

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE:

Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME: Tel. 57971 Telex: 610181 FAO I. Cables Foodagri

ALINORM 81/19

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Fourteenth Session

Geneva, 29 June-10 July 1981

REPORT OF THE TWELFTH SESSION

OF THE

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE

Innsbruck, 16-20 March 1981

INTRODUCTION

1. The Twelfth Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe was held in Innsbruck by courtesy of the Government of Austria. The meeting was chaired by Professor Dr. H. Woidich, the Coordinator for Europe.
2. Min.Rat Dr. Werner Thumser opened the session on behalf of Dr. Kurt Steyrer, Federal Minister for Health and Environment. He highlighted the work of the Committee and in particular its importance as a forum to discuss the harmonization of food standards and food control matters in countries of the Codex region of Europe.
3. The delegates received also a warm welcome to Innsbruck from Dr. A. Lugger, Lord Mayor of the City of Innsbruck who spoke on behalf of the Region of Tyrol and the City of Innsbruck.
4. The Committee observed a minute of silence in memory of Dr. Elisabeth Hufnagel from the Fed. Rep. of Germany who had been a very active member of the Committee.
5. The meeting was attended by delegations of the following 18 countries: Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Fed. Rep. of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, USSR and Yugoslavia. Observers were also present from Algeria, Mexico and Saudi Arabia and from the following international organizations: European Committee for the Study of Salt (CEES); European Economic Community (EEC) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO). The list of participants, including officers from FAO and WHO, is attached as Appendix I to this report.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

6. The Committee unanimously adopted the Agenda of the meeting. The Chairman briefly outlined which methods of analysis and hygiene provisions for the European Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters had to be finalized. In view of the highly specialized nature of these matters he proposed to establish an ad hoc Working Group which should examine the documentation on methods of analysis in the light of the deliberations of the 11th Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and elaborate a revised section of methods of analysis for inclusion in the standard. The Working Group should also be requested to consider any further work on the hygiene section of the mineral water standard and on the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collecting, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters which is being under

elaboration by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The Committee agreed with the Chairman's proposal and established the Working Group consisting of members of a number of delegations (for details see para. 120). It was further agreed that the Working Group should report back to the Committee under Agenda Item 9(d).

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE

7. The Committee had before it document CX/EURO.81/2, Part I, which briefly indicated matters arising from the Commission and other Codex Committees which were of interest to this Committee. It was pointed out that those matters which required a more detailed action by the Committee would be considered under the appropriate agenda items and in particular under item 9.

8. The Committee was informed that the Commission at its 13th Session had extended the amendments of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards to cover economic impact statements in connection with the elaboration of Codex regional standards. It was pointed out that these statements could be submitted at any step of the above procedure and that the Secretariat had been instructed to include an appropriate note into those Circular Letters which requested government comments on draft standards.

9. The Committee was further informed that the Commission had examined nutritional aspects related to food standards and its work in general. It was noted that the Commission had agreed (a) to place on its agenda as a standing item a review of the nutritional aspects of the Food Standards Programme (b) to request its subsidiary bodies to consider as the need arose, nutritional aspects in drawing up standards, particularly foods having a significant role in the diets of developing countries and (c) to carry out, through a consultant, a study of the nutritional impact of the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission. The Committee noted the mandate contained in (b) and agreed to give, when considering the draft standards on the agenda, attention to these nutritional aspects. The Committee further noted that the study mentioned under (c) would be available for discussion at the forthcoming (14th) Session of the Commission.

10. The Committee noted that the Code of Ethics for the International Trade in Food had been finalized by the Committee on General Principles and subsequently adopted by the Commission. The Secretariat briefly outlined the importance of the Code in international trade, in particular for countries which had not yet developed a very comprehensive food law and food control services, and for all countries with regard to their food exports which were not always covered by the regulations of the national food legislation. The Code was in the course of being published under reference CAC/RS 108-79.

11. The Committee was informed that the Commission had agreed with the texts which had been proposed to allow for a uniform wording relating to the carry-over principle in the food additives section in Codex standards and with the proposed definition of processing aids. The Commission had also decided, based on advice of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, that processing aids and additives carried-over under para. 3 of the principle need not be declared on the label. The Committee agreed to have regard to these decisions when considering the draft standards for fermentation vinegar and mayonnaise and mayonnaise-like products.

12. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the revision of the Guidelines on Date Marking of Prepackaged Foods for Use of Codex Committees which had been carried out by the Committee on Food Labelling and submitted for adoption to the 14th Session of the Commission. It was noted that these guidelines were intended to apply to the work of all Codex Committees and that it was expected that the appropriate provisions would also be included in the revised General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. Of importance were new precise

instructions to Committees concerning the expression of certain types of date marking (date of minimum durability) and its relation to the shelflife of the products concerned.

13. The Committee was informed that the Committee on Food Additives had given further consideration to the development of sampling plans for the determination of contaminants. The Committee on Food Additives had emphasized the complex nature of this matter and therefore decided to examine at its next session the different possible procedures on the basis of a comprehensive working paper. However, the Committee on Food Additives had already agreed that (Commodity) Committees in conjunction with CCMAS should be responsible for the elaboration of such sampling plans having regard to the conclusions which are expected to be reached by the Committee on Food Additives at its next session.

14. The delegation of Poland recalled that the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables had distributed a questionnaire on contaminant levels in canned fruits and vegetables and expressed the view that it would be very useful to have the paper on sampling plans, mentioned above, distributed as soon as possible, in order to enable governments to include the proposed sampling plans as guidelines in the study of contaminants which was carried out in various countries.

15. The Committee was informed that the Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products had commenced its work and held its first Session in March 1980. The Committee had examined comprehensive data on the major cereals and cereal products and drawn up its programme of work, which includes at present standards for maize grains, maize meals and grits and wheat flour. For a number of products (rolled oats, sorghum and millet products, milled rice and semolina) more information was needed before a conclusion could be reached whether standards should be elaborated for these products. With regard to composite products, further consideration should be given to this matter at a later date. It was pointed out by the Secretariat that some of these compound products had been mentioned at previous sessions of this Committee in connection with its future work programme. The Committee agreed to further discuss the conclusions of the Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products under "Other Business" (see paras 149-150).

WHO ACTIVITIES, COMPLEMENTARY TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

16. The WHO representative reported on some recent WHO activities which might be of interest to the Committee.

17. A survey on food safety services in Europe has been prepared by the WHO Regional Office for Europe ^{1/}. The survey was used as background for the discussion on food control services and inspection systems in Europe (see para. 59).

18. A surveillance programme for control of foodborne infections and intoxications, organized jointly by the WHO Headquarters, the WHO Regional Office for Europe and the FAO/WHO collaborating Centre at the Robert von Ostertag Institute in Berlin (West), had started. The Centre collects information on outbreaks of foodborne disease and disseminates summaries and information to the participating countries (at present 15 European countries).

19. A Joint UNDP/WHO Mediterranean Zoonoses Control Programme with its centre in Athens, Greece, started work in February 1979.

^{1/} Copies in English and French are available on request from WHO Regional Office for Europe, Scherfigsvej 8, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark.

20. A round table conference on salmonella was organized by WHO and WAVFH (World Association for Veterinary Food Hygiene) in Bilthoven, the Netherlands, in October 1980.
21. A Working Group on health examinations of food handling personnel was held in Copenhagen in 1979 ^{1/}.
22. New WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality are being prepared and will be published by the end of 1981. They will replace the previous International Standards for Drinking Water and the European Standards for Drinking Water.
23. The WHO representative stressed that foodborne diseases continue to be an important cause of morbidity in Europe. Microbiological contamination causes most of the acute cases of foodborne disease, but there is also increasing concern about long-term effects of low doses of chemicals (pesticide residues, contaminants from processing, food additives). WHO would like to see greater involvement of this Committee in helping to identify problems in the member countries and to encourage exchange of information on laws, regulations and food control infrastructure. It is recommended to member states to consider including in their delegations at the forthcoming session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission at least one expert with an understanding of the importance of safe food as an essential element of primary health care.

CONSIDERATION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

24. The Committee had examined the proposed new terms of reference at its last session and had suggested two amendments, in order to make them appropriate for the Coordinating Committee for Europe (ALINORM 79/19, paras 89-90). The Commission, at its 13th Session, agreed to one of the amendments, but requested the Coordinating Committee to reconsider its proposed amendment to clause (d) of the terms of reference concerning the development of regional standards (ALINORM 79/38, paras 291-292).
25. The Committee, at its current session, reconsidered its suggested amendment of clause (d) which reads "develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra-regional trade", so that it would read "develops regional standards for food products of particular interest for intra-regional trade". In introducing this item, the Secretariat drew the Committee's attention to the concern which had been expressed by several non-European delegations to the Commission's 13th Session, whose view was that regional standards should be established only where the foods concerned moved exclusively in intra-regional trade and not also for foods which, although of interest to a given region, moved in world trade. The Secretariat also drew attention to the remarks of the 74th Session of the FAO Council in November/December 1978, in which the FAO Council agreed with the FAO Programme Committee that there would be a need to exercise caution in elaborating regional food standards since regional standards, if not confined to products moving solely in intra-regional trade, could possibly become barriers to worldwide trade.
26. The Committee considered that to confine the development of European regional standards to products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra-European trade would be unduly restrictive, since very few products indeed moved exclusively or almost exclusively in European trade. The practical effect of such a limitation would be to deprive the Committee of its role as a developer of European regional standards for products of particular interest to the region. The Committee agreed that in most cases, and where a Codex Committee existed to carry out the work, worldwide standards rather than regional standards would be elaborated for products which moved both in intra-regional and worldwide trade. However, there could also be cases at times for the development of European regional standards for certain products

^{1/} Report available from the WHO Regional Office for Europe, Scherfigsvej 8, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark.

of particular interest to the European region with its large market and its own requirements.

27. As regards the concerns which had been expressed by certain delegations in the Committee, the Committee wished to draw attention to the fact that, in practice, the Committee had been very careful over the years in exercising its function in the development of European regional standards. Only three such standards had been elaborated. Furthermore, the Committee was obliged, under the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Regional Standards, to inform the Commission of its intention to start work on the elaboration of regional standards. The Commission had been informed of and had agreed to the Committee's programme of developing European regional standards for (i) vinegar and (ii) mayonnaise and mayonnaise-like products. In the development of European regional standards every opportunity was afforded to have the views of interested non-European countries taken into account. The Committee also noted that a regional standard could become a worldwide standard.

28. The Committee concluded by reaffirming the need for clause (d) of the terms of reference to be amended to read as follows: "develops regional standards for food products of particular interest for intra-regional trade".

CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCES OF CODEX STANDARDS

29. The Committee had before it document CX/EURO 81/3 containing a summary of all acceptances of European Regional Standards (Part I); a summary of acceptances of world-wide Codex standards by countries of the Codex European Region (Part II) and a brief outline of recent developments concerning the acceptance of Codex standards (Part III).

30. The Committee noted that the Commission at its 13th Session had agreed, in order to facilitate acceptance of Codex standards, that Codex Committees should place a standing item on the agenda of its sessions concerning the review of acceptances of Codex standards for which the Committee is responsible. The Committee recalled also that, at its previous session, it had agreed that Codex Coordinating Committees could serve as a forum for countries of the region to discuss the acceptance of Codex standards and to examine possible difficulties experienced in connection with it, and the nature of deviations indicated by member countries.

31. It was noted that formal notifications of acceptance or non-acceptance of individual Codex standards was contained in a periodically up-dated publication, the most recent being CAC/Acceptances Rev. 1, which was expected to be revised soon to cover also acceptances which had been received after October 1978. However information on acceptances received between October 1978 and February 1981 had been made available in various ALINORM documents. Information in Part II of the document was in addition to these formal notifications of acceptance.

32. It was pointed out that most of the data contained in Part I of the document is related to the European Regional Standard for Honey. The Committee agreed to consider this part in connection with proposed amendments to the standard under Item 9 (see para. 111).

33. The Secretariat expressed the view that countries might be able to supply more details of recent developments in respect of their national legislation which would be useful for the discussion on how to achieve the aim of harmonizing food laws and related regulations in Europe.

34. It was recognized in Part III that countries with an extensive food legislation might have more difficulties in incorporating Codex standards into their national legislation requiring extensive parliamentary action, than those not having to amend already existing provisions. However it was also noted that one exporting country which had accepted a particular Codex standard had already experienced some economic difficulties because the

importing countries in question, not having accepted the Codex standard, permitted free circulation of products with lower requirements for e.g. some quality criteria of an aesthetical nature. It should be noted, however, that the Codex Acceptance Procedure does not require an accepting country to apply the standard to exports, but in the country in question no distinction was made, under the law, between production for domestic consumption and production for export. These difficulties had also been brought to the attention of the 20th Session of the FAO Conference which therefore drew the attention of member governments to the importance of accepting Codex Standards to facilitate international trade and to protect the health of the consumer. Special importance was attached to full acceptance by importing countries in order to give effect to the desire of many developing countries to expand their exports by means of agreed international standards.

35. Having regard to the above considerations and also to the difficulties indicated by member countries with regard to amending national legislation, the Commission decided that information obtained under 4(b)(c) of the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius Commission should not be listed under "Non-acceptance". The 27th Session of the Executive Committee agreed with a proposed new structure of the acceptance format in which notification of countries that products conforming with the Codex standard were permitted to be freely distributed in the country would not be classified as non-acceptance even if the country had not yet formally accepted the standard. This procedure was however to be seen as an interim solution, especially in the case where a country did not commit itself to prohibiting entry of products not in conformity with the relevant Codex standard.

36. The representative of the EEC pointed out that almost all countries in Europe had a detailed food law which had been developed over many years and was amended by observance of very complicated procedures. The EEC had now taken a pragmatic approach to the acceptance of Codex standards and hoped to submit to the 14th Session of the Commission a statement which would cover the EEC position with regard to about ten Codex standards. For this purpose work was presently being carried out to compare the directives of the EEC with about 25 Codex standards for commodities and for labelling. In doing so it was noted that there were no fundamental differences between the two groups of standards. The information provided by the EEC would supply exporting countries with a list of deviations, i.e., with more or less stringent requirements than those stipulated in the Codex standards.

37. The representative of the EEC pointed further out that it had not been possible to include those Codex standards into this exercise for which no EEC directives existed. In these cases countries belonging to the EEC would have to notify their position.

38. The Chairman expressed his appreciation for this new development and hoped that the paper would be available in time for the 14th Session of the Commission, especially since this type of notification did not require lengthy parliamentary action.

39. The delegation of Switzerland indicated that it had agreed to the free circulation of products covered by about 31 standards and would notify the same for 10 other standards. Recognizing the difficulties for exporting countries and also the legal implications outlined by the representative of the EEC, the delegation of Switzerland pointed out that for certain important aspects of the standards, for example food additive provisions, his country had also to take into account the view of consumer organizations. Secondary quality criteria, however, were often covered by individual trade arrangements and should be optional only in standards. The delegation drew also attention to the fact that the revision of national food legislation may lead to a revision of previously notified acceptances. He further pointed out that countries should aim at unrestricted distribution of products covered by Codex standards and if possible, at full acceptance.

40. The Chairman pointed out that it was important to consider the prevailing conditions in as many countries as possible when elaborating the standards. This was particularly of importance with regard to contaminant levels and questions related to the stability of the product in regions with a tropical climate.

41. The delegation of Czechoslovakia informed the Committee that Codex standards were used in his country for foreign trade and for the elaboration of domestic standards. He pointed out that the Standing Commission on Food Industry of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance was working on a common approach to food standards in the countries covered by the agreement. He expressed the view that more detailed information would be available to the 14th Session of the Commission.

42. The delegation of the USSR stated that his government was considering Codex standards and attached great importance to them. The process of acceptance, however, was difficult since a number of different ministries was involved and the obligation under CMEA had to be taken into account. The delegation of the USSR noted similar difficulties in other countries; he expressed, however, the view that the USSR may accept some standards in time for notification of the 15th Session of the Commission.

43. The delegation of Poland informed the Committee that the Polish authorities were considering acceptance of several Codex standards. The world-wide Codex Standard for Olive Oil has already been introduced into the Polish food legislation. As far as the European Regional Standards were concerned, Poland was ready to accept the standards for fresh fungi, chanterelle and honey with a deviation concerning heavy metal contaminants. The delegation suggested to include the milk and milk products standards into the system of notification of acceptance. It was pointed out that these standards had been listed separately since the Milk Committee had the authority to finalize these standards; i.e., they had not to be adopted by the Commission. The Secretariat expressed the view that it would be useful to continue to supply information on progress of acceptance of the standards for milk and milk products.

44. The delegation of Spain drew attention to standards accepted by his country and to the maximum limits for pesticide residues of the 6th Series which were under consideration. A communication on the latter would be soon forthcoming. As for other Codex standards, the delegation of Spain stated that EEC regulations had also to be taken into account in view of the impending membership of Spain of EEC.

45. The delegation of Hungary informed the Committee that in its country a new food law had been promulgated in 1975 and that action was being taken to incorporate Codex standards in national legislation.

46. The delegation of Norway informed the Committee that action was being taken to arrive at formal acceptance of Codex standards for fish and meat products, fruit juices, fats and oils, milk products, infant foods, honey and the maximum limits for pesticide residues. For a number of these standards, acceptance will require revision of existing Norwegian legislation. It is hoped, however, that this action will be completed within a year's time. Work was also being carried out on the standards for processed fruits and vegetables.

47. The Chairman expressed the view that too many detailed mandatory requirements for aesthetic quality criteria created difficulties and these provisions should therefore be optional. It was however also noted, that some international agreement on details was needed to avoid that these requirements be used as barriers to trade.

48. Several delegations expressed the view that it was desirable that provisions contained in national standards but not in the relevant Codex standard should be considered by this Committee or the relevant Commodity Committees in connection with the discussion of acceptances.

The Committee agreed that it would be useful to have such data available for discussion.

49. The Committee agreed with an offer from Hungary to provide for a future session of the Committee a comparative description of differences between Codex standards and standards of CMEA and expressed the view that this would provide excellent documentation on which future discussions the coordination and harmonization of food standards in Europe could be based (see also para. 145).

ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ECONOMIC GROUPS IN EUROPE CONCERNED WITH HARMONIZATION AND STANDARDIZATION OF FOOD REQUIREMENTS

50. The Committee was informed that it was established practice at every session of the Commission for various international organizations and economic groupings in the world to present a report to the Commission on developments and progress in their respective activities in the food standards and related fields. The Committee, at its last session, had decided that it would be useful to provide the opportunity at Committee sessions for international organizations and economic groupings in Europe to report on their programmes of work, which could be of benefit also in stimulating and promoting cooperation, or improved cooperation as the case might be, between the various bodies.

51. The delegation of Czechoslovakia outlined what was being done in the CMEA's Standing Commission on Food Industry, and informed the Committee that for the period 1981 to 1985 specific programmes of work had been approved. Account was taken of Codex work in the development of CMEA food standards work.

52. The observer from the European Economic Community (EEC) indicated that a report on EEC activities in the food standards and related fields had been presented to the last session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The activities of the EEC were both vertical and horizontal, but priority was given to horizontal work. He mentioned that positive lists of certain classes of food additives had been drawn up. Certain basic labelling questions had been decided upon. Provisions relating to foods for infants and children were being worked out. In these matters the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had been very helpful. Other matters dealt with in the EEC included chemical substances that come into contact with food, including consideration of residues of vinyl chloride arising from manufacture of plastic material. Work was being done on cellulose and a proposal relating to flavouring agents, based on the work of the Council of Europe, was under discussion.

53. The observer from the EEC also indicated that it was hoped to make use of the Codex standards for fructose and lactose. In the case of fruit juices, the EEC requirements for these products were based on Codex requirements and were very similar. As regards condensed milk and powdered milk, the EEC requirements were very similar to those contained in the Codex standards. For jams, jellies and marmalade, the EEC requirements were similar to Codex requirements. EEC requirements relating to natural mineral water were also similar to Codex requirements.

54. In conclusion the observer from the EEC stated that an information system relating to EEC food standards and related work had now been set up (a separate telephone line had been installed for this activity). He made reference to the good contacts which were maintained with other international bodies, including the Codex Secretariat.

55. The observer from the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) outlined the work of his organization in the food standards and related fields. In particular he referred to the work of ISO/TC 34, which had established many texts of interest concerning methodology in the field of food analysis. ISO had always collaborated closely with the Codex Alimentarius Commission, especially in the frame-work of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling, where considerable use had been made of ISO methodology.

He mentioned that ISO methods of analysis had shown themselves to be particularly useful to developing countries.

56. The delegation of the United Kingdom referred to the work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) in the food standard field and inquired what steps were being taken to avoid overlapping of work on standards for certain food products between the UNECE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Secretariat outlined the background to this problem and the steps which had already been taken to deal with it. The area of overlap was not extensive and had been narrowed. The whole subject of avoiding overlapping of activities as between other international organizations, including the UNECE, and the Codex Alimentarius Commission, would be considered by the Executive Committee at its next session, whose recommendations would be put before the 14th Session of the Codex Commission.

57. The Committee agreed that the exposés which had been given by the representatives of international organizations present at the session had been very useful. The Committee stressed the importance, in the interest of consumer protection in the region of Europe, of developing closer cooperation between international organizations in the region and between the countries of the region. The term cooperation should be interpreted in its broadest sense, covering for example, food hygiene and the need to be on the alert against possible outbreaks and spread of foodborne diseases. The establishment of information systems was also seen by the Committee as being very useful in this connection.

58. Concerning the work of the UNECE, as mentioned in para. 56 above, the Committee considered that there should be close contact between the UNECE in its food standards work and the Coordinating Committee for Europe. The Committee considered that it would be important for the UNECE to be represented at its sessions in the future, in the interest both of improved cooperation and of the avoidance of any overlapping of activities.

SUMMARY REPORT ON SURVEY ON FOOD SAFETY SERVICES IN EUROPE

59. The Committee had before it a survey on food safety services in Europe to be published by the WHO Regional Office for Europe ^{1/}; and a summary report on the survey (CX/EURO 81/4), prepared by the WHO representative and the delegation of Hungary.

60. The WHO representative mentioned that the survey contains chapters on all the Member States of the European Region of WHO, giving for each country a brief outline of its food legislation, food control administration and enforcement system, and addresses where further information can be obtained. The survey was compiled from various sources and sent for comment to the respective governments, and their replies were used in the preparation of the final statements. The WHO Regional Office for Europe would appreciate criticism and comments with a view to the preparation of an improved and up-dated second edition.

61. Food safety services in Europe do not follow a common pattern and are differing widely in their organization, staffing and scope. The present survey is intended as a tool for better understanding and communication with and among the European countries on food safety problems. The WHO representative mentioned that, although most countries seem to have adequate legislation and regulations for food control, in many cases their practical application still needs to be improved.

62. The delegation of Hungary stressed the need for further work to continue to develop closer cooperation on food safety matters in view of the significant differences still existing between countries. The delegate of Austria outlined the food control system in Austria, which is based on the Federal Food Law of 1975 and related regulations issued thereto.

^{1/} Copies available in English and French from WHO Regional Office for Europe, Scherfigsvej 8, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark.

Furthermore independent expert opinion is contained in the Austrian Food Code in the form of guidelines and advice concerning examination. Food Control is within the responsibility of the regional authorities, however, for their support laboratories are being maintained by the Federal Ministry of Health and Environment as well as by individual states and, where appropriate, also within the framework of the animal health service.

63. The delegate of Spain mentioned that further developments towards increased decentralization and delegation of responsibilities has taken place since the survey was prepared. Also the responsibility for the implementation of food regulation has been given to the municipal authorities; the latter depend directly on those newly established autonomous bodies which have been charged with the responsibility for the control of food hygiene formerly carried out by subsidiary bodies of the Central Administration. The Central Administration, however, has kept the legislative power, the overall supervision of the services and the control of goods moving in international trade.

64. In this context it was mentioned that FAO and WHO both issue publications periodically, giving a selection of important new food legislation. 1/

65. The delegate of France mentioned that in Paris the food control is no longer a duty of the Prefecture of Police but follows the same rules as for the rest of the country.

66. The delegate of Norway mentioned that considerable changes have taken place recently. From 1st January 1980 a new Food Control (Coordination) Act gives provisions for coordination between the ministries and local authorities responsible for food legislation and control. A Food Control Board has been established to direct the coordination.

67. The delegate of Spain indicated that Spain would be interested in future follow-up work on the survey. Of particular interest is the establishment of a rapid information system, aiming at prevention of outbreaks of food-borne disease.

68. The Chairman thanked the delegation of Hungary and the WHO representative for their work on the survey, and said that further efforts should be made to study similarities and differences between existing systems in order to obtain harmonization and improved cooperation between countries.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR FERMENTATION VINEGAR AT STEP 4

69. The Committee had before it the above standard as contained in Appendix III to ALINORM 79/19 and comments thereon (CX/EURO 81/5) which had been received from Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Poland and Switzerland.

Title and Section 1 - Scope

70. The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by France, Belgium, Spain and Poland, expressed the view that the term "fermentation" was superfluous, since all vinegars were produced by fermentation in their countries and other products derived from synthetic acetic acid were not permitted to be labelled "vinegar". The delegations of Switzerland and Norway were principally in agreement with the above statement even if their national legislation permitted the use of acetic acid. However, these products had to be labelled vinegar with an appropriate qualifying term. The delegations of the Fed. Rep. of Germany, Austria and Netherlands informed the Committee that in their countries the term vinegar was also used to

1/ Food and Nutrition, FAO, Rome (published twice a year).

International Digest of Health Legislation, WHO, Geneva (published four times a year).

describe a product derived from acetic acid and that therefore the products covered by this standard should be declared as fermentation vinegar.

71. It was recognized that this appeared to be mainly a linguistic problem arising from the traditional use of the term "vinegar" for different products. The Committee agreed that the standard should cover only products obtained by double fermentation of suitable materials of agricultural origin and that the exact wording of Title and Scope would be determined in connection with the discussion of Section 8 on Labelling (see para. 94).

Section 2 - Definitions

72. The Committee agreed with the main definition of the product in Section 2.1.1 but decided however, to delete the second sentence, concerning pasteurization or sterilization of the product. The Committee noted the proposal to delete the third sentence of Section 2.1.1 and its analogue in Section 2.1.1.1, dealing with characteristic fermentation products. The view was expressed that these substances might better be listed in Section 3 under essential quality criteria. It was agreed that acetic acid ethylester was another substance which should be added to that list. The Committee agreed to delete the provisions from the definition and to reconsider the need for these provisions under Section 3 (see para. 86). Attention was drawn to an error in the Spanish translation of "acetous".

73. The Committee decided to retain the sentences in 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.1.2 dealing with requirements for raw material since it was important that only wines which fulfilled all requirements for wine as such were used for the manufacture of vinegar, except that the wines used for the manufacture of vinegar could have a higher acetic acid content than those which were marketable as wines. The reference to marc vinegar was deleted from Section 2.1.1.2.

74. It was pointed out that the present wording of Section 2.1.1.3 - Spirit Vinegar - did not include reference to unrectified alcohol as raw material; however this was used in some countries. The Committee also noted that in some countries "brandy" had the connotation of a cognac. It was agreed to delete the terms "(rectified alcohol, spirit, brandy)" from Section 2.1.1.3 and to include "distilled". The delegation of Spain proposed to delete the reference to spirit vinegar from the standard since these products did not have the characteristics expected from vinegar due to distillation of the intermediate product after the alcoholic fermentation. One delegation proposed that Section 2.1.1.5 (malt vinegar) be deleted and malt vinegar be incorporated into Section 2.1.1.4 (grain vinegar). However, it was recognized that malt vinegar was a very specific product with a characteristic flavour obtained by using malted barley and limiting the permitted enzymes to diastase contained in the malted barley. Hydrolysis in raw material for grain vinegar could be obtained by using isolated diastase, other enzymes or even mineral acids. The Committee did not change Sections 2.1.1.4 and 2.1.1.5.

75. The Committee noted an error in the French version of Section 2.1.1.6; the term "concentrated whey" was substituted for "lactoserum".

76. In order to clarify the exact nature of raw materials in Section 2.1.1.7 - Honey Vinegar - it was decided to include a reference to the Codex Standard for Honey (CAC/RS 12-1969). Section 2.1.1.8 - Distilled Vinegar - was amended to relate to the process of distillation after completed acetous fermentation.

77. The Committee noted the written comments from Switzerland to introduce a definition for lemon vinegar. The Committee also noted that reference to flavouring substances appeared in both the sections for optional ingredients and in the section for food additives and those substances would therefore have to appear in the list of ingredients. Furthermore the Committee agreed with a comment from Norway that any one of the vinegars defined in Sections 2.1.1.1 to 2.1.1.8 could be flavoured and decided to delete the definitions for

flavoured vinegar (2.1.1.9) and vinegar with fruit juice (2.1.1.10) and to include a reference to optional ingredients into the general definition of vinegar in Section 2.1.1.

Section 3 - Essential Composition and Quality Criteria

78. The Committee deleted reference to marc from Section 3.1.1 - Raw Materials - and made some consequential amendments to bring the provision in line with the amended Section 2.1.1.3. It was pointed out that the French text should be corrected to read "amidon et fécule".

79. The Committee fully considered a proposal to merge Sections 3.1.2 (Nutrients for Acetobacter) and 4.6.1 (Ammonium Phosphates) since both were processing aids and to place them either under 4.6 processing aids or 3.1.2. It was pointed out that the nutrients listed in 3.1.2 such as yeast extracts and autolysates were foods and would not have to be endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives, and for this reason should not be listed in the food additives section. In this context it was also proposed to add phosphates and other substances if the listing in Section 4.6.1 was considered to be a closed list, since in such case it would be difficult to amend 4.6.1 and a strict limitation to one substance might hinder technological progress. The delegation of the Fed. Rep. of Germany pointed to the problem of processing aids in general and proposed to place the whole section on processing aids into square brackets or to transfer it from the body of the standard to an Appendix to the Proposed Draft Standard for Vinegar.

80. The Secretariat pointed out that the Committee on Food Additives was still preparing an inventory for processing aids and was expected to be able to provide more guidance after its next session on matters related to processing aids. In view of the above information the Committee decided to postpone further discussion on this matter and to place Sections 3.1.2 and 4.6.1 in square brackets in order to indicate that they should be reconsidered in due course. The delegation of the Fed. Rep. of Germany wished to place on record that the list in 4.6.1 should be considered as an open list until a general decision becomes available from the Committee on Food Additives. The delegation of the United Kingdom could agree to the above decisions; reiterated, however, the proposal to place ammonium phosphates in Section 3.1.2.

Section 3.2 - Optional Ingredients

81. The question was raised whether there was a need to have separate Sections (3.2.1 and 3.2.2) for spices, herbs fruits and plants. Whereas some delegations felt that in view of the fact that flavouring extracts appeared also in the section of food additives, plant extracts and parts could be included in Section 3.2.1, it was pointed out by other delegations that there was a good reason to keeping them apart. It was pointed out that a number of aromatic plant extracts were food additives and would therefore be covered by Section 4.4. The Committee agreed to amend Section 3.2.1 to read: "Plants in particular herbs, spices or fruit, or their parts or extracts suitable for flavouring" and to delete Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3

82. It was pointed out that the colouring matters extracted from marc contained in Section 3.2.4 were anthocyanins and had as such been evaluated by JECFA. It was decided therefore to transfer the provision into the food additives section (see Section 4).

83. The delegation of Switzerland undertook to provide the Committee at its next session with a maximum limit for the addition of whey (Section 3.2.5). The Committee agreed that in Section 3.2.6 the addition of concentrated fruit juice should be permitted at equivalent amounts to single strength juices. Concerning Sections 3.2.7 (Sugars) and 3.2.8 (Honey) it was decided to include reference to the relevant Codex standards for these products. The Committee discussed at length the permitted amount of salt to be used as an optional ingredient. Whereas 100 grammes per 1000 ml were permitted in the EEC directive for wine vinegar, delegations felt that 20 grammes per 1000 ml were an acceptable figure.

The Committee could not come to a conclusion on this matter and decided to place 100 grammes in square brackets and requested government comments on this matter.

Section 3.3 - Acetic Acid Content

84. Some delegations felt that the minimum requirement of 5% was too high and suggested figures of 4 and 4.5% since products with that strength were traded in their countries. The delegation of the Fed. Rep. of Germany proposed to amend the title of Section 3.3 to read: "Acid Content (expressed as acetic acid). Considerable discussion arose as to whether products with an acetic acid content below 5% were shelf stable. The Committee, with the exception of Spain and Switzerland agreed that wine vinegar should have a minimum acetic acid content of 6%. The question was raised whether also a maximum limit was needed. It was pointed out that the technology of the production was self-limiting. Furthermore it was pointed out that the acetic acid content should be expressed as mass per volume (grammes per litre), which was a traditional method used in food control and trade. The Committee agreed to minimum limits for wine vinegar of 60 grammes/litre and of 50 grammes/litre for other vinegars both calculated as acetic acid. The delegation of the Netherlands felt that there was a need for a higher minimum level if the product was not to contain preservatives. Also the delegation of Spain stated that it wished to re-discuss the above minimum levels.

85. Attention was drawn to a printing error; the maximum residual alcohol content should read: 0.5% v/v (Section 3.4). It was decided to introduce a separate limit for wine vinegar of 1%, but to place it in square brackets and to request government comments.

86. Concerning the minimum soluble solids content in Section 3.5, it was proposed by one delegation to establish different values for wine and fruit/berry vinegars (14 grammes/litre and 28 grammes/litre). Other delegations felt that the minimum level in the draft was too high and should be lowered to 7-10 grammes per litre which were the normal levels formed in vinegar produced from wine. The Committee agreed with another proposal which was supported by several delegations, namely to relate the soluble solid requirements to the acid content, of "not less than 2 grammes per 1000 ml per 1% acetic acid". It was explained that these figures would permit an efficient vinegar production from highly alcoholic wines where otherwise very high requirements for soluble solids would hinder dilution to normal acetic acid levels. The Committee also agreed to place the new figures in square brackets and to request government comments. The Committee decided that more comments were needed from governments on the need to retain the provisions for characteristic fermentation products originally contained in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.1.1 (see also para. 72). If this was the case they would have to be included in Section 3.5.

Section 4 - Food Additives

87. The proposal was made and supported by several delegations to establish only one provision for sulphur dioxide to cover the substance as food additive and as carried-over substance in all vinegars (Sections 4.1 and 4.5.2). It was pointed out that in some countries the use of sulphur dioxide as an additive was not permitted; however it should be kept in mind the sulphur dioxide was formed in vinegars as a carry-over substance from raw materials. Carried-over SO₂ required no label declaration; however countries not permitting the use of this additive would have also to declare SO₂ on the label if only one provision was established to cover both sources of the SO₂. It was questioned whether the amount of 50-mg/kg permitted in Section 4.5.2 did have a preservative function in the final product; which means that it would have to be declared as a food additive, or whether the minimum for technological purposes was about 70 mg/kg. The Committee decided that the terms in brackets be deleted from Section 4.1 and that the matter should be rediscussed in the light of further comments.

88. The Committee deleted the brackets in Section 4.2 (Ascorbic Acid).

89. The Committee was informed that for technological reasons caramel colours made by the ammonia or ammonsulphite process was used for vinegars; however caramel colour made by the ammonia process was not included in the standard (Section 4.3). The Committee noted that these two substances had an ADI which in the case of caramel colour made by the ammonia process had been temporarily, and was now, withdrawn. The Committee also noted that JECFA was in the process of re-evaluating the ADI for caramel colours made by the ammonia process in the light of new toxicological data. The Committee decided to place Section 4.3 into square brackets and to request further information on the matters mentioned above.

90. The Committee was informed that nature-identical and artificial flavours were either not permitted or not used in vinegars and agreed to delete these provisions from the standard (Section 4.4). It was agreed to include a new section on flavour enhancers (Section 4.5) and to renumber the remainder of Section 4. The new Section 4.5 contains at present only provisions for monosodium, monopotassium and calcium glutamates. Governments might, however, wish to submit additional proposals.

Section 5 - Contaminants

91. The delegation of Poland reiterated its view that the contaminant limits were too high and confirmed the values which it had proposed at the 11th Session of the Committee (see para. 75 of ALINORM 79/19). The Committee discussed whether free mineral acids should be treated as a contaminant since sulphate was formed during the normal manufacturing process and could therefore be included in Section 3.3. It was pointed out that, if formed in that way, the sulphate would have a counterion, whereas if formed from SO_2 it was present as free mineral acid. Furthermore contaminants were characterized by their adverse health affect; this was true in the case of SO_2 . Attention was also drawn to the importance of the pH-value of the product, however, this could be taken into account by selection proper methodology for the determination of free mineral acids. The Committee concluded that more information was needed on the different problems mentioned above and decided to place the maximum limits into square brackets.

Section 6 - Hygiene

92. The delegation of Spain pointed out an incorrect translation of vinegar eels in the Spanish version of the standard,

Section 8 - Labelling

93. The Committee discussed a proposal which had been elaborated by a number of delegations to amend Sections 8.1.1, 8.1.2.5 and 8.2 as follows:

Section 8.1.1

8.1.1 The name of the food shall be:

(i) for products complying with Sections 2.1.1.1 - 2.1.1.8 the appropriate name as defined in those subsections;

(ii) for products containing more than one of the types of products mentioned in subsections 2.1.1.1 to 2.1.1.8 "x vinegar", where "x" constitutes the complete list of names of the types of product.

94. It was pointed out that the above proposal had been made to avoid usage of both the terms "vinegar" and "fermentation vinegar". Several delegations stated that they could not agree to not permitting the use of the term "vinegar" unqualified since that was the traditional name of the product in their countries. The declaration of origin of the raw material

should be optional. The Committee decided to make the use of the term "vinegar" mandatory for the products covered by the standard and to allow for an optional declaration in accordance with (i) and (ii) as in para.93. The Secretariat was instructed to amend title and scope of the standard in accordance with the above decision. The delegation of the Netherlands could not agree with this decision since it meant that the name vinegar unqualified could not be used for a product made from acetic acid, a product which was traditionally known in his country as "vinegar", (in Dutch "azyn").

95. The Committee agreed to amend Section 8.1.2 to read as follows:

"8.1.2 Where an ingredient or ingredients has or have been added in accordance with subsection 3.2 and/or 4.4 which impart(s) to the food the distinctive flavour of the ingredient or ingredients the name of the food shall be accompanied by appropriate descriptive term".

96. The Committee also deleted Section 8.1.3 since the corresponding Section 4.4(ii) had been deleted and agreed to delete from Section 8.1.4 the terms "natural vinegar" and "pure vinegar". However, the remainder of 8.1.4 was retained since it contained reference to useful information for the consumer. The Committee felt that Section 8.1.5 concerning the use of a coined name was superfluous and deleted this section.

97. The Committee agreed to add to Section 8.2 the following wording:

"If the food is derived exclusively from a single basic product, and no other ingredient has been added, no list of ingredients need be given".

Date Marking

98. The Committee was informed of the instructions contained in the Revised Guidelines for Date Marking of Prepackaged Foods that Codex Committees should consider date marking provisions when elaborating standards. A number of countries agreed that vinegar was used as a preservative in other foods and therefore there was no need to provide for date marking in any form. In one country it was the only food which had been exempted from the general requirement for mandatory date marking. Attention was drawn to some low acid vinegars; and the delegation of Spain submitted a proposal from consumer organizations and government authorities that the dates of minimum durability and of manufacture should be declared. The majority of the Committee was not in favour of introducing date marking provisions into the standard.

Section 8.6 - Lot Identification

99. The delegation of Switzerland proposed to change this section to require simply a marking of the containers which were normally glass bottles. It was agreed that advice of the Labelling Committee should be sought on this matter.

Section 9 - Methods of Analysis and Sampling

100. The Chairman pointed out that methods of analysis and sampling for provisions contained in the standard would have to be elaborated. The Committee accepted the kind offer of Mr. Roberto Conty Larrez, Codex Contact Point for Spain, to collate the data obtained from governments and elaborate a text for Section 9 for the next session of this Committee. The Chairman urged governments to submit suitable data as soon as possible to Mr. R. Conty Larraz, Comisión Interministerial para la Ordenación Alimentaria, Ministerio de Sanidad y Seguridad Social, P^o del Prado, 18-20, Madrid 14, Spain.

Status of the Standard

101. The Committee decided to advance the Proposed Draft Standard for Vinegar to Step 5 of the Procedure. The amended version of the standard is contained in Appendix II to this report.

CONSIDERATION OF NEED TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDED STANDARD FOR CANNED FRUIT COCKTAIL
(CAC/RS 78/1976)

102. The Committee, at its 11th session, had expressed the view that the list of ingredients in the standard for canned fruit cocktail was unduly restrictive (peaches, pears, pineapple, cherries and grapes). The Committee had suggested, therefore, that there should be a possibility to select fruit from similar groups of fruit ingredients, e.g. using apples instead of pears or using apricots instead of peaches. The Committee referred this matter to the Codex Committee on Processed Fruit and Vegetables for consideration (ALINORM 79/19, paras 17-18).

103. The Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables at its 15th Session reiterated its view that fruit cocktail was a product which had been marketed for many years with a composition which corresponded to that laid down in the Recommended Standard. Other remarks on this topic by the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables are to be found in ALINORM 81/20, paras 9-10. The Committee was informed that the Codex Committee on Processes Fruits and Vegetables had decided (i) to request the delegation of Australia to prepare a working paper on the feasibility of extending the range of fruit ingredients and (ii) to establish a small working group to consider the Australian paper by correspondence and report back to the 16th Session of the Committee. The Committee noted that the Working Group consisted of Australia, the Fed. Rep. of Germany, Japan, South Africa, Thailand and the U.S.A.

104. The Committee agreed to await the outcome of the deliberations of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables on this subject and to place the matter on the agenda of its next session.

CONSIDERATION OF NEED FOR SIZE GRADING IN THE RECOMMENDED STANDARD FOR CANNED PEAS
(CAC/RS 58/1972)

105. The Committee, at its 11th Session, had decided to propose to the 13th Session of the Commission that the Recommended Standard for Canned Peas (CAC/RS 58/1972) be amended to provide, on an optional basis, for size grading. The Committee had proposed the adoption of a particular sizing scheme which had been set out in Appendix IV to the report of its last session (ALINORM 79/19). The views expressed by the Committee in support of its proposal to the Commission are contained in paras 81-83 of ALINORM 79/19).

106. The Commission referred the matter to the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables and recommended that the Committee should also look at the size grading system included in the Recommended Standard for Quick-Frozen Peas (CAC/RS 41-1970).

107. The Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables, at its 15th Session, agreed that any size grading system should be optional, but could not reach agreement on any particular system for inclusion in the standard. That Committee concluded that if the European countries wished to elaborate an European size grading system for peas, they might consider taking the matter up again with the Commission.

108. The Committee was informed by the observer from the EEC that the size grading system contained in Appendix IV of ALINORM 79/19, was not an official EEC size grading system, but rather represented a system which had been agreed upon, as a voluntary arrangement, years ago by the industry in several European countries. The delegation of the Netherlands stated that, on the basis of the results of an inquiry from producers, size grading of peas was a matter of low priority. The same delegation expressed the view that the nomenclature proposed in the size grading system contained in Appendix IV of ALINORM 79/19 was not very meaningful or helpful to the consumer. The Committee was informed by the delegation of Hungary that the size grading system of the CMEA was the same as that proposed in Appendix IV of ALINORM 79/19, except that the CMEA nomenclature for the various sizes was different.

The delegation of Switzerland informed the Committee that in Section B of the French version of the document covering this issue - CX/EURO 81/2, Part II - some of the text was missing, when compared with the original English version.

109. The Committee agreed not to pursue this matter any further at this time, but to invite interested countries in the region of Europe to submit suggestions for improved nomenclature for consideration by the Committee at its next session. The Committee agreed that any size grading system which might eventually be agreed upon should be optional and not mandatory.

CONSIDERATION OF THE NEED TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDED EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR HONEY
(CAC/RS 12-1969)

110. The Committee recalled that, at its 11th Session, it had considered the above topic (ALINORM 79/19, paras 25-39). Following this, governments had been requested in CL 1979/28 to submit analytical data for moisture content, diastase activity and HMF for the more important types of natural honey. Replies had been received from the Fed. Rep. of Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom.

111. The Commission, at its 13th Session, had been informed that the Committee had under consideration the amendment of certain of the provisions of the standard for honey. The views expressed at the Commission's Session concerning this matter are set forth in ALINORM 79/38, paras 302-305. Several delegations at the Commission's Session had expressed the view that if the standard for honey was to be revised, it should be revised on a worldwide basis, in view of the fact that honey represented an important commodity in international trade. The Commission noted that most of the acceptances of the standard received so far were from non-European countries, a number of which could only accept the regional standard with specified deviations. The Commission instructed the Secretariat to examine the specified deviations which had been notified by governments and to report on this matter to the Executive Committee.

112. The conclusions which the Secretariat reached in examining the specified deviations which had been notified by governments are reproduced in CX/EURO 80/2, Part II, section c., para. 6. The Executive Committee instructed the Secretariat to seek the views of all Member Governments on (i) whether there was a need to amend the standard for honey; (ii) whether the standard should be a worldwide standard rather than a European regional standard; and (iii) what would be the most appropriate body to develop a revised standard on a worldwide basis. The Executive Committee also decided that the views of all Regional Coordinating Committees should be sought on these matters and that the replies from Member Governments and the views of the Coordinating Committees should be put before the 14th Session of the Commission. A CL on these matters was issued to Governments in November 1980 (CL 1980/48). The Committee was informed that the replies received to-date indicated that there was a need to amend the standard and that the standard should be a worldwide rather than an European regional standard.

113. The delegation of Poland drew attention to a correction which needed to be made in the Polish comments as recorded in document CX/EURO 81/2, Part II. In Section c., para. 4(ii), the reference in the second sentence to alfalfa honey should read Trefoil honey. On the basis of the data available so far, the delegations of the Fed. Rep. of Germany, United Kingdom and Switzerland and the observer from the EEC saw no reason to alter the standard at the present time. The delegation of Poland indicated that the standard was acceptable as it stood, although if it were decided to amend the standard, it would have proposals for some amendments. The observer from Mexico stated that some of the provisions of the standard were difficult to comply with. The delegation of the USSR indicated that in the case of some USSR honeys, the provision on moisture content presented some difficulties. There were also other differences between the provisions of the standard and the USSR regulations. The delegation of Switzerland, however, was of the opinion that the maximal moisture content in the standard could be reduced from 22% to 21%.

114. On the question whether the standard should be a regional European standard or a worldwide standard, the delegations of the Fed. Rep. of Germany and Switzerland and the observer from the EEC stated that they could support a worldwide standard for honey rather than an European regional standard. The Chairman of the Committee stated that he also could agree to the idea of a worldwide standard for honey if this should be the wish of the Commission. No delegation or observer voiced a contrary view. It was concluded, therefore, that there was no objection by the Committee to the idea of a worldwide rather than an European regional standard for honey.

115. Concerning the question of which body would be the most appropriate one to develop a revised standard on a worldwide basis, the Secretariat indicated that in their replies a number of countries had expressed the view that the Codex Committee on Sugars would be the appropriate body. Some countries, in their replies had suggested that the Codex Committee on Sugars be reactivated or that, as the Codex Committee on Sugars had adjourned sine die, the task of revising the standard might be undertaken by correspondence, as was done with the standard for fructose.

116. The delegation of the United Kingdom stated that it would be difficult for the authorities concerned in the United Kingdom to agree to reactivating the Codex Committee on Sugars just for the purpose of dealing with the revision of the standard for honey. To revise the standard by correspondence did not seem to be a very satisfactory solution either. The delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that perhaps the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables might, if it was willing to undertake the task, be an appropriate forum for revising the standard in view of its work on jams.

117. The Secretariat referred to the remarks of the Chairman of the Committee that during the elaboration of the standard, as a European regional standard, interested non-European countries had been given every opportunity to present their views and some had participated actively in the work of developing the standard. The Secretariat stated that as the standard had been developed as a regional standard only the member countries of the region could, under the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, take part in any vote which there might have been on the amendment or adoption of the standard. The standard had been developed in the early years of the Commission, when experience had to be gained, through trial and error, as to how best to develop acceptable international standards. But since then, with experience over the years, voting was rarely if ever resorted to in the development of standards. Rather every effort was made to reach consensus.

118. The reference to voting rights in para. 117 above related to standards that were being developed for a region or group of countries. But the Committee had unanimously declared its willingness to see a worldwide standard for honey developed in place of the existing European regional standard. It was true that, in the normal course, one would expect to see worldwide standards being elaborated by worldwide rather than regional committees. But in the present circumstances, the Commission might be willing to consider entrusting the task of developing a worldwide standard for honey to the Coordinating Committee for Europe, on the basis of all interested countries participating on an equal footing. The Secretariat noted that under sub-section (g) of its new terms of reference the Committee "exercises ... such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission". The Secretariat added that it would be necessary to see whether the above idea would give rise to any difficulties under the Rules of Procedure. The Chairman of the Committee and the members of the Committee expressed their willingness to undertake the task of developing a worldwide standard for honey with the full participation of all interested non-European countries, if they should be asked by the Commission to do so.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS RELATED TO THE SECTIONS ON MICROBIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS (SECTION 5.2) AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS (SECTION 8) OF THE REGIONAL EUROPEAN STANDARD FOR NATURAL MINERAL WATERS

119. The Committee had established a Working Group to consider the above matters in the light of available documentation and to report back to the meeting (see para. 6). The Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. P. Rossier, from Switzerland, introduced the following report of the Working Group.

120. "The Ad Hoc Working Party consisted of delegates from Austria, Fed. Rep. of Germany, France, Hungary, Mexico, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland (Chairmanship), United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, observers from the EEC and ISO, and members of the FAO Secretariat. The Working Group had before it a working paper (CX/EURO 81/2, Part II) prepared by the Secretariat setting out the issues relating to the Hygiene and Methods of Analyses sections of the Standard on Natural Mineral Waters and the earlier working documents which had been mentioned in CX/EURO 81/2.

Microbiological Requirements

121. The Chairman explained that the 16th Session of the Committee on Food Hygiene had criticized this section of the standard as contained in Appendix II to ALINORM 79/19, on several grounds and consequently had felt unable to endorse it. In particular it had requested evidence to justify the necessity for the requirements of Section 5.2.2 (paras 110-119 of ALINORM 79/13A). It was recognized that the Commission had declared that the standard should not be published before all provisions of the standard had been endorsed. However, it was felt that this would hold up the publication of the standard unduly, and it was decided, in view of the present situation, to request permission from the Commission to publish the standard with Section 5.2 replaced by the words of "to be elaborated".

122. It arose from the discussion that three options were open to the Working Party:

(i) to replace the Section 5.2 with reference to the Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collection, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters being developed by the Committee on Food Hygiene, either by a reference similar to that made in Section 5.1, or by introducing the end product specifications of the code as a mandatory provision in the standard;

(ii) to amend Section 5.2 of the standard with the criticisms of the Committee on Food Hygiene in mind with a view to reaching a compromise solution, for example:

- replace 5.2.2 with a coliform criterion without a separate reference to E. Coli;
- delete 5.2.3 since this was regarded as advisory only by the Committee on Food Hygiene;
- retain 5.2.4 as a mandatory provision;
- delete 5.2.5;

(iii) to defend the existing section on hygiene against the criticisms of the Committee on Food Hygiene.

123. The Working Party noted that option (i) would mean retaining the present mandatory nature of the requirements by reference to an advisory code of practice yet to be elaborated. It might be difficult to ensure that the Committee on Food Hygiene, when elaborating this Code of Practice, was fully aware of the special problems and properties of natural mineral waters, particularly those of the European region. It was also mentioned that since this Code of Practice was now at Step 3, there would be a delay of some years before it would be adopted.

124. In considering option (ii), several delegations felt that it was important to retain both the criteria for coliforms and streptococcae, as indicators of faecal contamination, and that the E. Coli test was a useful indicator of the source of degree of contamination. Further, although the Committee on Food Hygiene had stressed the importance of end product specifications to protect the interest of consuming countries, it was also important to measure the microbiological properties of the water at source (see Section 5.2.3) to assist in the detection of any contamination after collection. The microbiological state of the water at the marketing stage was also important (Section 5.2.5).

125. In considering option (iii), it was recognized that to defend the hygiene provisions against the criticisms of the Committee on Food Hygiene would delay the adoption of the standard, and that there was a risk that the Committee on Food Hygiene might concentrate on their work on the Draft Code of Practice at the expense of examining Section 5.2. However, it was felt that when making their comments on Section 5.2, the Committee on Food Hygiene had been insufficiently aware of the special nature and characteristics of natural mineral waters, and the Working Party took the view that this and the points made in para. 124 above were compelling enough to recommend the retention of Section 5.2 unchanged. It was further recommended that the detailed justification of Section 5.2 should be considered by individual governments by correspondence, to be sent to Mr. P. Rossier who agreed to coordinate the work.

Methods of Analysis (Appendix V to ALINORM 79/23)

126. The Working Group agreed that Reference Methods should be included for the following substances which were characterizing elements of mineral waters, in addition to those already contained in the standard:

Sodium	Chloride
Potassium	Sulphate
Magnesium	Carbonate and Hydrogencarbonate
Calcium	Free carbonioxide (CO ₂)

Furthermore, the Working Group recommends to replace (g) silicic acid (SiO₂) by (g) silicic acid (H₂SiO₃) in the item 3.1.6.2 and to include a reference method for silicic acid (H₂SiO₃).² The Working Group held the opinion that difficulties would arise in international trade³ if the above reference methods were not included in the standard, particularly in view of the fact that these elements are generally declared on the label.

127. Considering that Prof. Ninard (France) has a centre of documentation at his disposal, the Working Group recommended that the Committee should request him to compile the bibliography listed in the "Proposed Methods of Sampling and Analysis for Mineral Waters" in extenso in the original language, in order to make it available to the Session of "the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling", to be held in Budapest, 11-15 May 1981.

128. The Working Group pointed out that in their opinion the "Draft European Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters" as contained in Appendix II to ALINORM 78/19, contains the following printing errors: in Section 3.2.16 the correct version of Ra 226-activity should be 3.0 pCi/l instead of 30 pCi/l and Section 4.2 should read "total beta-activity (except K⁴⁰ and H³): not more than 10 pCi/l," instead of "1 pCi/l". The Secretariat is requested to check this matter.

129. The Working Group noticed that the Committee on Food Additives had only temporarily endorsed some of the contaminants listed in Section 4. The Committee had requested that the methods should be defined more exactly to correlate their exactness and tolerance limits. Details on these methods will also be included in the document under elaboration by Prof. Ninard and will be submitted to the Committee concerned".

130. The Committee agreed with the content (paras 121-125) of the above report and decided to follow up the 3rd option indicated in the report; i.e., to continue by correspondence with the elaboration of Section 5.2 based on the current Section 5.2 of the standard as contained in Appendix II to ALINORM 79/19. It was further agreed that the information required in para. 125 should be sent to:

Mr. P. Rossier
Codex Contact Point for Switzerland
c/o Abt. Lebensmittelkontrolle
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3008 Bern (Switzerland)

preferably by the end of September 1981 for submission to the next Session of the Committee on Food Hygiene.

131. The Committee further agreed to request the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene to afford this Committee a possibility to examine thoroughly the Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collecting, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters preferably when the Code is at Step 5.

132. The Committee also agreed with the proposals as to how to proceed with the further elaboration of those methods of analysis which had not yet been endorsed (see paras 126 and 127 above).

133. The representative of ISO informed the Committee that a number of methods which had been elaborated by ISO, were available for examination together with those methods which already had been examined by the Working Group. The observer from ISO agreed to make these methods available in full text and with all available explanatory and supporting material to Prof. Ninard who kindly agreed to examine these additional methods. Information should also be provided, if available, on the applicability of these methods to mineral waters. Copies of these data will also be sent to Mr. Rossier and the Coordinator for Europe.

134. The Chairman thanked the members of the Working Group for the valuable work and in particular Mr. Rossier and Prof. Ninard for their kind offer to prepare further documentation for submission to the Committees on Food Hygiene, Methods of Analysis and Sampling and Food Additives.

COMMENT ON DRAFT STANDARD FOR FOOD GRADE SALT

135. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives, Dr. A. Feberwee (Netherlands) introduced the Draft Standard for Food Grade Salt, which had been referred to all Coordinating Committees for their comments by the Codex Committee on Food Additives at its 14th Session. The draft standard was reproduced in Annex I to CX/EURO 81/2, Part II. In his introductory remarks Dr. Feberwee gave a brief historical account of developments in this Committee and the Commission leading up to the development of the salt standard. Additional information concerning food grade salt and the draft standard therefore, was given by the observer from the European Committee for the Study of Salt (ECSS).

136. Concerning the section on scope, the delegation of the Fed. Rep. of Germany was of the opinion that there was no need to include the third sentence which was a negative statement indicating the kind of salt which the standard did not apply to. The Chairman explained that such negative statements were to be found in other Codex standards when there could conceivably be some doubt as to which products were covered by the standard and which were not.

137. As regards the section on food additives, a number of delegations thought that the list of food additives was rather long and that perhaps it could be shortened. These delegations found it hard to accept that all of the additives listed were technologically necessary. In reply the point was made that the list was subject to overall maximum limits of use which were small. Furthermore, the fact of a long list did not mean that all the additives listed would be used: rather it constituted a list of additives from which a choice could be made.

138. The delegation of the United Kingdom considered that the maximum level of 10 mg/kg for ferrocyanides was too low to be effective in preventing salt from caking, and suggested that a figure of 20 mg/kg would be more appropriate. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany also thought that the level was too low.

139. Concerning the section on Contaminants the delegation of the U.K. stated that, in its view, the maximum level under consideration for cadmium $\sqrt{0.5}$ mg/kg was too high. It had been calculated in the U.K. that if all salt contained this amount of cadmium, then salt would account for half the total intake of cadmium in the diet. The Chairman of the Committee also thought the level for cadmium was rather high, even though he noted that the figure of 0.5 mg/kg was in square brackets and therefore subject to alteration. He thought that a figure of 0.2 mg/kg might be more appropriate.

140. The observer from the EEC expressed the view that Section 7.1, Name of the Product, needed to be revised in such a way that the name of the product would be "salt", rather than, say, "table salt", "cooking salt", or "sea salt", and with the requirement that the source or origin of the salt also be shown separately on the label, whether it be sea salt or rock salt. The delegations of France and the Netherlands supported this. The delegation of France doubted whether there was any need to draw a distinction between "cooking salt" and "table salt", for example. It was pointed out by the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives that there were no definitions of "table salt" and "cooking salt" in the standard, but that it would be possible to define the difference between refined and coarse salt.

141. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed to delete from 7.6 the reference to "lot", because it was a case of continuous production and therefore the "lot" could not be defined. It was pointed out in reply, however, that in the case of packaged salt, "lot" could be defined.

CONSIDERATION OF INFORMATION PAPER AND FIRST DRAFT OF A EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR MAYONNAISE AND MAYONNAISE-LIKE PRODUCTS

142. The Secretariat, in introducing this topic, recalled that the Committee, at its 11th Session, had agreed that it would be desirable to commence the elaboration of a General Standard or Guidelines for Mayonnaise and Mayonnaise-like Products (ALINORM 79/19, para 95). The 13th Session of the Commission had been informed of the above proposal of the Committee and had agreed that the Committee could embark on the standardization of these products (ALINORM 79/38, para 296). No country having been nominated to prepare a first draft of such a standard, the Chairman of the Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare a first draft, taking into account the EEC Proposed Directive relating to mayonnaise and other emulsified condiment sauces (amended version of 8 March 1976). The first draft prepared by the Secretariat was contained in document CX/EURO 81/6.

143. The Committee noted that the draft standard contained provisions for such products as salad cream, salad dressing, bearnaise sauce, tartare sauce, etc. It was the general view in the Committee, however, that there was too much dissimilarity between these products and mayonnaise to enable them all to be dealt with satisfactorily in one standard. The Committee considered that it would be better to develop a standard for mayonnaise and flavoured mayonnaise (aioli) and lemon mayonnaise in the first instance, and then later the question of developing a standard for mayonnaise-like products, such as salad cream, sauce bearnaise, etc. could be looked into.

144. The Committee accepted the offer of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany to prepare a revised first draft standard for mayonnaise for consideration at the Committee's next session. The Committee requested the Secretariat to send out a circular letter (CL) requesting governments to send to the rapporteur:

Dr. Wilhelm Hellwig
Oberregierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit
Deutschherrenstrasse 87
D-5300 Bonn 2

any comments they might wish to make or any material they might like to make available, which might be useful for the development of the revised draft standard. In order to enable the rapporteur to prepare the revised draft and to have it dispatched to governments in good time before the next session, governments were requested to send their comments or other material that might be useful to the rapporteur by mid-October 1981.

FUTURE WORK

145. The Committee noted that it would have before it for consideration at its next session the following matters:

- (i) Consideration of Draft Standard for Vinegar;
- (ii) Consideration of First Draft Standard for Mayonnaise;
- (iii) Consideration of Code of Hygienic Practice for Natural Mineral Water;
- (iv) Reports from Member Countries of the Region on Acceptances of Codex Standards;
- (v) Progress Reports from International Organizations and Economic Groups in Europe concerned with Harmonization and Standardization of Food Requirements;
- (vi) Report by the delegation of Hungary on Comparison between Recommended Codex Standards and the corresponding CMEA standards and Progress Report on the extent to which it has been possible to bring CMEA standards into line with Recommended Codex Standards;
- (vii) Developments concerning Survey of Food Control Services and Inspection System in Europe;
- (viii) Reconsideration of possible amendment of the Recommended Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail;
- (ix) Reconsideration of Question of Size Grading of Canned Peas.

146. The Committee reviewed the list of topics for possible future work contained in para 94 of the report of its last session. The Committee noted that most of these topics fell within the terms of reference of other Codex Committees, notably the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The Committee considered, however, that the item "A review of national food control and certification procedures, taking into account work being undertaken by OECD and UNECE" was a subject of interest and requested the WHO representative to cover this topic, which was related to the work being done by WHO concerning the Survey on Food Control Services and Inspection Systems in Europe. The WHO representative agreed to do so.

147. The problem of coordination between Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Trade, etc., as well as other authorities responsible for enforcement and application of food law, was discussed. The delegation of France informed the Committee that in February 1981 a National Council for Foodstuffs had been formed, charged with the task of assisting responsible authorities in coordination of food legislation and its enforcement. It was suggested that a report be prepared for the next session of the Committee giving examples from Member States of how the coordination problems have been solved. The WHO representative undertook to prepare such a report in collaboration with the delegation of Hungary. The Member States would be asked to submit relevant information to the Food Safety Programme Unit, WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark. The Committee noted that this would be another topic for consideration at its next session.

148. The delegation of Spain presented a statement on the need to establish a regulation to limit the vinyl chloride monomer content in certain products. The Spanish delegation considered it important to recommend that this item be examined by the Committee on Food Additives, having regard to the following:

The regulation should cover the following products containing polyvinyl chloride:

- (a) articles for use in the fabrication, processing, distribution or consumption of food products coming in contact with foods or having an effect on them (for example, packaging materials for food products, table articles);
- (b) articles coming in contact with mucus of the mouth (for example, mouthpieces of musical instruments, pipes, excluding medical and dental instruments);
- (c) toys, and trick games or playthings which, when used normally, can come in contact with mouth mucus.

These articles should not be sold in trade if their chloride vinyl monomer content is above 1 mm per kg.

OTHER BUSINESS

149. The Committee recalled that the Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products had examined its future work programme (see para 155 of ALINORM 81/29) and had requested governments and Coordinating Committees to submit their views on the conclusions reached by that Committee with regard to the need or otherwise to establish Standards or Codes of Practice for the most important cereals and cereal products.

150. The Committee further noted that the Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products had not yet examined processed or composite products in which cereals were main ingredients. The Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products had agreed that these products could be considered at a later stage. The Committee recalled that certain types of these products had been mentioned at the 11th Session of this Committee in conjunction with discussions on future work.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

151. The Committee was informed by the Chairman that its next session would be held probably in October or late September 1982. No decision had yet been taken concerning the place where the session would be held. Several delegations expressed the hope that it would be possible to hold the session in Innsbruck. More detailed information will be made available to governments and interested international organizations in due course.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

ALINORM 81/19
APPENDIX I

Chairman of the Session
Président de la session
Presidente de la Reunion

Univ.Prof.
Dr. Herbert Woidich
Lebensmittel-Versuchsanstalt
Blaasstraße 29
A-1190 Vienna
AUSTRIA

Delegates
Délégués
Delegados

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE

Dr. Wilfried Steiger
Rat
Bundesministerium für Gesund-
heit und Umweltschutz
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Georg Lindner
Oberrat
Bundesanstalt für Lebensmittel-
untersuchung und -forschung
Kinderspitalgasse 15
A-1090 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Heinrich Neukirchen
Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gärungssessig
Fachverband der Nahrungs- und
Genußmittel-Industrie Österreichs
Zaunergasse 1-3
A-1037 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Otto Braun
Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gärungssessig
Fachverband der Nahrungs- und
Genußmittel-Industrie Österreichs
Trinkhausstraße 10
A-1110 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Alfred Psota
Sen.Rat
Bundesministerium für Gesund-
heit und Umweltschutz
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Ladislaus Blaschek
Bundeskammer der gewerblichen
Wirtschaft
Stubenring 12
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dipl.Ing. Otto Riedl
Vorstandsmitglied der Firma
Josef Manner & Co., AG
Felix Mottlstraße 50
A-1190 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Herbert Gutwald
Fachverband der Nahrungs- und
Genußmittel-Industrie
Zaunergasse 1-3
A-1037 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Klaus Smolka
Geschäftsführer des Fachverbandes
der Nahrungs- und Genußmittel-
Industrie Österreichs
Zaunergasse 1-3
A-1037 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Herbert Hauffe
Min.Rat
Bundesministerium für Handel,
Gewerbe und Industrie
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Ing. Arwed J. Stehlik
Bundesstaatliche Anstalt für experimentell-
pharmakologische und balneologische
Untersuchungen
Währinger Straße 13a
A-1090 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Komm.Rat Walther Stuller
Bundeskammer der gewerblichen
Wirtschaft
Bauernmarkt 13
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

APPENDIX I

Univ.Prof. Dipl.Ing.
Dr. Getrude Weber
Hygieneinstitut der Universität Wien
Kinderspitalgasse 15
A-1095 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

Dr. Richard Wildner
Fachverband der Nahrungs- und
Genußmittel-Industrie
Elisabethstraße 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Tuula Neuvonen
National Board of Trade and
Consumer Interests
Box 9
00531 Helsinki 53 (FINLAND)

Mag. Dr. Hedwig Wögerbauer
Koär.
Bundesministerium für Land- und
Forstwirtschaft
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Dr. Erkki Petäjä
Director of Customs Laboratory
Box 512
00101 Helsinki 10 (FINLAND)

Mag. Heinz Zourek
Österreichischer Arbeiterkammertag
Prinz Eugen-Straße 20
A-1040 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

FRANCE
FRANCIA

Jean Luc Gianardi
Direction de la Qualité
44 Bd. de Grenelle
F-75732 Paris Cedex 15 (FRANCE)

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

Marcel Meyers
Adjoint technique principal
Ministère des Affaires Economiques
Square de Meeûs 23
B-1040 Bruxelles (BELGIUM)

Dr. B. Ninard
Laboratoire National de la Santé
Ministère de la Santé
F-75015 Paris (FRANCE)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Dipl.Ing. Otakar Zálabský
Executive Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Tesnov 65
CS-Praha 1 (CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

GERMANY, FED. REP. OF
ALLEMAGNE, REP. FED. D'
ALEMANIA, REP. FED. DE

Dr. Wilhelm Hellwig
Oberregierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Jugend,
Familie und Gesundheit
Deutscherherrenstraße 87
D-5300 Bonn 2 (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

Dr. Miroslav Novotny
Ministry of Health of the
Czech Socialist Republic
W.Piecka 98
CS-12038 Praha 10 (CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

Helmut Martell
Verbände der Feinkost- und
Essigindustrie
Renterstraße 151
D-5300 Bonn 1 (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

Dr. Karlheinz Schlegel
Kraft GmbH
Postfach 5520
D-6236 Eschborn (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

APPENDIX I

Béla Talpay
 Institut für Honigforschung
 Postfach 100705
 Bonn (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

Agnes Makay
 Techn. Director
 Ministry of Agriculture and Food
 Kossuth L. tér 11
 H-1051 Budapest (HUNGARY)

Dr. Christian Thieme
 Verein Deutscher Salzindustrie
 Schwanenstraße 124
 D-5650 Solingen 11 (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

J. Marosi
 Techn. Director
 Hungarian Office for Standardization
 Üllői út 25
 H-1091 Budapest (HUNGARY)

Horst Tuchel
 Warenverein
 D-Hamburg (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

Dr. Günther Vorwohl
 Landesanstalt für Bienenkunde
 Bundesgesundheitsministerium
 Hohenheim
 D-7000 Stuttgart 70 (FED. REP. of GERMANY)

NETHERLANDS
 PAYS-BAS
 PAISES BAJOS

Dr. Alfred Feberwee
 Nutrition and Quality Affairs
 Ministry of Agriculture and
 Fisheries
 Bezuidenhoutseweg 73
 NL-The Hague (NETHERLANDS)

GREECE
 GRÈCE
 GRECIA

Dr. Constantina Gegiou
 General Chemical State Laboratory
 16 An. Tsoha Street
 Greece
 Athens-602 (GREECE)

Dr. Jan Mees
 Commission for the Dutch Food
 and Agricultural Industry
 P.O. Box 5100
 NL-2508 AC The Hague (NETHERLANDS)

HUNGARY
 HONGRIE
 HUNGRIA

NORWAY
 NORVEGE
 NORUEGA

Dr. K. Sütö
 President of National Codex Alimentarius
 Committee of Hungary
 Üllői út 25
 H-1091 Budapest (HUNGARY)

Dr. Brita Brandtzaeg
 Norwegian Codex Committee
 Post Box 8139 Dep.
 N-Oslo 1 (NORWAY)

Balint Czakó
 Hungarian Codex Alimentarius Committee
 Üllői út 25
 H-1091 Budapest (HUNGARY)

Trygve Östmo
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Quality Control Division
 Processed Fruits and Vegetables
 Gladengveien 3 B
 N-Oslo 6 (NORWAY)

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

Anna Czerni
Ministry of Foreign Trade & Shipping
Quality Inspection Office
Zurawia 32/34
Warsaw (POLAND)

Gomez Lopez José Luis
Instituto Nacional del Consumo
Juan Bravo 3
Madrid (SPAIN)

Juan Ponz Marín
Comision Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Sanidad Y Seguridad Social
Paseo Prado 18-20
Madrid (SPAIN)

PORTUGAL

António Martins Nunes
Direcção-Geral de Geologia e Minas
Rua António Enes', 7
1097 Lisboa (PORTUGAL)

Pedro A. Garcia Gonzalez
Comisión Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
P^o dal Prado, 18-20
Ministerio de Sanidad Y Seguridad Social
18 Madrid 14 (SPAIN)

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

Roberto Conty Larraz
Comisión Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Sanidad Y Seguridad Social
P^o. Prado -18-20
Madrid (SPAIN)

Agustín Cerdá Rubio
Comisión Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Industria Y Energia
P^o de la castellana
160 Madrid 6 (SPAIN)

Cándido Egoscozabal Lopez
Comisión Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Economia Y Comercio
Almagro 33
Madrid 4 (SPAIN)

Juan José Guitian
Comisión Interministerial para la
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Agricultura Y Pesca
P^o infanta Isabel
1 Madrid 14 (SPAIN)

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

Pierre Rossier
Codex Alimentarius
c/o Abt. Lebensmittelkontrolle
Haslerstraße 16
CH-3008 Bern (SWITZERLAND)

Ferdinand Jeanrichard
Sté Assistance technique pour
Produits Nestlé SA
Case Postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour de Peilz (SWITZERLAND)

TURKEY
TURQUIE
TURQUIA

Dr. Fethullah Kog
General Director of Food Affairs
Ministry of Agriculture
Turkey

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

Mary Coales
Food Standards Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House, Horseferry Road
London S.W. (U.K.)

Dr. Richard Harding
Principal Scientific Officer
Food Science Division,
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London S.W. (U.K.)

Graham Bond
British Vinegars Ltd.
87 South Lambeth Road
London S.W. 8 (U.K.)

USSR
URSS

Dr. Anatoli M. Zaitsev
Representative for Europe
Executive Committee CAC
Ministry of Health
Rakhvnanovsky 3
Moscow (USSR)

YUGOSLAVIA
YUGOSLAVIE

Dr. Mirkoviz-Brus Bosa
Yugoslav Standard Organization;
Assic Products of Mineral Water
Bulevar 116/IV
Beograd (YUGOSLAVIA)

OBSERVERS
OBSERVATEURS
OBSERVADORES

ALGERIA
ALGERIE
ARGELIA

Bayoub Semaoui
Ambassade d'Algérie
Reichsrats Strasse, 17
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

MEXICO
MEXIQUE

Ing. Eliseo Peralto P.
Comité Intersectorial Normas de Calidad
Dirección General Economía Agrícola
Carlina No. 132
Mexico City (Z.P. 18) (MEXICO)

SAUDI ARABIA
ARABIE SAOUDITE
ARABIA SAUDITA

Khaled M. Alqusair
Agricultural Engineer
Saudi Arabia Standard Organization
P.O. Box 3437
KSA-Riyadh (SAUDI ARABIA)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF SALT (CEES)

Jacques Mignon
Président de la Commission des Sels
Alimentaires du Comité Européen
d'Etude du Sel
11bis Avenue Victor Hugo
75116 Paris, (FRANCE)

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Egon Gaerner
Commission des Communautés Européennes
Rue de la Loi 200
B-1049 Bruxelles (BELGIUM)
Luciano Robotti
Conseil des C.E.
Rue de la Loi 170
B-1040 Bruxelles (BELGIUM)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION
(ISO)

Ing. Mag. Dr. Rudolf Danninger
Leopoldgasse 4
A-1020 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

SECRETARIAT

FAO

Henry James McNally
Senior Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
00100 Rome (ITALY)

Barbara Dix
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
00100 Rome (ITALY)

Marina Cianfanelli
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
00100 Rome (ITALY)

WHO

Barbro Blomberg
Regional Officer for Food Safety
WHO Regional Office for Europe
Scherfigsvej 8
DK-2100 Copenhagen (DENMARK)

AUSTRIAN TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT

Dr. Werner Thumser
Ministerialrat
Bundesministerium für Gesundheit
und Umweltschutz
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Regina Schütz-Szepessy
Reyident
Bundesministerium für Gesundheit
und Umweltschutz
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Elisabeth Winter
Bundesministerium für Gesundheit
und Umweltschutz
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna (AUSTRIA)

PROPOSED DRAFT EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR VINEGAR
(at Step 5)

1. SCOPE

This standard applies to vinegars as defined in Section 2.1 below. This standard does not apply to products derived from synthetic acetic acid.

2. DESCRIPTION

2.1 Product Definition

2.1.1 Vinegar is a liquid, fit for human consumption, produced from a suitable raw material of agricultural origin containing starch, sugars or starch and sugars by the process of double fermentation, alcoholic and acetous and contains a specified amount of acetic acid. Vinegar may contain optional ingredients in accordance with Section 3.2.

2.1.1.1 Wine vinegar is a vinegar obtained from wine of grapes by acetous fermentation. The raw material shall comply with the specifications prescribed in the producing country, except that the maximum level for volatile acids may be exceeded.

2.1.1.2 Fruit (wine) vinegar, Berry (wine) vinegar are vinegars obtained by acetous fermentation from wine of fruit or wine of berries. The raw material shall comply with the specifications prescribed in the producing country, except that the maximum level for volatile acids may be exceeded. The products may also be obtained from fruit or fruit wastes by the process defined in Section 2.1.1.

2.1.1.3 Spirit vinegar is a vinegar obtained by acetous fermentation from distilled alcohol of agricultural origin.

2.1.1.4 Grain vinegar is a vinegar obtained without intermediate distillation by the process defined in Section 2.1.1 from any cereal grain, the starch of which has been converted to sugars by a process other than solely by the diastase of malted barley.

2.1.1.5 Malt vinegar is a vinegar obtained without intermediate distillation by the process defined in Section 2.1.1 from malted barley, with or without the addition of cereal grains, the starch of which has been converted to sugars solely by the diastase of the malted barley.

2.1.1.6 Whey vinegar is a vinegar obtained without intermediate distillation by the process defined in Section 2.1.1 from whey.

2.1.1.7 Honey vinegar is a vinegar obtained without intermediate distillation by the process defined in Section 2.1.1 from honey.

2.1.1.8 Distilled vinegar is a vinegar obtained in accordance with Section 2.1.1 which has been subject to the process of distillation after completed alcoholic fermentation.

3. ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY CRITERIA

3.1 Raw Material

3.1.1 (i) Products of agricultural origin containing starch, sugars or starch and sugars including but not limited to: fruit, berries, fruit wastes, cereal grains, malted barley, whey, honey.

(ii) Wine of grapes, fruit or berries.

(iii) Distilled alcohol of agricultural origin.

3.1.2 Nutrients for Acetobacter such as yeast extracts and autolysates and amino acids are permitted. 1/

1/ See paras 79-80 and Section 4.10.1.

APPENDIX II3.2 Optional Ingredients

The following ingredients may be added to vinegar:

3.2.1 Plants, in particular herbs, spices and fruit, or their parts or extracts suitable for flavouring.

3.2.2 Whey, not more than [] grammes (1000 ml).

3.2.3 Fruit juices or their equivalent of concentrated fruit juices, not more than 25 grammes/1000 ml per 1% acetic acid.

3.2.4 Sugars as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, not more than 100 grammes/1000 ml.

3.2.5 Honey as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, not more than 100 grammes/1000 ml.

3.2.6 Salt, not more than [100] grammes/1000 ml.

3.3 Acetic Acid Content

3.3.1 Wine vinegar: not less than 60 grammes per litre (calculated as acetic acid).

3.3.2 Other vinegars: not less than 50 grammes per litre (calculated as acetic acid).

3.4 Residual Alcohol Content

Residual alcohol: not more than 0.5% v/v, [except for 1% v/v in wine vinegar]

3.5 Soluble Solids

The soluble solids content of the vinegars defined in Sections 2.1.1.1 and 2.1.1.2, exclusive of added sugars or salt, shall not be less than [2] grammes per 1000 ml per 1% acetic acid.

[3.6 Vinegar contains characteristic fermentation products such as gluconic acid, 2-acetogluconic acid, 5-acetogluconic acid, acetic acid ethylesters, citric acid and amino acids.]

[3.7 Wine vinegar has a marked reaction on acetoin and 2,3-butyleneglycol.] 1/

4. FOOD ADDITIVES

[4.1 Sulphur dioxide

Maximum level
70 mg/kg]

4.2 L-ascorbic acid (as antioxidant)

400 mg/kg

4.3 Caramel colour (plain)

GMP

4.4 Caramel colour
(ammonium sulphite process)

[]

4.5 Caramel colour
(ammonia process)

[]

4.6 Anthocyanins derived from grapes

[]

4.7 Flavours

Natural flavours and flavouring substances as defined for the purpose of the Codex Alimentarius (see Codex Guide to the Safe Use of Food Additives (CAC/FAL 5-1979).

1/ See para 72.

4.8 Flavour Enhancers

4.8.1 Monosodium, monopotassium and calcium glutamate []

4.9 Carry-over principle

4.9.1 Section 3 of the "Principle relating to the Carry-over of Additives into Foods" (ALINORM 76/12, App. III) shall apply.

4.9.2 Sulphur dioxide shall be not more than 50 mg/kg if carried over in accordance with Section 4.9.1.]

4.10 Processing Aids

4.10.1 Ammonium phosphates: not more than [] mg/kg (to facilitate multiplication of acetobacter spp.)]

4.10.2 Clarifying and filtering agents as approved by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and used in accordance with Good Manufacturing Practice.

5. CONTAMINANTS

Maximum levels

5.1 Arsenic (As)

[1 mg/kg]

5.2 Lead (Pb)

[1 mg/kg]

5.3 Copper (Cu)

[10 mg/kg]

5.4 Zinc (Zn)

[10 mg/kg]

5.5 Iron (Fe)

[30 mg/kg]

5.6 Free mineral acids

[] mg/kg

6. HYGIENE

6.1 It is recommended that the products covered by the provisions of this standard be prepared in accordance with the General Principles of Food Hygiene (Ref. No.CAC/RCP 1-1969).

6.2 When tested by appropriate methods of sampling and examination the product:

(a) shall be free from micro-organisms capable of development under normal conditions of storage and from turbidity caused by micro-organisms (mother of vinegar);

(b) shall not contain vinegar eels or substantial quantities of other suspended matters and sediments; and

(c) shall not contain any substances originating from micro-organisms in amounts which may represent a hazard to health.

7. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

7.1 Fill of Container

7.1.1 Minimum fill

Vinegar shall occupy not less than 90% v/v of the water capacity of the container. The water capacity of the container is the volume of distilled water at 20 °C which the sealed container will hold when completely filled.

8. LABELLING

In addition to Sections 1, 2, 4 and 6 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (Ref. No. CAC/RS 1-1969) the following provisions apply:

APPENDIX II8.1 The Name of the Food

8.1.1 The name of the food shall be vinegar, except that:

- (i) products complying with Sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.1.8 may be designated by the appropriate name as defined in those sections.
- (ii) products derived from more than one of the raw materials mentioned in Sections 2.1.1.1 to 2.1.1.8 may be designated "x vinegar" where "x" constitutes a complete list of names of the types of products.

8.1.2 Where an ingredient has been added in accordance with sub-sections 3.2 and/or 4.4 (i) which imparts to the food the distinctive flavour of the ingredient or ingredients the name shall be accompanied by an appropriate descriptive term.

8.1.3 Where vinegar does not contain added colours or any other additive the term "without colour", or any other appropriate descriptive term, may appear in close proximity to the name of the food.

8.2 List of Ingredients

A complete list of ingredients shall be declared on the label in descending order of proportion except that substances present in accordance with sub-sections 4.9 and 4.10 need not be declared. If the food is derived exclusively from a single basic product, and no other ingredient has been added, no list of ingredients need be given.

8.3 Net Contents

The net contents shall be declared in volume in either the metric ("Système International" units) or avoirdupois or both systems as required by the country in which the food is sold.

8.4 Name and Address

The name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor of the food shall be declared.

8.5 Country of Origin

The country of origin of the food shall be declared if its omission would mislead or deceive the consumer.

8.6 Lot Identification

Each container shall be embossed or otherwise permanently marked in clear or in code to identify the producing factory and the lot.

9. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

To be elaborated. 1/

1/ See para 100.