measurements and physiologically relevant concentrations. In vitro fermentation can screen plausible pathways but cannot independently reproduce absorption, hepatic metabolism, immune responses or the full ecology of the intestine. Human confirmation is essential for consequential translational claims.

An ingredient supplier should distinguish exposure under intended use from exaggerated concentrations used to force an in vitro signal. High-dose microbial inhibition may be experimentally real but irrelevant to normal consumption. Equally, a weak average effect can obscure a sensitive subpopulation. Study protocols should therefore justify realistic intestinal concentrations, food-matrix effects and anticipated daily intake.

5. Functional foods, fermentation and the temptation of unsupported claims

Fermented ingredients, prebiotic substrates, postbiotic preparations and microbial-derived metabolites can all interact with gut ecology. They are not interchangeable categories. A live microbial product introduces viability, identity and possibly antimicrobial-resistance considerations; a purified metabolite raises chemical identity and exposure questions; a complex fermentation biomass requires compositional and manufacturing characterisation. A fibre that is selectively utilised by microorganisms does not automatically improve health in every formulation or population.

Regulatory and commercial claims must be separated. A reproducible rise in a microbial metabolite is not itself evidence that a finished food prevents disease, strengthens immunity or treats dysbiosis. Claims require the evidence standard applicable to the jurisdiction and the exact wording. In the European Union, Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 governs nutrition and health claims; safety under novel-food legislation and authorisation of a health claim are distinct questions [5,6].

This matters commercially because microbiome-associated marketing can outrun validated analytical science. The strongest innovation strategy is to identify a concrete, measurable functional endpoint, then test whether it translates into a meaningful host benefit at a realistic dose. Marketing language should follow the evidence, not dictate the experimental design.

6. Regulatory geography: four different decision environments

6.1 European Union and Spain

Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 establishes the novel-food framework where an ingredient falls within its scope, while Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 provides general food-safety principles. Food additives are governed by Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 and their applicable specifications and conditions of use. EFSA supplies scientific assessments; the European Commission and Member States perform their respective risk-management functions. A microbiome endpoint is not, by virtue of the November colloquium, a universal mandatory test for all existing ingredients [5–8].

In Spain, directly applicable EU legislation operates alongside national and autonomous-community official controls. Companies should document whether a material is a conventional ingredient, a novel food, an additive, a processing aid or another legally defined category. Microbiome data may strengthen a case where biologically relevant, but cannot replace identity, purity, toxicology, exposure or legally required authorisation. Nor should a research observation be converted into an implied AESAN endorsement.

6.2 Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Great Britain has its own regulated-products authorisation processes administered through the Food Standards Agency and Food Standards Scotland, with domestic legal measures and guidance requiring a separate check. EU scientific opinions can be relevant evidence without automatically determining the British legal position. Northern Ireland requires assessment under its applicable arrangements rather than being treated as legally identical to Great Britain [9].

6.3 United States

In the United States, FDA food-additive and generally recognised as safe (GRAS) pathways assess safety under intended conditions of use. The evidentiary question is whether available scientific information supports a reasonable certainty of no harm, not whether a product produces an attractive microbiome profile. Structure/function or disease-related claims may trigger additional labelling or product-classification issues. Microbiome studies should therefore be mapped to the actual safety or claim question rather than presented as an all-purpose substitute for the relevant regulatory framework [10].

7. Industrial consequences: a new quality of evidence, not a new universal assay

For ingredient and biotechnology manufacturers, the practical priority is an evidence inventory: intended use, population, realistic intake, production history, potential microbial interactions, existing toxicology and unresolved exposure pathways. Where a credible microbial mechanism exists, teams should decide in advance what result would change a safety or product-development decision. This avoids commissioning expensive sequencing that generates uninterpretable associations.

Analytical laboratories should specify collection conditions, stabilisation, extraction methods, spike-in or absolute-abundance approaches, sequencing controls, database versions, metabolite quantification and blinded quality assessment. Data scientists should report batch effects, multiple-testing correction, model calibration and external validation. Procurement and regulatory teams should preserve batch identity and formulation comparability so that biological findings can be linked to the marketed product rather than an obsolete research sample.

For INTABIOTECH's broad functional-ingredient, protein and fermentation-related domains, the credible opportunity is collaborative, application-specific research into ingredient–microbial metabolism–host exposure relationships. It would be premature to assert any particular product benefit or safety advantage without controlled evidence. The industrial value lies in making future development decisions better informed, not in attaching a microbiome narrative to every ingredient.

8. Research & Innovation Opportunity

8.1 The narrower research gap

Microbiome sequencing, gut fermentation models, causal-inference methods and metabolomics are mature research fields, and extensive prior art exists. The gap proposed here is narrower: can an independently benchmarked decision framework determine when a reproducible microbiome perturbation materially changes a food-ingredient safety conclusion? This is an integrative validation problem, not a claim to have invented microbiome toxicology. A systematic literature, standards and patent/public-disclosure review would be required before claiming a proprietary method.

8.2 Hypothesis and experimental architecture

Hypothesis (unvalidated): a tiered model combining realistic ingredient exposure, absolute microbial measurements, microbial functional readouts, targeted biotransformation products and predefined host-relevant outcomes will classify decision-relevant effects more reliably than relative-abundance sequencing alone. The rationale is that causal inference improves when exposure, mechanism and consequence are measured together. Its predictive performance is unknown.

Stage one should select contrasting ingredient classes, as fermentable substrates, defined microbial metabolites and chemically characterised processing-derived materials, and of course, to establish baseline chemical and microbiological comparability. Stage two should use standardised anaerobic fermentation systems and independent laboratories to identify reproducible candidate pathways at realistic concentrations. Stage three should test a limited set of prespecified hypotheses in appropriately designed human or animal studies where ethically and scientifically justified. Stage four should prospectively compare blinded regulatory-expert decisions made with conventional evidence versus the integrated evidence package.

Failure criteria must be defined in advance: high false-positive rates from compositional artifacts, missed adverse metabolite formation, non-replicating signals, instability across laboratories or an inability to distinguish a harmless community shift from a host-relevant effect. Uncertainty should be reported explicitly, with negative results published. No algorithm can grant an authorisation or replace a legally required study; competent authorities determine whether evidence is sufficient.

8.3 Potential industrial output

A successful outcome would be a transparent study-selection protocol, a reference dataset and a map of circumstances in which microbiome testing is informative, optional or misleading. This could reduce both unnecessary testing and the risk of overlooking meaningful microbial biotransformation. It would also support better-defined collaboration between ingredient developers, analytical laboratories, clinical researchers and regulatory scientists. The proposal remains a research agenda, not a validated commercial platform.

9. A practical 2027 implementation agenda

First, classify existing product dossiers by the plausible role of microbial metabolism, the degree of chemical characterisation and the intended consumer population. Second, select only a small number of high-value case studies where a microbial mechanism could plausibly alter exposure or benefit–risk assessment. Third, preregister measurement plans, endpoints and criteria for interpreting positive and negative results. Fourth, build a version-controlled evidence register connecting product batches, protocols, laboratory data and jurisdiction-specific legal reviews.

Management should resist a familiar error: turning a new scientific capability into a compulsory marketing metric before its decision value is established. The appropriate KPI is not the number of microbiome profiles generated, but the proportion of meaningful development or safety questions resolved with reproducible evidence. Stronger science may reveal that some products do not require microbiome testing at all.

10. Conclusions

EFSA's November 2026 colloquium is important because it exposes a mismatch between the biological sophistication of microbiome research and the evidentiary discipline required for food regulation. A microbiome signal is not synonymous with an adverse effect, a beneficial effect or an enforceable legal endpoint. The scientific task is to connect realistic exposure, microbial function and host consequence through reproducible causal evidence.

For industry, the priority is disciplined study selection and transparent uncertainty, not generic microbiome claims. For regulators, the challenge is to develop proportionate criteria without importing unvalidated ecological indicators into binding decisions. For researchers, the most valuable advance may be a validated method for knowing when microbiome evidence changes the answer—and when it does not.

References and primary sources

[1] EFSA (2026). Scientific Colloquium 29: Decoding the Microbiome: From Knowledge Gaps to Actionable Regulatory Science, 23–24 November 2026. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/events/scientific-colloquium-29-decoding-microbiome-knowledge-gaps-actionable-regulatory-science

[2] Knight R et al. (2018). Best practices for analysing microbiomes. Nature Reviews Microbiology 16, 410–422. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-018-0029-9

[3] Gloor GB et al. (2017). Microbiome datasets are compositional: and this is not optional. Frontiers in Microbiology 8, 2224. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.02224

[4] Johnson AJ et al. (2019). Daily sampling reveals personalized diet-microbiome associations in humans. Cell Host & Microbe 25, 789–802.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2019.05.005

[5] Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 on novel foods. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2015/2283/oj

[6] Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2006/1924/oj

[7] Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 laying down general food law principles. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj

[8] Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 on food additives. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2008/1333/oj

[9] UK Food Standards Agency. Regulated products authorisation guidance and register. https://www.food.gov.uk/business-guidance/regulated-products

[10] US FDA. Generally Recognized as Safe (GRAS). https://www.fda.gov/food/food-ingredients-packaging/generally-recognized-safe-gras

[11] EFSA (2026). Food additives: scientific assessment and regulatory context, reviewed 27 October 2026. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/food-additives

[12] European Commission (2026). Re-evaluation of food additives, status as of 10 September 2026. https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/food-improvement-agents/additives/re-evaluation_en

Evidence classification: the EFSA event and current legal frameworks are documented institutional facts; analytical limitations are supported by established methodological literature; the proposed integrated decision architecture is expert interpretation and an unvalidated research hypothesis. Source review date: 20 November 2026.

© 2026 José M. López. All rights reserved.