Government and scientific bodies around the globe have extensively evaluated the weight of scientific evidence on bisphenol A (BPA) and have declared that BPA is safe as used, including in materials that come into contact with food, such as reusable food-storage containers and linings in metal cans.

Government agencies that have recently ruled on BPA safety include:

- German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (February 2015)
- European Food Safety Authority (January 2015)
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration (November 2014)
- Hong Kong Centre for Food Safety (January 2013)
- Health Canada (September 2012)
- Food Standards Australia New Zealand (April 2012)
- Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (December 2011)
- Japanese National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (July 2011)
- European Union (June 2008)

Safety of BPA Confirmed by Government Agencies and Scientific Experts

**European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)**

In January 2015, following a comprehensive re-evaluation of BPA exposure and toxicity, EFSA’s scientific experts concluded that “BPA poses no health risk to consumers of any age group (including unborn children, infants and adolescents) at current exposure levels.” Going beyond previous assessments, EFSA evaluated exposure to BPA not only from food, but also from a range of other potential sources.

**U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**

In November 2014, the FDA updated its assessment of BPA. The FDA’s current perspective, based on its most recent safety assessment, is that BPA is safe at the current levels occurring in foods. In another recent update, the FDA answered the question “Is BPA Safe?” with a clear answer - “Yes.”
Health Canada

In September 2012, Health Canada released an updated assessment of BPA. Experts concluded that “current dietary exposure to BPA through food packaging uses is not expected to pose a health risk to the general population, including newborns and young children.”

Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ)

In April 2012, FSANZ, an independent statutory agency responsible for setting food standards in the two countries, reaffirmed the safety of BPA and stated: “The weight of scientific evidence indicates that exposure to BPA in food does not present a significant human health and safety issue at current exposure levels.”

World Health Organization (WHO) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

In September 2011, an international panel of experts organized by WHO and FAO released a report on their review of all the latest scientific evidence on BPA and concluded that “initiation of public health measures would be premature.” The experts also concluded that BPA does not accumulate in the body, is rapidly eliminated in urine, and that it is difficult to interpret the relevance of studies claiming adverse health effects from BPA.

Japanese National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST)

In July 2011, AIST concluded that “the risk of BPA with regard to human health was believed to be very small.” This conclusion is consistent with AIST’s previous 2005 BPA risk assessment. Of note, in its 2011 assessment, the data uncertainty factor was reduced to 25 as compared to 100 in the previous assessment, indicating higher confidence in the scientific data supporting the 2011 conclusion.

Advisory Committee of the German Society for Toxicology

In its April 2011 review published in Critical Reviews in Toxicology, the Advisory Committee concluded, that “BPA exposure represents no noteworthy risk to the health of the human population, including newborns and babies.” After reviewing all available evidence and controversial arguments, the Committee concluded that the “current Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) level for BPA is adequately justified.” In its specific evaluation of studies reporting that low doses of BPA cause adverse health effects in laboratory animals, the Committee found that these studies “failed to meet minimal quality criteria for experimental design and statistical analysis” and that their results were inconsistent with more robust studies on similar endpoints.