codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

ALINORM 05/28/39

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Twenty-Eighth Session
Rome, Italy, 4 - 9 July 2005

REPORT OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON FRUIT AND VEGETABLE JUICES

Fortaleza (Ceará), Brazil, 11 - 15 October 2004

NOTE: This Report includes Codex Circular Letter CL 2004/51-FJ

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

CX 5/100 **CL 2004/51-FJ**
November 2004

TO : - Codex Contact Points
- Interested International Organizations

FROM : Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, 00100 Rome, Italy

SUBJECT : **Distribution of the Report of the 4th Session of the *Ad Hoc* Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices**

MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 28TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEPS 8 OR 5/8 OF THE UNIFORM PROCEDURE

1. ***Draft Codex General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars*** **at Step 8** (para. 103 and Appendix II).

2. ***Draft Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (%v/v) – grape, guava, mandarine/tangerine, mango, passion fruit and tamarind (Indian date) juices/nectars*** **at Step 8** (para. 104 and Appendix III).

3. ***Proposed Draft Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (%v/v) – orange, lemon, lime and pineapple juices/nectars*** **at Step 5/8** (para. 105 and Appendix IV).

Governments and international organizations wishing to propose amendments or to comment on the above should do so in writing in conformity with the *Guide to the Consideration of Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards Including Consideration of Any Statements Relating to Economic Impact* (Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, 13th Edition, pages 24-26) to the Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy (Fax: +39 (06) 5705 4593; E-mail: codex@fao.org ***preferably***), **before 31 March 2005**.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 4th Session of the *Ad Hoc* Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices reached the following conclusions:

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 28TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

The Task Force agreed to forward:

- the ***draft Codex General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars*** to the 28th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8 (para. 103).

- the ***draft Minimum Brix Levels for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (% v/v) – grape, guava, mandarine/tangerine, mango, passion fruit and tamarind (Indian date) juices/nectars*** to the 28th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8 (para. 104).

- the ***proposed draft Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (%v/v) – orange, lemon, lime and pineapple juices/nectars*** to the 28th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (para. 105).

OTHER MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMISSION

Revocation of individual standards and related texts for fruit juices/nectars

- The Task Force recognized that the above decisions were in line with the recommendation of the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission that a single Standard could be presented for final adoption by the Commission. Once the General Standard be adopted at Step 8, all the individual standards for fruit juices and nectars and related texts as contained in Volume 6 of the Codex Alimentarius would be revoked. (para. 106).

Completion of work of the *Ad Hoc* Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices

- The Task Force noted that it completed the work assigned to it by the 23rd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and concluded by thanking the Government of Brazil for the efficient and hard work in organizing four meetings of the Task Force, and for the kind hospitality shown (para. 110).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

1. The 4th Session of the *Ad Hoc* Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices was held in Fortaleza, from 11 - 15 October 2004 at the kind invitation of the Government of Brazil. Mr Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva, Chief of the Technical Cooperation and International Agreement Division, Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Food Supply, chaired the Session. The Session was attended by delegates from 19 Member countries and 1 Member Organization and Observers from 3 international organizations. The List of Participants is attached to this report as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. The Session was opened by Mr Cesar Wilson Martins da Rocha, Deputy Secretary of Animal and Plant Health and Inspection of the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Food Supply of Brazil. Mr Wilson highlighted the importance of Codex standards, especially the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars, for international trade and encouraged delegates to work on the spirit of consensus in finalizing the aforesaid Standard and wished the participants the utmost success in its deliberations as well as an enjoyable stay in Fortaleza.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)[1]

3. The Delegation of the European Community (EC) presented CRD 1 on the division of competence between the European Community and its Member States according to paragraph 5, Rule II.5 of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

4. The Task Force adopted the Provisional Agenda as proposed.

MATTERS REFFERED/OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES (Agenda Item 2)[2]

5. The Task Force noted that the document was presented mainly for information and therefore, it did not need to take any action on the matters contained therein except for a request arising from the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) on "*The Use of Analytical Results: Sampling Plans, relationship between the Analytical results, the Measurement Uncertainty, Recovery Factors and Provisions in Codex Standards*" which was decided to be considered under Agenda Item 5 "Other Business".

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 7

DRAFT CODEX GENERAL STANDARD FOR FRUIT JUICES AND NECTARS (Agenda Item 3a)[3]

6. The Task Force noted that the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (July 2003) adopted the proposed draft Codex Standard General for Fruit Juices and Nectars at Step 5 and advanced it to Step 7 for further consideration by the Task Force without the need for obtaining additional comments. However, the Commission agreed that further comments were necessary for the development of Brix levels for certain fruit juices/nectars (see paras. 67 and 81). The Commission noted the important progress and decision made on the major Sections of the Standard and that the Task Force would have the opportunity to finalize the text at its next Session so that a single Standard could be presented for final adoption by the Commission.

---

1 CX/FJ 04/1, CRD 1 (Annotated Provisional Agenda, Division of Competence between the European Community and its Member States).

2 CX/FJ 04/2

3 CX/FJ 04/3 and comments submitted by Australia, Brazil, Canada, European Community, Russia, United States, and IFU (CX/FJ 04/3-Add.1); Panama (CRD 4); and, Thailand (CRD 5).

7. The Task Force also noted that there were a number of issues arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and from the Codex Committees on Food Additives and Contaminants, Food Labelling, and Methods of Analysis and Sampling due to the endorsement process in the relevant Sections of the Standard. These issues were considered as follows:

Coconut Water

8. The Task Force noted that the 36th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (March 2004) considered the allocation of food additive provisions for "coconut water" in the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA). However, the Committee could not identify the proper food category in the Food Category System of the GSFA to cover this product so that food additive provisions for "coconut water" could be incorporated into the GSFA. In view of this, the Committee decided to request the advice of the Task Force as to whether "coconut water" could fit into the definition of "fruit juice" and hence covered by the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars.

9. The Task Force had an exchange of views on the definition of "coconut water" vis-à-vis compliance with the definition and requirements of the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars to determine if this product could be considered as a "fruit juice" and consequently covered by the General Standard.

10. The delegation of Brazil informed the Task Force that "coconut water" referred to the aqueous liquid (liquid endosperm) enclosed in the kernel (endosperm) of the coconut. The "coconut water" was extracted by cutting off the head of the coconut followed by an aseptic process of storage of the liquid in formulation tanks, filtration, and packaging. The filtration process was to eliminate residues to obtain a clear or slightly turbid liquid that was processed by heat (Ultra High Temperature – UHT -) and packaged in tetra-pack containers with a maximum durability of 9 months.

11. The Task Force noted that "coconut water" was different from "coconut milk"[4] which was the diluted emulsion of comminuted coconut endosperm (kernel) in water with the soluble and suspended solids distributed in the product. The delegation of Thailand informed the Task Force that "fat content" was the quality parameter applied to "coconut milk" as opposed to "Brix level". The Task Force further noted that the 25% minimum juice content in the Annex on Brix Levels referred to the minimum content of "coconut water" required to prepare nectars.

12. The Task Force agreed that "coconut water" complied with the provisions of the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. Some delegations noted that the definition of "fruit juice" in Section 2.1.1.1 needed to be amended to accommodate "coconut water" as it was the juice obtained by extracting the water from the fruit and not by expressing the coconut meat (kernel). Other delegations recalled that it would be not advisable at this time to amend this Section as it was a compromised language agreed to by Task Force at previous sessions. In view of this, the Task Force decided to enter a footnote to the term "coconut" in the Annex to the General Standard to clarify that the juice of this fruit was the "coconut water" extracted from the coconut without expressing the coconut meat.

Section 4 - Food Additives

13. The 36th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC) endorsed the food additive provisions in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars with an amendment in the footnote related to sulphites to limit their use to fruit juices and nectars in bulk dispensers and to certain tropical fruit juices and nectars.

14. In taking this decision, the CCFAC: (a) removed all food provisions in the Step procedure (Steps 3 and 6) for inclusion in the GSFA for fruit juices and nectars and their concentrates and (b) recommended the Commission to revoke those food additive provisions for fruit juices and nectars and their concentrates already included in the GSFA but not matching the endorsed list of food additive provisions in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. The 27th Session of the Commission (July 2004) concurred with this decision.

---

4 Codex Standard for Aqueous Coconut Products – Coconut Milk and Coconut Cream (CODEX STAN 240/2003).

15. Consequently, the Committee recommended the Task Force to remove the list of food additives of the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars and to replace it with the following: "*Food additives listed in Tables 1 and 2 of the General Standard for Food Additives in Food Categories 14.1.2.1 (Fruit Juice), 14.1.2.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Juice), 14.1.3.1 (Fruit Nectar), and 14.1.3.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Nectar) may be used in foods subject to this Standard*".

16. The Task Force agreed to refer the food additive Section in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars to the GSFA by introducing the general statement as proposed by CCFAC. In taking this decision the Task Force agreed on the following amendments:

Sulphites

17. The Task Force noted that, when endorsing food additive provisions in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars, the 36th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants did not endorse the footnote on the use of sulphites as proposed by the Task Force i.e. "*sulphites should be used when there is a technological necessity*" as only food additive that were technologically justified were included in the GSFA. Instead, the Committee amended the footnote to read "*sulphites should be used only in fruit juices and nectars in bulk dispensers and in certain tropical fruit juices and* nectars" to specify that the use of sulphites applied to specific cases such as fruit juices and nectars in bulk dispensers or to prevent oxidation in certain tropical fruit juices/nectars when no more other suitable technological means were available.

18. Some delegations indicated that the current language was unnecessary restrictive as it excluded broader uses of sulphites as antioxidants and did not represent current industry practices worldwide which applied to fruit juices/nectars other than tropical ones. These delegations said that the amendment introduced by CCFAC was not based on safety considerations but to clarify the language. They also indicated that the previous footnote represented a compromise language agreed to by the Task Force on a matter that was difficult to reach consensus.

19. Other delegations proposed to keep the footnote as endorsed by CCFAC and to expand it to cover uses of sulphites in fruit juices/nectars other than tropical ones. These delegations noted the safety concern associated with the use of sulphites.

20. Those delegations favouring the removal of the footnote indicated that the safety concern on sulphites could be adequately addressed through labelling. These delegations indicated that it was not a workable solution to broaden the footnote as there were several fruit juices/nectars and their mixtures that could be left aside by introducing specific names in the footnote. They also indicated that in any case sulphites were subject to national legislation of the importing country and footnote 6 already provided for countries to apply their own legislation on the use of sulphites.

21. In view of the above, the Task Force agreed to delete footnote 7 "*sulphites should be used only in fruit juices and nectars in bulk dispensers and in certain tropical fruit juices and* nectars" and to inform CCFAC to make the corresponding amendment on sulphites (INS 220-225, 227, 228, 539) in food categories 14.1.2.1 (Fruit Juice), 14.1.2.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Juice), 14.1.3.1 (Fruit Nectar), and 14.1.3.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Nectar) of the GSFA.

Amendment of Sections 2.1.4 Fruit Purée and 2.1.5 Concentrated Fruit Purée

22. The Task Force noted that the food additive provisions of the GSFA for fruit purées were not the same as those given in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars for fruit purées used to make fruit juices and nectars. This was because Codex, through the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables, had developed food additive provisions for certain fruit purées, e.g. *Standard for Canned Chestnuts and Chestnut Purée* (CODEX STAN 145-1985), that were applicable to fruit purées to be sold as such and not for further processing.

23. In view of this, the Task Force agreed to rephrase the description of "fruit purée" and "concentrated fruit purée" in Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 of the General Standard to clarify that these purées were intended for the production of (concentrated) fruit juices and nectars. This approach would avoid any confusion with those food categories of the GSFA covering fruit purées to be sold as such. In this regard, the Task Force noted that for the most part, the Food Category System of the GSFA applied to foods sold directly to the consumer.

24. In addition, the Task Force noted that it would not be necessary to amend the Food Category System by introducing a new sub-category for (concentrated) fruit purées intended for the production of (concentrated) fruit juices and nectars as these purées were solely intended for further processing into (concentrated) fruit juices and nectars identified in food categories 14.1.2.1 (Fruit Juice), 14.1.2.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Juice), 14.1.3.1 (Fruit Nectar), and 14.1.3.3 (Concentrates for Fruit Nectar) that were covered by the general statement recommended by CCFAC (see para. 15) which clearly stated that only the additives in those particular food categories where appropriate for fruit juices and nectars.

Section 4.8 - Processing Aids (*renumbered Section 5*)

Polydimethylsiloxane

25. The Task Force noted that the 36th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants endorsed processing aid provisions in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars with the exception of polydimethylsiloxane which was returned to the Task Force for clarification on whether the technological function of this compound was linked to a food additive or a processing aid use.

26. The Task Force had an exchange of views on whether polydimethylsiloxane at a maximum level of usage of 10 mg/l should be regarded either as a food additive or as a processing aid. A number of delegations were of the view that polydimethylsiloxane was a processing aid rather than a food additive and supported its retention in the Processing Aid Section of the General Standard. Other delegations were of the opinion that this compound should be considered as a food additive and included in the Section on Food Additives in accordance with the GSFA.

27. Those delegations favouring the retention of polydimethylsiloxane in the list of processing aids indicated that this compound was used to prevent foaming during processing (e.g. pumping, concentration, filling, packaging) and that the amount of residues left after processing did not have a technological effect in the final product. Therefore, the use of polydimethylsiloxane fulfilled the definition of a processing aid given in the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual[5]. In addition, as processing aids were not subject to labelling declaration[6], the introduction of labelling requirements for polydimethylsiloxane would imply a significant change in the current industry practices. These delegations recalled that the 3rd Session of the Task Force had already agreed to consider polydimethylsiloxane as a processing aid for the products covered by this General Standard[7]. They recognized that although polydimethylsiloxane might have a dual function of processing aid/food additive the latter applied to other technological functions such as anticacking agent but not as antifoaming agent. In order to better reflect the use of polydimethylsiloxane as a processing aid, these delegations proposed its use at GMP level with a maximum residue limit in the final product not greater than 10 mg/l.

---

5 Definitions for the Purposes of the Codex Alimentarius, Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, 13th Edition, pages 49-51. See also General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 1-1991), Section 2 – Definitions of Terms and the General Standard for Food Additives (CODEX STAN 192-1985, Rev. 2-1999), Definitions of Terms used in the GSFA, point (a).

6 General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, Processing Aids and Carry-Over of Food Additives, Section 4.2.4.2.

7 ALINORM 03/39A, para. 35.

28. Those delegations favouring the consideration of polydimethylsiloxane as a food additive expressed the view that CCFAC had already identified this compound as a food additive in the GSFA[5] for food category 14.1.2 Fruit and Vegetable Juices at a maximum level of use of 10 mg/kg. They noted that the definition of food additive also referred to their addition in the manufacture, processing, preparation, treatment, packing, packaging, transport, etc. to perform a technological effect in the final product. In this regard, they indicated that most of the processing aids listed in the General Standard were eliminated after processing while polymethylsiloxane remained in the product at a level that might still have a technological effect in the final product and if this was the case, it should be declared on the label. Therefore, the use of polydimethylsiloxane also fulfilled the definition of food additive given in the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual[5]. In view of this, they proposed to request CCFAC to provide clarification on the use of this compound at the level proposed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. The Task Force noted that the CCFAC had requested clarification about whether the technological function of this compound was linked to a food additive use or a processing aid as the technical expertise to identify food additives technologically necessary in a given product rested with Codex commodity committees.

29. In order to reach a compromise solution, some delegations proposed to differentiate the use of polydimethylsiloxane as a processing aid with the functional effect of an antifoaming agent when related to the manufacture of the product e.g. pumping, concentration, etc. and as food additive with functional effect of antifoaming agent when associated with the final product e.g. filling, packaging. It was therefore proposed to have polydimethylsiloxane as an antifoaming agent in both processing aid with a maximum level of use up to 10 mg/l and a maximum residue limit not greater than 10 mg/l and food additive with a maximum level of use equal or greater than 10 mg/l. It was however noted that there was no methodology to differentiate between the two uses of the compound in the final product and that in any case, the term "processing" covered the entire production chain as filling, packaging, and transport, were still part of the "processing" of the product.

30. The Task Force reconfirmed the decision taken at its 3rd Session that polydimethylsiloxane should be treated as a processing aid for the purposes of this General Standard at a maximum level of use of GMP level with a maximum residue limit in the final product not greater than 10 mg/l and to request CCFAC to withdraw polydimethylsiloxane from the GSFA for the food categories covered by the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. The Delegation of the EC expressed its reservation on these decisions.

Allergenicity of certain Processing Aids – Sodium & Potassium Caseinates/Isinglass

31. The Task Force noted that when considering the adoption of the General Standard, the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission agreed to include sodium and potassium caseinates in the list of processing aids[8].

32. Some delegations indicated that these sodium and potassium caseinates as well as isinglass might entail allergenicity problems and therefore they should be removed from the list of processing aids or to apply mandatory labelling requirements in accordance with Sections 4.2.1.4 (Mandatory Labelling in the List of Ingredients for Foods and Food Ingredients known to cause Hypersensitivity) and 4.2.4 (Processing Aids and Carry-Over of Food Additives - non applicability of exception from ingredient declaration for processing aids) of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.

33. The Task Force agreed to remove these 3 compounds from the list of processing aids. As isinglass was endorsed by the 36th Session of the CCFAC, the Task Force agreed to inform the Committee of this change for appropriate action by CCFAC. In addition, the Task Force agreed that, if the Commission considered the inclusion of isinglass or sodium and potassium caseinates in the General Standard, the following statement should be entered as a footnote to these compounds:

> "Use of these processing aids should take into account their allergenic potential. If there is any carry over of these processing aids into finished product, they are subject to ingredient declaration in accordance with Sections 4.2.1.4 and Section 4.2.4 of the of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods."

---

8 ALINORM 03/41, paras. 86 – 89.

34. The Task Force also agreed to keep the Section on Processing Aids in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars and requested CCFAC to remove those processing aids from the Inventory of Processing Aids (IPA) that did not match the endorsed processing aid provisions listed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars for consistency between the two Codex texts.

35. The Task Force noted that although the IPA was basically a "List" intended for compiling information on substances used as a processing aids or whose safety should be evaluated by JECFA and was not intended to provide a positive list of processing aids, the IPA had been adopted by the 18th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (1989) as CAC-MISC 3 and therefore, it was an official Codex document.

Section 5 - Contaminants (*renumbered Section 6*)

36. The Task Force recalled that at its last Session it agreed to change the reference to "for these products" to read "for the respective fruits" as there were no maximum residue limits for pesticide residues regarding the products defined by the Standard but for individual agricultural commodities (e.g. fresh fruits and vegetables).

37. However, the Task Force noted that the Codex Alimentarius Commission had set up maximum residue limits for pesticide residues in a number of fruit juices and therefore, it agreed to reinsert the reference to "these products" instead of "the respective fruits" which corresponded to the standardized language applying to Codex commodity standards for this provision.

38. In addition, the Task Force reorganized the Section into two sub-sections 5.1 Pesticide Residues and 5.2 Other Contaminants in accordance with the Format of Codex Commodity Standards[9] and applied the standardized language also to Section 5.2 for consistency throughout Codex commodity standards.

Section 7 - Labelling (*renumbered Section 8*)

39. The Task Force noted that the 32nd Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (April 2004) considered labelling provisions in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars for endorsement. The Committee endorsed the labelling provisions in the General Standard except for the following exceptions:

Section 7.1.1.7 - Labelling of Mixed/Blended Fruit Juices and Nectars

40. The Committee did not endorse Section 7.1.1.7 as it could not agree on the need to delete the first paragraph related to the use of the term "mixed" or "blended" in the name of product for mixtures of fruit juices and nectars.

41. The Task Force noted diverging views on this Section. Some delegations considered that the first paragraph of this Section was redundant as already covered by the relevant Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. Other delegations were of the view that both paragraph were complementary and proposed a combined amended text to clarify the provision.

42. The Task Force agreed to amend the Section to introduce a more flexible language while retaining the concept of listing the fruits constituting the mixed/blended fruit juice/nectar in descending order of proportion. Some delegations questioned the retention of this concept as Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods already provided for mandatory labelling of the ingredients in descending order of proportion. The Task Force noted that the provisions in this paragraph did not refer to the list of ingredients but to the name of the product which should also name the fruits in descending order of proportion, if the fruits were spelt out in the name of the product, to avoid misleading consumers as per the proportion of the fruits in the product.

---

9 Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, 13th Edition, page. 91.

Section 7.1.2.2 – Warning accompanying the name of fruit juices/nectars sweetened with food additive sweeteners that may cause hypersensitivity

43. The Task Force agreed to amend this Section as per the decision taken in Section 4 – Food Additives to refer to the GSFA. To this aim, it replaced the reference to "sweeteners as listed in Section 4.7" by "food additive sweeteners" to make it clear that the term "sweetener" applied only to food additives used as sweetening agents to replace sugars.

44. In addition, the Task Force noted that the 32nd Session of CCFL did not endorse this Section due to a request from the delegation of India to specify the name of the food additive sweeteners in conjunction with the name of the fruit juice/nectar by adding a statement e.g. "*not recommended for children and phenyketoneurics*".

45. The Task Force recalled that this Section was extensively discussed and agreed upon at its 3rd Session. It was indicated that the concern in Section 7.1.2.2 was already covered by Section 4.2.2.3 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. However, in response to the concerns of India that its national legislation did not permit the use of artificial sweeteners, the Task Force considered that India could distinguish fruit nectars containing food additive sweeteners from other fruit nectars by the labelling requirement provided for in this Section i.e. "with sweeteners". Therefore, the Task Force agreed not to reopen the discussion of this item and to leave the Section unchanged.

Section 7.1.2.8 – Pictorial representation on the label

46. The Task Force noted that the 32nd Session of CCFL did not endorse Section 7.1.2.8 due to a request from the delegation of India to amend this Section to avoid misleading consumers as per the fruit constituting the fruit juice/nectars and their pictorial representation on the label.

47. The Task Force recalled that this Section was extensively discussed and agreed upon at its 3rd Session. However, in order to further clarify the text and to accommodate the concern of India, the Task Force amended the text by introducing "*with respect to the fruit so illustrated*" at the end of the paragraph.

Section 7.1.2.11 – Footnote on Pulp and Cells

48. The Task Force agreed to leave the Section unchanged as footnote 2 to Section 2.1.1 already clarified that for citrus fruits, pulp and cells were the juice sacs obtained from the endocarp.

49. The delegation of the Russian Federation suggested excluding Section 7.1.2.11 totally as the wording "normally contained" had not been discussed and, therefore, it did not have any numerical definition, which could lead to ambiguity and various possible interpretations in production, trade, and quality control. In consequence, this Section could not be regarded as a requirement for labelling. However, the Task Force restated its previous decision to keep the Section unchanged.

Section 8 - Methods of Analysis and Sampling (*renumbered Section 9*)

Endorsement of Methods of Analysis in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars

50. The Task Force noted that the 25th Session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (March 2004)[10] decided that those methods of analysis for quality and authenticity would be listed without a type as "temporarily endorsed" pending the establishment of numerical values by the Task Force.

---

10 ALINORM 04/27/23, paras 85-91.

51. Several delegations indicated the need to have methods of analysis for quality and authenticity testing listed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. These delegations pointed out that the General Standard covered products made from a single fruit juice/nectar and blends of fruit juices/nectars as well as fruit juices made from concentrate, nectars, concentrated fruit juice and concentrated fruit purees and hence for each analyte there were a large number of applicable values. Further, the "correct" value of an analyte for a particular product might vary depending upon the specific fruit(s) used to make the fruit juice or juice blend, the geographic source of the fruit(s), the particular cultivar/variety of the source fruit(s), the specific methods used to extract and process the fruit juice, the growing conditions, etc. Due to these difficulties, the lack of data, and time constraints, it was not feasible to establish individual numerical values for each method for each of the products covered by the General Standard nor to develop a "general" value which could be applied to all products that would be meaningful for quality and authenticity determinations.

52. Other delegations proposed to use as reference the *Code of Practice for Evaluation of Fruit and Vegetable Juice of the Association of the Industry of Juices and Nectars from Fruits and Vegetables of the European Union* (AIJN Code of Practice) which contained numerical values for quality and authenticity for a number of fruit juices which matched as well the methods of analysis temporarily endorsed by CCMAS. However, this proposal was not accepted by the Task Force as some delegations did not have the opportunity to study the proposed values which might not be necessarily representative of the world production and were not well aware of the content of the Code.

53. Some delegations suggested to amend Section 3.4 on Authenticity, to indicate that for those methods relating to the verification of composition, quality and authenticity, comparison to the authentic fruit of the same type and from the same region be made, taking into account the normal variations attributable to processing. Additionally, other delegations proposed to link the determination of authenticity to those values established in national legislations when they existed. The Task Force could not agree on these proposals and consequently, it decided to leave the Section unchanged.

54. The Task Force recalled that in the development of the list of methods that the guidance of the CCMAS with respect to the proposed Criteria Approach for the acceptance of methods including reproducibility, repeatability, and HORRAT value were considered. The Task Force also considered *Recommendations for a Checklist of Information Required to evaluate Methods of Analysis submitted to the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling for Endorsement* as provided in Volume 13 and was of the view that the guideline was provided as required in Section 1.1.4 of the above Checklist and that this provided the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable material. The Task Force noted that Section 1.1.4 of the Checklist provided further clarity of the requirements for analyte or property in Section 1.1.3 of the above Checklist. Therefore the requirements of 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 was provided in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars which stated that the acceptable material was the fruit from which the juice was made or from which it came.

55. The Task Force concluded that it was neither practical nor feasible to establish fully acceptable numerical analytical values for quality and authenticity to match those "temporarily endorsed" methods of analysis in the short term. The Task Force was of the view that it met requirements of the Checklist by providing guidelines rather than specific numerical values. Therefore, the Task Force requested CCMAS to endorse the methods.

56. However, if CCMAS did not endorse the methods, the Task Force requested the Committee to maintain the list of Temporarily Endorsed Methods in the Standard until enough data was available to agree on numerical values. The Task Force noted that this was likely to require an extensive period of time. In addition, the Task Force strongly urged that the list of methods should be published within the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars.

Applicability of Methods for Food Additives that are Intrinsic Constituents of Fruit Juices and Nectars

57. The Task Force noted the request of the CCMAS to clarify the applicability of the methods of analysis for food additives that are also intrinsic constituents of fruit juices and nectars. The Task Force agreed that the methods for the organic acid additives endorsed by CCMAS were strictly to determine total values of the additive in the fruit juice. One or more other methods might need to be used to determine if the constituent such as an organic acid had been added or if it was solely the naturally present constituent. These additives might be determined by methods normally used to determine the authenticity of the juice such as isotopic methods or enzymatic methods. For example, organic acids added to a fruit juice might be determined by the presence of a specific enantiomer of the organic acid at a level different than the racemic mixture. Due to analytical limitations such as differences in detection limits or precision of the different methods it might not be possible to determine very low levels of the commercially added additive.

Weights and Measures

58. The Task Force noted that the Format of Codex Commodity Standards provided for provisions on weights and measures which normally applied a standardized language with necessary deviations to take account of the nature of the product. The Task Force also noted that individual standards for fruit juices and nectars currently in force (Volume 6 of the Codex Alimentarius) contained a Section on Weights and Measures covering provisions for minimum fill.

59. The Task Force had an exchange of views on the appropriateness to include provisions for weights and measures in the General Standard in particular those related to minimum fill. It was noted that provisions for minimum fill usually applied as a measure to avoid deceptive practices as per the net content of the product in the container destined to the final consumer. It was also noted that in the case of fruit juices (single strength or concentrates) the 90% filling requirement for containers (flexible or rigid) might not be possible to apply in all cases due to the nature of some juices/nectars and/or the packaging technology used and thus, this requirement might prevent future developments of packaging materials on the market for the products covered by the General Standard. It was further noted that net content of the product in the retail and non-retail containers was already covered by labelling.

60. The Task Force could not reach an agreement on the language of this Section and therefore, it agreed that provisions for weights and measures i.e. minimum fill would be not included in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars.

Annex to the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars

Format of the Annex

61. The Task Force had a discussion regarding the format of the Annex which contained a Table listed the minimum Brix levels in alphabetical order by botanical names as opposed to common names. The Task Force noted that the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had agreed to change the order of the columns which was previously organized by common names.

62. Some delegations indicated that main users of this Standard would be traders, factory operators and laboratory personnel who might not be familiar with the scientific names and therefore, they proposed to list the fruits in alphabetical order of their common names as was previously done in Appendix II to ALINORM 03/39A. These delegations indicated that the same would apply to the French and Spanish versions in the corresponding alphabetical order of these languages. They also proposed as an alternative to split the Annex into two tables, one listing the fruits in alphabetical order of their botanical names and the other listing the fruits in alphabetical order of their common names as a way to keep a common language and a cross reference to facilitate the use of the Annex.

63. Other delegations did not favour listing the fruits in alphabetical order of their common names in the corresponding languages as it might create confusion in the correspondence of the different versions. Some other delegations supported the current Table listing the fruits in alphabetical order of their botanical names which allowed for a common language between the users of the General Standard.

64. The Task Force agreed to keep the format of the current Table as adopted by the 26th Session of the Commission namely to list the fruits in alphabetical order of their botanical names and having the corresponding common names translated in the official languages of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Amendments to the Annex

65. The Task Force noted that there were some missing botanical names as well as duplications, typos or discrepancies in the botanical names of the Annex and agreed to correct them as proposed by the Observer from IFU. In addition, it agreed to amend the entry of *Musa species* as there were certain plantains i.e. *Musa acuminata* and *Musa paradisiaca* that were used in the manufacture of fruit nectars and that the common name in the Spanish version would include the term "*platano*" as it was a synonym of the term *banana* in certain Spanish-speaking countries. In this regard, the Task Force also included the French and Spanish translation of certain common names for which only the English name was provided in the Table.

66. The Task Force added a footnote to the title clarifying the definition and method for the determination of Brix and agreed that the minimum Brix should be determined at 20°C for all juices and nectars. As a result, the footnote on acid correction was amended accordingly. In this connection, it agreed to clarify that acid correction should be determined by the method for total titratable acids as stated in Section on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

DRAFT MINIMUM BRIX LEVEL FOR RECONSTITUTED JUICE AND RECONSTITUTED PUREE AND MINIMUM JUICE AND/OR PUREE CONTENT FOR FRUIT NECTARS (% V/V) – GRAPE, GUAVA, MANDARINE/TANGERINE, MANGO, PASSIONFRUIT, AND TAMARIND (INDIAN DATE) JUICES AND NECTARS (Agenda Item 3b)[11]

67. The Task Force noted that the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission adopted the above mentioned minimum Brix levels for reconstituted juice and reconstituted puree and minimum juice and/or puree content for fruit nectars – grape, guava, mandarine/tangerine, mango, passionfruit, and tamarind (Indian date) at Step 5 and advanced them to Step 6 for circulation, comments, and further consideration by the next Session of the Task Force.

General comments

68. The Delegation of the EC drew the attention of the Task Force to the fact that the methodology for the calculation of Brix proposed by the Task Force was only a tool to facilitate discussion on the establishment of minimum Brix values and that other parameters such as consumers palatability and current industry practices should be taken into account when establishing the final value.

69. The Task Force noted that for certain fruit juices there were data missing from some of the main producing countries. However, the Task Force also acknowledged that the request for comments as contained in CL 2003/38-FJ was circulated well in advance the Session soliciting Codex Member and Observers comments for consideration at this Session. The Brazilian delegation prepared calculation tables (CRD 9) with data transmitted by some countries representing the majority of the fruit processed into juice. The average Brix levels were weighted on the basis of quantities submitted by these countries in order to facilitate the discussion of the Brix levels.

Grape

70. The Task Force agreed to retain the minimum Brix value of 16.0 as proposed at its 3rd Session and confirmed by the Brix calculation form used to determine the international mean Brix value for grape juice. It was noted that this value would provide optimum product palatability.

---

[11] CL 2003/38-FJ, Annex I and comments submitted by Australia, Brazil, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, South Africa, Thailand, United States of America, and Uruguay (CX/FJ 04/4); Portugal, Slovak Republic and Venezuela (CX/FJ 04/4-Add.1); EC (CRD 2); United States (CRD 3); Chile (CRD 7); and CRD 9 (Brix calculation tables).

71. The Task Force also agreed that the minimum juice and/or puree content for grape nectars should be 50%.

Guava

72. Several figures varying from 7.5 to 9.5 were proposed for consideration by different delegations based on production and trade practices. Some delegations requested clarification on whether data on minimum Brix levels for guava juice came from white or red guavas. The Delegation of Brazil indicated that there was a natural variation in Brix values between white and red guavas and that Brazilian production came from red guavas. The Delegation indicated that the minimum Brix level should not go lower than 8.00 in order not to compromise product palatability.

73. Some delegations indicated that their guava juice production showed a lower minimum Brix value around 7.00 – 8.00 and supported the establishment of a minimum Brix value of 8.00 having regard of the product palatability.

74. As a compromised solution, the Task Force agreed to set the minimum Brix value at 8.5. The Delegation of Cuba expressed its reservation on this decision.

Mandarine/Tangerine

75. The Task Force noted that there were few different varieties of this commodity and that usually earlier varieties presented a lower Brix value as opposed to late season varieties.

76. The Task Force agreed that in order to ensure a reasonable product palatability the minimum Brix value should be set at 11.8.

Mango

77. The Task Force noted that there was a wide range of varieties of mangoes and that Brix values had a natural wide range of variation from 11.0 to 16.0. The Task Force noted that a product with a Brix value of 14.00 presented the best quality of the product from the point of view of consumer palatability and production technology. Some delegations indicated that the caloric content should be also taken into account when setting Brix levels as product with high sugar content might make consumers move away from fruit juices/nectars and to select “lighter products” such as fruit drinks.

78. In order to accommodate other Codex Members needs, the Task Force agreed that the minimum Brix value should be set at 13.5 to ensure reasonable product palatability.

Passion fruit

79. The Task Force noted that major production was from the yellow passion fruit. The Task Force agreed that minimum Brix value should be set at 12.0.

Tamarind (Indian date)

80. The Task Force agreed to retain the current minimum Brix value of 13.00 as proposed at the 3rd Session of the Task Force.

PROPOSED DRAFT MINIMUM BRIX LEVEL FOR RECONSTITUTED JUICE AND RECONSTITUTED PUREE AND MINIMUM JUICE AND/OR PUREE CONTENT FOR FRUIT NECTARS (% V/V) – LIME, LEMON, ORANGE, AND PINEAPPLE JUICES AND NECTARS (Agenda Item 4a)[12]

81. The 3rd Session of the Task Force could not reach consensus on a provisional minimum Brix value for orange juice nor to establish any minimum Brix levels for lemon, lime, and pineapples juices. Consequently, it decided to defer their discussion until the next Session of the Task Force. In taking this decision, the Task Force agreed they were placed separately and circulated for comments at Step 3 for consideration at its next Session.

Lemon and Lime

82. Some delegations indicated that the parameter used in international trade for lime and lemon juice was the acid content and not the minimum Brix level. The US delegation proposed a value of 4.5% for lime and lemon juices and the delegation of Brazil proposed a value of 5.5% for the same juices. The delegation of the US indicated that it could agree on an acid content of 5.0% for lime juice but the 4.5% acid content for lemon juice should be retained as this was a figure largely recognized in international trade. In addition, the percentage of lemon juice content was calculated based on this figure. The Delegation also indicated that a variation of this value might create disruption in international trade of lemon juice.

83. A number of delegations questioned this proposal as the request for comments in CL 2003/38-FJ solicited Codex Members and Observers to submit data on minimum Brix levels and not on acid content for lime and lemon juice. These delegations recalled that there was some discussion on this matter at the 3rd Session of the Task Force but no decision was taken nor record was kept in the report of the last Session about this matter. They indicated that based on values sent by several countries in response to CL 2003/38-FJ the minimum Brix level should be approximately 8.0.

84. The Task Force considered a compromise proposal to introduce acid content and its equivalent minimum Brix level for lime and lemon juice namely 5.0% acid content and 8.0 minimum Brix level for lime and lemon juice. However, it was noted that the introduction of two different parameters for the same products in the General Standard might make the enforcement of the value(s) by national regulatory agencies more difficult as the two values did not exactly correspond to each other. It was indicated that the establishment of acid content for lime and lemon juice should reflect current international trade practices in Codex standards in order not to create confusion on the international market.

85. In view of the above, the Task Force agreed to refer only to minimum Brix value. The delegation of Brazil indicated that ideal combination would be 5.5% acid content and 9.00 minimum Brix level. The delegation of the United States proposed a minimum Brix level of 7.00 for both juices based on the 4.5% acid content. It noted that it could accept a minimum Brix level of 8.00 as long as it was acid corrected. The Task Force noted that acid correction applied to all citrus fruit juices specified in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars.

86. As a compromise, the Task Force agreed to set a minimum Brix value of 8.0 acid corrected for lime and lemon juice.

---

[12] CL 2003/38-FJ, Annex II and comments submitted by Australia, Brazil, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, South Africa, Thailand, United States of America, and Uruguay (CX/FJ 04/5); Israel, Portugal, Slovak Republic and Venezuela (CX/FJ 04/5-Add.1); EC (CRD 2); United States (CRD 3); Costa Rica (CRD 6); Chile (CRD 7); United States (CRD 8); and CRD 9 (Brix calculation tables).

87. The Task Force had an exchange of views on the minimum juice content and/or puree content for lime and lemon nectars. Some delegations indicated that lime and lemon nectars were not common products on the market as usually lemon juice was used in the preparation of juice drinks such as lemonade. Other delegations agreed that a level of 25% could be acceptable. These delegations indicated that lemon juice was used in the preparation of mixed fruit nectars and therefore a minimum juice level was needed to calculate the percentage of this juice in the fruit blend. In order to find an agreement, the delegation of Brazil proposed that the minimum lemon juice content to be used in the preparation of the nectar should be the one necessary to reach an acidity of 0.5%. The Task Force could not reach consensus on this issue and agreed to leave the minimum juice content for these two juices up to the national legislation of the importing country.

Orange

88. The Task Force had an extensive discussion on the minimum Brix level that should apply to orange juice. Some delegations were in favour of a minimum Brix level of 12.1 as it reflected the international mean value calculated on the basis of the data submitted to the Task Force.

89. The delegation of the United States first proposed a minimum Brix value of 12.03 based on the mean Brix reported by countries[13] and the world production of tonnage as reported by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) according to the tables in CRD 8. After some discussion, it agreed that a minimum Brix level of 11.8 could be accepted as it was in practice the minimum Brix level used in reconstituted orange juice in its country. This proposal was shared by the delegation of Brazil. In this regard, the Brazilian delegation indicated that the value of 12.1 found in the reference table should be preferentially considered. However, with the aim of fitting the particularities of other countries, the delegation of Brazil would agree on a Brix level of 11.8.

90. The delegations of the EC and the Russian Federation requested a minimum Brix level of 11.2 as this level was close to the value stated in the current Codex Standard for Oranges of 11.00 and represented the consumers palatability in the European Community and the Russian Federation as well as current industry practices in some markets. This view was shared by many delegations which expressed their views on this issue.

91. Some delegations referred to the direct relation between Brix level/price of the juice and the economic implications of raising the Brix levels to values such as 12.00 as well as other nutritional aspects related to foods with high content of sugars. Other delegations indicated that this value represented the Brix value of orange juice currently on the international market and that lower values would not match the concept of "reconstituted fruit juice" which was to reconstitute the corresponding amount of water extracted during the concentration process. Those delegations in favour of a lower level of Brix indicated that other considerations such as keeping of consumer palatability should be also considered as in the case of other fruit juices discussed previously. They indicated that there was no a technological justification to increase the level to 11.80.

92. In search of consensus, the Brazilian delegation also proposed a minimum Brix level of 11.8 for orange juice, allowing the importing countries which might have difficulties with that limit to use the minimum value of 11.2.

93. The Task Force agreed to establish a range of values from 11.8 to 11.2 consistent with the application of national legislation of the importing country but not lower than 11.2.

94. The delegation of the United States, understanding that the mean world Brix of orange juice used to make concentrate was 12.00, noted that reconstitution down to 11.2 Brix was consistent with excessive dilution with water. The Delegation believed that countries should strive to produce reconstituted orange juice at a Brix no less than 11.8.

95. The delegations of the EC, the Russian Federation, Mexico, Cuba and Guatemala accepted the compromise on the Brix level for reconstituted orange juice but underlined that there was no relevant justification to promote its increase further than 11.2 as this value reflected the real situation of the majority of the markets for this type of juice.

96. The delegation of Mexico drew the attention of the Task Force to the possible difficulties that could arise for countries which did not have legislation for minimum Brix level for orange juice.

97. The delegation of Costa Rica considered that although it was difficult to reach consensus on the minimum Brix level for reconstituted orange juice, the agreed values did not reflect the reality of various developing countries, with the consequent difficulty for market access.

Pineapple

98. The Task Force noted that the minimum international mean Brix level of 12.8 represented current international trade practices and should be incorporated into the Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars. Some delegations noted that their minimum Brix levels were lower than the value proposed.

99. The delegation of Thailand indicated that its country was the major producer of pineapple juice and proposed a minimum Brix level of 11.00 for consideration by the Task Force. The Delegation noted that Brix levels varied widely due to small scale production, different varieties and climate. It also noted that the Brix values in CX/FJ 04/5 referred to single strength pineapple juices for export. After the Task Force agreed to set up a range of Brix values for orange juices (see para. 93), the Delegation requested the Task Force to reconsider a range of Brix levels for pineapple juice ranking from 11.0 to 12.8.

100. The delegation of the United States noted that the Brix data submitted by Thailand for pineapple did not reflect certain high Brix products produced by this country.

101. The Task Force recalled that minimum Brix levels applied to reconstituted fruit juices and not single strength juices. It noted that fruit juices with low Brix levels due to regional or seasonal variations could be accommodated in the footnote applied to apple and orange juices by which it was recognized that in different geographical areas the Brix level might naturally differ from the established minimum Brix level. This would allow countries consistently producing fruit juice with low Brix values to be able to be marketed internationally.

102. In view of the above considerations, the Task Force agreed to set a minimum Brix level for pineapple juice of 12.8 and applied the footnote for apple and orange juice also to pineapple juice. In addition, it was also agreed to apply "acid corrected" to pineapple juice. The Task Force noted that the same method for acid correction applied to citrus fruit juice listed in the Section on Methods of Analysis could be applied to pineapple juice. The delegation of Thailand expressed reserved its position in opposition to the decision of the Task Force to limit the minimum Brix level for reconstituted pineapple juice at 12.8.

Status of the draft Codex General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars

103. The Task Force agreed to forward the draft Codex Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars to the next Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8 (see Appendix II).

104. The Task Force also agreed to forward the draft Minimum Brix Levels for Reconstituted Juices and Reconstituted Purées and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (% v/v) - grape, guava, mandarine/tangerine, mango, passionfruit and tamarind (Indian date) juices and nectars to the next Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8 (see Appendix III).

105. The Task Force further agreed to forward the proposed draft Minimum Brix Levels for Reconstituted Juices and Reconstituted Purées and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (% v/v) – lemon, lime, orange, and pineapple juices and nectars to the next Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7).

106. The Task Force recognized that this was in line with the recommendation of the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission that a single Standard could be presented for final adoption by the Commission. Once the General Standard be adopted at Step 8, all the individual standards for fruit juices and nectars and related texts as contained in Volume 6 of the Codex Alimentarius would be revoked.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 5)

The use of analytical results: Sampling Plans, Relationship between the Analytical Results, the Measurement Uncertainty, Recovery Factors and Provisions in Codex Standards

107. The Task Force noted that this matter was referred to Codex commodity committees by 25th Session of the session of the CCMAS[13].

108. The Task Force recalled that it already replied to the CCMAS on this matter at its 3rd Session[14]. The Task Force concluded that it had no new elaborations on this matter. It noted that much better expertise on this issue rested with the CCMAS and was of the view that the Committee could organize a specialized Working Group dealing with commodities within the CCMAS in order to address the issue on the use of analytical results from the general point of view, including the possibility of developing guidance to governments e.g. sampling plans for general fields such as composition or quality, nutrition, pesticide residues, etc.

Methods of Analysis for Fruit Juices and Nectars

109. The Task Force agreed to ask the Government of Canada to include Mrs Carla Barry into the list of Canadian delegation attending the CCMAS in order to ensure that all technical questions which might arise at the CCMAS regarding the proposed methods for fruit juices and nectars would be adequately replied. In addition, the Task Force stressed the need for the various member countries to brief their CCMAS national delegates on this issue to clearly explain the position of the Task Force on the methods of analysis for fruit juices and nectars with a view to simplifying the discussions at the next CCMAS session.

Final Consideration

110. The Task Force noted that it completed the work assigned to it by the 23rd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission[15] and concluded by thanking the Government of Brazil for the efficient and hard work in organizing four meetings of the Task Force, and for the kind hospitality shown. The Task Force expressed its appreciation to the former Chairpersons and to the current Vice-chairperson Mr Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva for guiding the work of the Task Force to a satisfactory conclusion.

---

13 ALINORM 04/27/23, paras 128-135.
14 ALINORM 03/39A, paras 65-68.
15 ALINORM 99/37, para. 221.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject	Step	For Action by	Document Reference (ALINORM 05/39)
Draft Codex General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars	8	28th CAC	para. 103 and Appendix II.
Draft Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (%v/v) – *grape, guava, mandarine/tangerine, mango, passion fruit and tamarind (Indian date) juices/nectars*	8	28th CAC	para. 104 and Appendix III.
Proposed Draft Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Juice and Reconstituted Purée and Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content for Fruit Nectars (%v/v) – *orange, lemon, lime and pineapple juices/nectars*	5/8	28th CAC	para. 105 and Appendix IV.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

CHAIRPERSON: Maçao Tadano

PRESIDENT: Secretário de Defesa Agropecuária

PRESIDENTE: Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D
Anexo B - 4º Andar - Sala 406
Brasília, DF - Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2314 / 55 61 218 2315 / 55 61 226 9771
Fax: 55 61 224 3995
E-mail: tadao@agricultura.gov.br

VICE CHAIRMAN: Odilson Luiz Ribeiro e Silva

VICE PRESIDENT: Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento

VICE PRESIDENTE: Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D
Anexo B – 4º Andar – Sala 414 B
Brasília, DF - Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2308
Fax: 55 61 224 3995
E-mail: dcta@agricultura.gov.br

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE
AUSTRALIA

Mr Tom Black
Senior Policy Officer
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858
Camberra, Austrália
Tel: 61 2 62723668
Fax: 61 2 62724367
E-mail: tom.black@daff.gov.au

Mrs Alison Watkins
Ceo Berri Ltd
Australian Delegation
Berri Ltd 15 Pelham St. Carlton Victoria
Australia
Tel: 61 2 9827 4600
Fax: 61 2 9827 4755
E-mail: Alison.watkins@berriltd.com.au

Mr David Goldberg
Technical Manager
Australian Fruit Juice Association
Berri LTD 253-257 Wood Park RD Smithfield
NSW 2164
Sydney Australia
Tel: 61 2 9827 4600
Fax: 61 2 9827 4755
E-mail: david.goldberg@berriltd.com.au

BRAZIL
BRÈSIL
BRASIL

Mr. Ricardo da Cunha Cavalcanti Júnior
Chefe da Delegação Brasileira
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "D" – Anexo "B" – Sala
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2443
Fax: 55 61 224 8961
E-mail: cavalcanti@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Alba Lúcia Andrade Coelho Nisida
Diretor Técnico de Divisão
Instituto de Tecnologia de Alimentos - ITAL
Avenida Brasil, nº 2880
Campinas, SP – Brasil - CEP
Tel: 55 19 3743 1840
Fax: 55 19 3242 3104
E-mail: anisida@ital.sp.gov.br

Mrs Ana Paula Cunha Machado
Especialista em Políticas Públicas e Gestão Governamental-EPPGG
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco B, 4º Andar, Sala 414 Brasília – Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2314
Fax: 55 61 224 3995
E-mail: paulamachado@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Antonio Carlos Gonçalves
ABECITRUS
Rodovia Armando S. Oliveira, Km 396
Bebedouro, SP – Brasil - CEP: 14.700-000
Tel: 55 17 3344 6030
Fax: 55 17 3344 6003
E-mail: goncalvesac@ldcitrus.com

Mr Cézar Silvino Gomes
Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "D" Anexo "B" Sala 322
Brasília, DF – Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2800
Fax: 55 61 225 5098
E-mail: cezars@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Cezar Wilson Martins da Rocha
Chefe de Gabinete da Secretaria de Defesa Agropecuária
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco " D" Anexo "B" Sala 322
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2314
E-mail: cezarrocha@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Cláudia Kammer
ABECITRUS
Acesso Engenheiro Ivo Najm, - Km 3800
Araraquara, SP – Brasil - CEP: 14.807-900
Tel: 55 16 330 11207
Fax: 55 16 330 11365
E-mail: claudiakammer@cutrale.com.br

Mrs Cláudia Maria de Sousa
Secretária-Executiva do CCAB
CODEX
SEPN 511, Bloco B, Ed. Bittar III - 4º Andar
Brasília, DF - Brasil
Tel: 55 61 3402211
Fax: 55 61 3473284
E-mail: cmsousa@inmetro.gov.br

Mrs Conceição de Maria Moreira
Engenheira Agrônoma
SEAGRI
Av. Bezerra de Meneses 1820
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 288 1564
Fax: 55 85 288 1563
E-mail: conceicaopontes@seagri-ce.gov.br

Mr Daniel Egídio Basile
Diretor
UVIBRA – União Brasileira de Vitivinicultura
Linha Leopoldina Km 6
Bento Gonçalves, RS – Brasil – CEP 95700-000
Tel: 55 54 4531999
E-mail: dbasile@tecnovin.com.br

Mr Eduardo Barros Steffen
Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Delegacia Federal de Agricultura em São Paulo
Rua Treze de Maio, 1558 – 1º Andar
São Paulo, SP – Brasil - CEP
Tel: 55 11 289 6560 R: 1108
Fax: 55 11 287 9453
E-mail: eduardobs@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Edval de Jesus Santos
Engenheiro Agrônomo
Instituto Agropolos do Ceará
Av. Santos Dumont 3060 Sls. 701 – 704
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 433 5191
Fax: 55 433 5199
E-mail: edval@agropolos.org.br

Mr Edy Sousa de Brito
Pesquisador
EMBRAPA
Rua Dra. Sara Mesquita, 2270, Pici
Fortaleza – CE – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 299 1800
Fax: 55 85 299 1833
E-mail: edy@cnpat.embrapa.br

Mrs Elisabete Gonçalves Dutra
Assessora Técnica da Gerência Geral de Alimentos
Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária
SEPN 511, Bloco A, Ed. Bittar II, 2º andar
Brasilia, DF – Brasil
Tel: 55 61 448 6322
Fax: 55 61 448 6274
E-mail: elisabete.goncalves@anvisa.gov.br

Mr Eliseu A. Nonino
ABECITRUS
Av. Ivo Najm, nº 3.800
Araraquara, SP - Brasil
Tel: 55 16 3301 1140
Fax: 55 16 3301 1524
E-mail: nonino@cutrale.com.br

Mrs Etelvina Carl
Coordenadora-Geral de Operações Comerciais
Ministério do Desenvolvimento, Indústria e Comércio Exterior
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "J" Sala 718
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP: 70.053-900
Tel: 55 61 2109 7429
Fax: 55 61 2109 7980
E-mail: etelvina.carl@desenvolvimento.gov.br

Mr Fausto Ferraz Filho
Gerente de Qualidade/Desenvolvimento
ABIA
Rua Timbiras 181–Americana, SP – CEP 13.466-210
Tel: 55 19 97477594
Fax: 55 19 34713669
E-mail: fferraz@jvalle.com.mx

Mr Francisco das Chagas Silva
Delegado Federal de Agricultura do Ceará – DFA
DFA – CE
Av. dos Expedicionários
Fortaleza – CE
Tel: 55 85 455 9202

Mr Francisco Zuza de Oliveira
Coordenador da Assessoria Tecnológica
SEAGRI – Secretaria de Agricultura e Pecuária do Ceará
Ceará – Brasil - CEP
Tel: 55 85 999 73163
E-mail: zuza@seagri-ce.gov.br

Mr Geraldo Arraes Maia
Professor
ASTN /UFC
Rua Silva Jatahi, nº 4000 / aptº 4001
Fortaleza, CE – Brasil - CEP
Tel: 55 85 288 9752
Fax: 55 85 288 9752
E-mail: gmaia@secrel.com.br

Mrs Graça Quiroga
Assessora de Imprensa
Delegacia Federal de Agricultura – DFA
Av. dos Expedicionários
Ceará – Brasil CEP
Tel: 55 85 455 9202
Fax: 55 85 281 0004

Mr Hiroshi Arima
Chefe da Divisão de Bebidas e Vinagres
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D Anexo B
3ºAndar
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2327
Fax: 55 61 224 8961
E-mail: hiroshi@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Ivan Marie Schuermans
Customer Service Manager
ABECITRUS (CITROVITA)
Rod. Com. Pedro Monteleone, Km 206
Brasil
Tel: 55 17 35316044
Fax: 55 17 35316100
E-mail: ivan.marie@citrovita.com.br

Mr José Ximenes de Farias Jr.
Gerente de Fruticultura
SEAGRI
Av. Bezerra de Menezes 1820
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 288 1597
E-mail: ximenes@seagri-ce.gov..br

Mrs Juliana Ribeiro Alexandre
Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "D" Anexo "B" Sala 349
Brasília, DF – Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2327
Fax: 55 61 218 2323
E-mail: julianara@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Karina Fontes Coelho
Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "D" Anexo "B" Sala 349
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2327
Fax: 55 61 224 8961
E-mail: karina@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Manuel Napoleon Muro Arbulú
Diretor Técnico
Instituto Agropolos do Ceará
Av. Santos Dumont 3060 – Salas 701-704
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 433 5191
Fax: 55 85 433 5199
E-mail: napoleon@agropolos.org.br

Mrs Maria de Fátima A. Almeida da Paz
Química Responsável Téc. Laboratório de Bebidas e Vinagre
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Av. Almirante Barroso nº 5384 – Souza
Belém, PA – Brasil – CEP 66.600-000
Tel: 55 91 214 8633
Fax: 55 91 231 2402
E-mail: mariapaz@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Maria de Jesus da Silva Oliveira
Engenheira Agrônomo - Técnico em Desenvolvimento Agropecuário
EMATER – CE
Rua Damião Fernandes, 946 – Parquelândia
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 981 5243
Fax: 55 85 341 3445
E-mail: emater@sole.ce.gov.br

Mrs Marilde Amaral Vieira
Secretária do Diretor do Departamento de Defesa e Inspeção Vegetal
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D Sala 303 B
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2675
Fax: 55 61 224 3874
E-mail: mvieira@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Milva Edith de Rosa
Assessora do Diretor do Departamento de Defesa e
Inspeção Vegetal
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D Sala 303 B
Brasília, DF – Brasil – CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2675
Fax: 55 61 224 3874
E-mail: milva@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Nivardo Silva Junior
Engenheiro Agrônomo – Supervisor do Núcleo de Classificação Vegetal
Secretaria da Agricultura e Pecuária
Av. Bezerra de Menezes, 1820
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP:
Tel: 55 85 288 1565
Fax: 55 85 288 1567
E-mail: nivardo@seagri-ce.gov.br

Mr Paulo Alberto Oliveira
Engenheiro Agrônomo
SEAGRI
Av Bezerra de Menezes, 1820
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 288 1565
Fax: 55 85 288 7569

Mr Pedro Viana Borges
Especialista em Políticas Públicas e Gestão Governamental
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 414 Brasília – Brasil - CEP 70.043-900
Tel: 55 61 218 2317
Fax: 55 61 224 3995
E-mail: pedroviana@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Régia Cysne
Assessora de Comunicação
Delegacia Federal de Agricultura no Ceará – DFA
Av. dos Expedicionários
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP:
Tel: 55 61 455 9202
Fax: 55 61 281 0004

Mr Rogério Perujo Tocchini
Pesquisador Científico
Instituto de Tecnologia de Alimentos - ITAL
Avenida Brasil, nº 2880
Campinas, SP - Brasil
Tel: 55 19 3743 1846
Fax: 55 19 3242 3104
E-mail: tocchini@ital.sp.gov.br

Mr Rubens Gomes de Oliveira
Instituto Nacional de Metrologia, Normalização e Qualidade Industrial – INMETRO
SEPN Q 511 – Bl. B – Ed. Bittar III – 4º Andar
Brasília, DF – CEP 70750-542
Tel: 55 61 3402211
Fax: 55 61 347 3284
E-mail: diraf-bsb@inmetro.gov.br

Mrs Shirley Abrantes
Pesquisador Titular III
ANVISA/FIOCRUZ/INCQS
Av. Brasil 4365 – Manguinhos – CEP 21045-900
Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Tel: 55 21 386 55124
Fax: 55 21 229 00915
E-mail: shirley@incqs.fiocruz.br

Mrs Suzy Anne Alves Pinto
Engenheira Agrônoma
Instituto Agropolos do Ceará
Av. Santos Dumont 3060 salas 701-704
Fortaleza, Ceará – Brasil – CEP
Tel: 55 85 433 5191
Fax: 55 85 433 5199

CANADA
CANADA
CANADÁ

Mr James Trenholm
Food Evaluation Officer
A/National Manager, Processed Products
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Drive
0ttawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Tel: 613 221 7151
Fax: 613 221 7294
E-mail: trenholmj@inspection.gc.ca

Mrs Carla Barry
National Manager Fair Labelling Practices Program
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Tel: 613 221 7157
Fax: 613 221 7295
E-mail: cbarry@inspection.gc.ca

CHINA
CHINA
CHINA

Mr. Wu Shuangmin
Vice Chief of Health and Food Supervision Department
Shaanxi Entry – Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau, AQSIQ of P. R. China
10, North Hanguang Road, Xi´an,
P. R. China
Tel: 0086 29 85365723
Fax: 0086 29 85365723
E-mail: wsminxa@163.com

Mr Li Ge
Section Chief
Shandong Entry – Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau, AQSIQ of P.R. China
70, Qutangxia Roads Qingdao
Tel: 0086 532 2929932
Fax: 0086 532 2650719
E-mail: lg197005@163.com

COSTA RICA
COSTA RICA
COSTA RICA

Mrs Mónica Elizondo Andrade
Calidad y Normas Técnicas
Camara Costarricense de La Industria Alimentaria
San Jose, Guadalupe
Costa Rica
Tel: … 234 1127
Fax: … 234 6783
E-mail: melizondo@cacia.org

CUBA
CUBA
CUBA

Mr Angel Julio Paneque Leiva
Unión de Conservas de Vegetales . MINAL
Calle E nº 152 Esquina Calzada Vedado
Cuba
Tel: 056 46 832 0896
Fax: 053 46 832 7636
E-mail: tecnico@consva.com.cu

Mrs Marcia Delgado Espinosa
Directora Gestión de la Calidad
Empresa Conservas de Cítrico
Carretera Abraham Lincoln K. 1½. Nueva Gerona
Isla de la Juventud
Cuba
Tel: 056 46 323233
Fax: 056 46 324573
E-mail: ccitrico@enet.cu

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENE
COMUNIDAD EUROPEA

Dr Jérôme Lepeintre
Administrator
European Community - European Commission B-1049 Brussels - Belgium
Tel: 32 229 93701
Fax: 32 229 98566
E-mail: jerome.lepeintre@cec.eu.int

Mr Denis de Froidmont
Administrator
E.C.
200 Rue de La Lei, 1059
Brusselles, Belgium
Tel: 32 2 2956438
E-mail: denis.de-froidmont@cec.eu.int

FRANCE
FRANCE
FRANCIA

Mr Dominique Delaunay
Chargé de Mission
Ministère de l´Agriculture, de l'Alimentation,
de la Pêche et des Affaires Rurales
3, rue Barbet-de-Jouy
75349 - Paris – France
Tel: 0149 55 5595
Fax: 0149 55 5075
E-mail: dominique.delaunay@agriculture.gouv.fr

GEORGIA
GEORGIE
GEORGIA

Mr Paata Gogolidze
Executive Director
Geo TUV Ltd
74/4 Basnov St.
Tel: 995 32 22 0762
Fax: 995 32 22 0762
E-mail: geotuv@access.sanet.ge

Mr Sergo Lejava
Financial Manager
Sante GMT Products
Kaklet
Tel: 995 12 708055
Fax: 995 12 706352

GREECE
GRÈCE
GRECIA

Mr Konstantin Mallidis
Director / Research Institute
Institute of Technology of Agricultural Products
NAGREF
1, S. Venezelou, Lykovrisi, Athens, 14123
Athens – Greece
Tel: 210 2845940
Fax: 210 2840740
E-mail: itap@otenet.gr

GUATEMALA
GUATEMALA
GUATEMALA

Mrs Eunice Lara
Asesor Técnico
Asociación de Productores de Jugos y Néctares de Centro América – APROJUNECA
Cámara de Industria Guatemalteca,
Ruta 6 9-21 Zona 4
Ciudad Guatemala – Guatemala
Tel: 502 8880622
Fax: 502 8880108
E-mail: eunicelara@icasa.com.gt

Mr. Julio César Flores
Lic. Quimico Biologo
Gerente de Calidad
Alimentos Kern de Guatemala S.A
Km 6.5 Carretera al Atlántico, Zona 18 – Guatemala
Tel: 502 256 2222
Fax: 502 259 9482
E-mail: jflores@alikerns.com

HUNGARY
HONGRIE
HUNGRÍA

Mr László Péter Fekete
Adviser
Assotiasion of Hungarian Soft Drink Producers
Tel: +36 30 952 5956
Fax: +36 72 512305
E-mail:laszlo.fekete@wild.de
softdrink@efcsz.hu

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

Mrs Brunella Lo Turco
Ministry of Agricolture
Via Sallustiana 10
00187 - Roma, Italy
Tel: 39 06 466 56512
Fax: 39 06 488 0273
E-mail: QTC6@politicheagricole.it

Mr Ciro Impagnatiello
Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali
Via XX Settembre, 20
00187 – Roma - Italy
Tel: 39 06 4665 6511
Fax: 39 06 488 0273
E-mail: ciroimpa@tiscali.it

MEXICO
MEXIQUE
MEXICO

Mr José Luis de Baro Haces
Director Técnico
Grupo Jumex
Via Morelos, 272, Tulpetlac, Edo de Mexico
C.P. 55400 - Mexico
Tel: 52 55 58 36 9999 ext. 50501
Fax: 52 55 58 36 9999 ext.50599
E-mail: jldebaro@jumex.com.mx

Mrs Juana Maria Sánchez
Gerente de Investigación y Desarrollo
Grupo Jumex
Via Morelos # 272, Tulpetlac, Ecatepec
C.P. 55400 - Mexico
Tel: 52 55 58 36 9999 ext. 50514
Fax: 52 55 58 36 9999 ext.50599
E-mail: jmsanchez@jumex.com.mx

Mrs Maria de Los Angeles Hurtado Ortiz
Ingeniero de Proyectos
Jugos del Valle
Insurgentes 30 Barrio Texcacoa Tepotzotlan
Mexico CP 54600
Tel: 52 55 58 99 1000 ext. 1434
Fax: 52 55 58 99 1064
E-mail: ahurtado@jvalle.com.mx

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAÍSES BAJOS

Mr Frederic Westerling
Quality Policy Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
P.O.Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: 31 70 378 4162
Fax: 31 70 378 6123
E-mail: f.j.westerling@minlnv.nl

Mr Jan Hermans
Expert Dutch Delegation
A.I.J.N.
Wetstraat 221, Box 5 1040 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: 32 2 235 0620
Fax: 32 2 282 9420
E-mail: aijn@aijn.org

Mr Jos van de Vooren
Agricultural Counsellor
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
Caixa Postal 07/0098
SES Avenida das Nações Q 801 Lote 05
Brasília, DF – Brasil CEP 70359-970
Tel: 55 61 321 4769
Fax: 55 61 323 5342
E-mail: j.g.van.de.vooren@minlnv.nl / BRA-LNV@minbuza.nl

Mr Martin Greeve
Manager IQM and EU Affairs
Doehler Euro Citrus B.V.
P.O.B. 227, 4900 AE Oosterhout
The Netherlands
Tel: 31 16 247 9500
Fax: 31 70 247 9583
E-mail: martin.greeve.@planet.nl

Mr Andreas Lernhart
Principal Administrator
Council of the European Union / General Secretariat
Rue de La Loi 175
B-1048 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: 32 2 285 62 41
Fax: 32 2 285 61 98
E-mail: andreas.lernhart@consilium.eu.int

ROMANIA
ROUMANIE
RUMENIA

Dr.Gheorghe Ontanu
Director
National Sanitary Veterihary and Food Safety Authority
Romania, Bucharest, Street Negustory
Romania
Tel: 0040 21 3157875
Fax: 0040 21 3127967
E-mail: ontanu-idsa@ansv.ro

RUSSIA
RUSSIE
RUSIA

Mrs Alla Kochetkova
Coordinator of the Working Group of the TC 93 of the Gosstandard of Russia / MGUPP
142703 Moscow region, Vidnoye, Shcolnaya St.78, Russia
Tel: 7095 1587 125
Fax: 7095 1587 128
E-mail: prof.kochetkova@biolab.ru

Mr Alexander Kolesnov
Coordinator of the Working Group of the TC 93 of the Gosstandard of Rússia / MGUPP
142703 Moscow region, Vidnoye, Shcolnaya St.78, Russia
Tel: 7095 1587 125
Fax: 7095 1587 128
E-mail: dr.kolesnov@biolab.ru

Mr Alexey Yakovlev
Coordinator of the Working Group of the TC 93 of the Gosstandard of Rússia / WBD
142703 Moscow region, Vidnoye, Shcolnaya St.78, Russia
Tel: 7095 7458080
Fax: 7095 4830047
E-mail: yakovlev@wbd.ru

Mrs Tatiana Savosina
Secretary of the Working Group of the TC 93 of the Gosstandard of Russia / MGUPP
142703 Moscow region, Vidnoye, Shcolnaya St.78, Russia
Tel: 7095 745 8080
Fax: 7095 483 0047
E-mail: codex@biolab.ru

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

Mr Jesús Campos Amado
Jefe de Área de Estructuración Alimentaria de la Subdirección General de Planificación Alimentaria
Dirección General de Industria Agroalimentaria y Alimentación
Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación,
Paseo Infanta Isabel 1
Madrid - España
Tel: 34 91 3475314
Fax: 34 91 3475728
E-mail: jcamposa@mapya.es

Mr Ignacio Martín Paco
Jefe de Servicio de la S. G. Planificación Alimentaria
Subdirección General de Planificación Alimentaria
Dirección General de Industria Agroalimentaria y Alimentación
Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación
Paseo Infanta Isabel 1
Madrid – España
Tel: 34 91 3475407
Fax: 34 91 3475006
E-mail: imartinp@mapya.es

THAILAND
THAILANDE
TAILANDIA

Dr Saipin Maneepun
Head Delegate, Expert Researcher
Institute of Food Research and Product Development
Kasetsart University,
PO 1043, Kasetsart, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Tel: 662 9428629-35 ext. 508
Fax: 662 5611970
E-mail: usmp@ku.ac.th

Mrs Anurat Tiamtan
Director,
Thai Food Processors´ Association
170/21-22 Ocean Tower I, 9th Floor
Ratchadaphisek Rd, Klongtoey
Bangkok 10110 - Thailand
Tel: 662 2612684
Fax: 662 2612996
E-mail: thaifood@thaifood.org

Mrs Linda Pleanprasert
Assistant Manager (Technical),
Thai Food Processors´ Association
170/21-22 Ocean Tower I, 9th Floor
Ratchadaphisek Rd, Klongtoey
Bangkok 10110 - Thailand
Tel: 662 2612684
Fax: 662 2612996
E-mail: linda@thaifood.org

Ms. Nalinthip Peanee
Standards Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
3 Rajadamnern Nok Avenue,
Bangkok 10200 - Thailand
Tel: 662 2831600 Ext.: 1182
Fax: 662 2803899
E-mail: nalinthip@acfs.go.th

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Mr Martin Stutsman J. D.
United States Delegate
Consumer Safety Officer
United States/ Food and Drug Administration
5100 Paint Branch Parkway
College Park, Maryland 20740
United States of America
Tel: 1 301 436 1642
Fax: 1 301 436 2651
E-mail: MARTIN.STUTSMAN@FDA.GOV

Dr. Allen Matthys
Vice President
National Food Processors Association
1350 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
United States of America
Tel: 1 202 63959 60
Fax: 1 202 639 59 91
E-mail: amatthy@nffa-food.org

Mrs Chere Shorter
Agricultural Marketing Specialist
US. Department of Agriculture
Stop 0247, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW
United States of America
Tel: 1 202 720 5021
Fax: 1 202 690 1087
E-mail: chere.shorter@usda.gov

Ms. Dianne Nury
Juice Products Association
11903 S. Chestnut Avenue
P.O. Box 2908
Fresno, CA 93745
United States of America
Tel: 1 559 834 2525
Fax: 1 559 834 1348
E-mail: dnury@vie-del.com

Mrs Edith Kennard
Staff Officer
US. Codex Office, FSIS, USDA
Room 4861 - 1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20250
United States of America
Tel: 1 202 720 5261
Fax: 1 202 720 3157
E-mail: edith.Kennard@fsis.usda.gov

Dr. Hany Farag
Director, Technical Services
Dole Packaged Foods
One Dole Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91362
United States of America
Tel: 1 818 874 4857
Fax: 1 818 874 4960
E-mail: hany_farag@na.dole.com

Dr. H. Michael Wehr
Codex Program Coordinator
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
5100 Paint Branch Parkway
College Park, MD 20740
United States of America
Tel: 1 301 436 1724
Fax: 1 301 436 2618
E-mail: michael.wehr@cfsan.fda.gov

Dr. John Lyon
Director of Technical Services
Dole Food Company, Inc.
One Dole Drive
Westlake Village, California 91362
United States of America
Tel: 1 818 874 4648
Fax: 1 818 874 4804
E-mail: john_lyon@na.dole.com

Mr Karl Hoppe
Senior Manager
Pepsico Beverages and Foods
1000-113th Street
Arlington, Texas 76011
United States of America
Tel: 1 817 695 3222
Fax: 1 817 649 7306
E-mail: karl.hoppe@pepsi.com

Mr Kevin Gaffney
Senior Research and Development Manager
Florida's Natural Growers Inc
P.O.Box 1111
Lake Wales, FL 33859
United States of America
Tel: 1 863 676 1411
Fax: 1 863 678-9588
E-mail: kgaffney@citrusworld.com

Mrs Lucy Reid
Director, Juice and Wellness Products
- Scientific and Regulatory Affairs
The Coca-Cola Company
2000 St. James Place
Houston, Texas, 77056
United States of America
Tel: 1 713 888 5757
Fax: 1 713 888 5792
E-mail: alreid@na.ko.com

Dr. William Stinson
Scientific Research Director
Florida Department of Citrus
700 Experiment Station Road
Lake Alfred, Florida 33850
Tel: 1 863 295 59 35
Fax: 1 863 295 5920
E-mail: bstinson@citrus.state.fl.us

INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES NO GUBERNAMENTALES

International Council of Grocery Manufacter Associations (ICGMA)

Ms Nathalie Beriot
Head of Delegation
International Council of Grocery
Manufacturers Associations – ICGMA
2401 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Second Floor
|Washington, DC 20037
United States of America
Tel: 1 202 337 9400
Fax: 1 202 337 4508
E-mail: nathalie.beriot@intl.pepsico.com

International Federation of Fruit Juice Producers (IFU)
Federation Internationale des Producteurs de Jus de Fruits

Mr Tony Beattie
IFU President
International Federation of Fruit Juice Producers
23, Boulevard des Capucines
75002, Paris, France

Mr Paul Zwiker
Head of Delegation
International Federation of Fruit Juice Producers
Postfach 45,
CH 9220 Bischofszell
Switzerland
Tel: 41 71 420 0644
Fax: 41 71 420 0643
E-mail: zwiker@bluewin.ch

Mr David Hammond
Head of IFU Analytical Commission
International Fruit Juice Union
Reading Scientific Services Ltd, LZRC,
The University, Whiteknights, Reagind, RG6 6LA
UK
Tel: 44 118 986 8541
Fax: 44 118 986 8932
E-mail: david.a.hammond@rssl.com

Mrs. Elisabetta Romeo-Vareille
Secretary General of the IFU
International Federation of Fruit Juice Producers
23, Boulevard des Capucines 75002
Paris – France
Tel: 33 147 428280
Fax: 33 147 428281
E-mail: ifu@wanadoo.fr

Mrs Kristen Gunter
Member of the IFU Delegation
International Federation of Fruit Juice Producers
1501 S. Florida Av e Lakeland, FL. USA
Tel: 1 863 680 9908
Fax: 1 863 683 2849
E-mail: GUNCHAD@aol.com

Dr. Klaus Sondhaus
Member of the IFU Delegation
Verband Der Deutschen Fruchtsaft – Industrie E.V.
Mainzer STR. 253
53179 Bonn
Germany
Tel: 00 49 228954600
Fax: 0049 228956030
E-mail: heitzmann@fruchtsaft.org

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF BEVERAGES ASSOCIATIONS (ICBA)

Mr José Mauro Moraes
(ICBA)
Praia de Botafogo, 374
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro
Brasil - CEP
Tel: 55 21 2559 1118
Fax: 55 21 2559 1594
E-mail: jmoraes@la.ko.com

CODEX SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT DU CODEX
SECRETARIADO DEL CODEX

Mrs Gracia Teresa Brisco López
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 – Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 5705 2700
Fax: 39 06 5705 4593
E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

Dr Jeronimas Maskeliunas
Codex Secretariat
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 - Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 5705 3967
Fax: 39 06 5705 4593
E-mail: Jeronimas.Maskeliunas@fao.org

BRAZILIAN SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT DU BRÈSIL
SECRETARIA DEL BRASIL

Mrs Maria Aparecida Martinelli
Coordinator of Brazilian Codex Committee
CODEX FOCAL POINT
SEPN 511, Bloco B, Ed. Bittar III , 4º Andar
Brasília - DF
Tel: 55 61 340 2211
Fax: 55 61 347 3284
E-mail: codexbrasil@inmetro.gov.br

DRAFT CODEX GENERAL STANDARD FOR FRUIT JUICES AND NECTARS
(At Step 8)

1. SCOPE

This Standard applies to all products as defined in Section 2.1 below.

2. DESCRIPTION

2.1 PRODUCT DEFINITION

2.1.1 Fruit Juice

Fruit juice is the unfermented but fermentable liquid obtained from the edible part of sound, appropriately mature and fresh fruit or of fruit maintained in sound condition by suitable means including post harvest surface treatments applied in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Some juices may be processed with pips, seeds and peel, which are not usually incorporated in the juice, but some parts or components of pips, seeds and peel, which cannot be removed by Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) will be acceptable.

The juice is prepared by suitable processes, which maintain the essential physical, chemical, organoleptical and nutritional characteristics of the juices of the fruit from which it comes. The juice may be cloudy or clear and may have restored[1] aromatic substances and volatile flavour components, all of which must be obtained by suitable physical means, and all of which must be recovered from the same kind of fruit. Pulp and cells[2] obtained by suitable physical means from the same kind of fruit may be added.

A single juice is obtained from one kind of fruit. A mixed juice is obtained by blending two or more juices or juices and purées, from different kinds of fruit.

Fruit juice is obtained as follows:

2.1.1.1 Fruit juice directly expressed by mechanical extraction processes.

2.1.1.2 Fruit juice from concentrate by reconstituting concentrated fruit juice defined in Section 2.1.2 with potable water that meets the criteria described in Section 3.1.1(c).

2.1.2 Concentrated Fruit Juice

Concentrated fruit juice is the product that complies with the definition given in Section 2.1.1 above, except water has been physically removed in an amount sufficient to increase the Brix level to a value at least 50% greater than the Brix value established for reconstituted juice from the same fruit, as indicated in the Annex. In the production of juice that is to be concentrated, suitable processes are used and may be combined with simultaneous diffusion of the pulp cells or fruit pulp by water, provided that the water extracted soluble fruit solids are added in-line to the primary juice, before the concentration procedure. Fruit juice concentrates may have restored[1] aromatic substances and volatile flavour components, all of which must be obtained by suitable physical means, and all of which must be recovered from the same kind of fruit. Pulp and cells[2] obtained by suitable physical means from the same kind of fruit may be added.

---

1 Introduction of aromas and flavours are allowed to restore the level of these components up to the normal level attained in the same kind of fruit.

2 For citrus fruits, pulp or cells are the juice sacs obtained from the endocarp.

2.1.3 Water Extracted Fruit Juice

Water Extracted Fruit Juice is the product obtained by diffusion with water of:

- Pulpy whole fruit whose juice cannot be extracted by any physical means, or

- Dehydrated whole fruit.

Such products may be concentrated and reconstituted.

The solids content of the finished product shall meet the minimum Brix level for reconstituted juice specified in the Annex.

2.1.4 Fruit Purée for use in the manufacture of Fruit Juices and Nectars

Fruit purée for use in the manufacture of Fruit Juices and Nectars is the unfermented but fermentable product obtained by suitable processes e.g. by sieving, grinding, milling the edible part of the whole or peeled fruit without removing the juice. The fruit must be sound, appropriately mature, and fresh or preserved by physical means or by treatment(s) applied in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Fruit purée may have restored[1] aromatic substances and volatile flavour components, all of which must be obtained by suitable physical means, and all of which must be recovered from the same kind of fruit. Pulp and cells[2] obtained by suitable physical means from the same kind of fruit may be added.

2.1.5 Concentrated Fruit Purée for use in the manufacture of Fruit Juices and Nectars

Concentrated fruit purée for use in the manufacture of Fruit Juices and Nectars is obtained by the physical removal of water from the fruit purée in an amount sufficient to increase the Brix level to a value at least 50% greater than the Brix value established for reconstituted juice from the same fruit, as indicated in the Annex. Concentrated fruit purée may have restored[1] aromatic substances and volatile flavour components, all of which must be obtained by suitable physical means, and all of which must be recovered from the same kind of fruit.

2.1.6 Fruit Nectar

Fruit Nectar is the unfermented but fermentable product obtained by adding water with or without the addition of sugars as defined in Section 3.1.2(a), honey and/or syrups as described in Section 3.1.2(b), and/or food additive sweeteners as listed in the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) to products defined in Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 or to a mixture of those products. Aromatic substances, volatile flavour components, pulp and cells[2] all of which must be recovered from the same kind of fruit and be obtained by suitable physical means may be added. That product moreover must meet the requirements defined for fruit nectars in the Annex. A mixed fruit nectar is obtained from two or more different kinds of fruit.

2.2 SPECIES

The species indicated as the botanical name in the Annex shall be used in the preparation of fruit juices, fruit purées and fruit nectars bearing the product name for the applicable fruit. For fruit species not included in the Annex, the correct botanical or common name shall apply.

3. ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS

3.1 COMPOSITION

3.1.1 Basic Ingredients

(a) For directly expressed fruit juices, the Brix level shall be the Brix as expressed from the fruit and the soluble solids content of the single strength juice shall not be modified, except by blendings with the juice of the same kind of fruit.

(b) The preparation of fruit juice that requires reconstitution of concentrated juices must be in accordance with the minimum Brix level established in the Annex, exclusive of the solids of any added optional ingredients and additives. If there is no Brix level specified in the Table, minimum Brix shall be calculated on the basis of the soluble solids content of the single strength juice used to produce such concentrated juice.

(c) For reconstituted juice and nectar, the potable water used in reconstitution shall, at a minimum, meet the latest edition of the *Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality of the World Health Organization* (Volumes 1 and 2).

3.1.2 Other Permitted Ingredients

Except as otherwise provided, the following shall be subject to ingredient labelling requirements:

(a) Sugars with less than 2% moisture as defined in the Codex Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999, Amd. 1-2001): sucrose[3], dextrose anhydrous, glucose[4], fructose, may be added to all products defined in Section 2.1. (The addition of ingredients listed in Section 3.1.2(a) and 3.1.2(b) applies only to products intended for sale to the consumer or for catering purposes.)

(b) Syrups (as defined in the Codex Standard for Sugars), liquid sucrose, invert sugar solution, invert sugar syrup, fructose syrup, liquid cane sugar, isoglucose and high fructose syrup may be added only to fruit juice from concentrate, as defined in Section 2.1.1.2, concentrated fruit juices, as defined in Section 2.1.2, concentrated fruit purée as defined in Section 2.1.5, and fruit nectars as defined in Section 2.1.6. Honey and/or sugars derived from fruits may be added only to fruit nectars as defined in Section 2.1.6.

(c) Subject to national legislation of the importing country, lemon (*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm. *f. Citrus limonum* Rissa) juice or lime (*Citrus aurantifolia* (Christm.)) juice, or both, may be added to fruit juice up to 3 g/l anhydrous citric acid equivalent for acidification purposes to unsweetened juices as defined in Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.5. Lemon juice or limejuice, or both, may be added up to 5 g/l anhydrous citric acid equivalent to fruit nectars as defined in Section 2.1.6.

(d) The addition of both sugars (defined in subparagraphs (a) and (b)) and acidifying agents (listed in the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA)) to the same fruit juice is prohibited.

(e) Subject to national legislation of the importing country, the juice from *Citrus reticulata* and/or hybrids with r*eticulata* may be added to orange juice in an amount not to exceed 10% of soluble solids of the *reticulata* to the total of soluble solids of orange juice.

(f) Salt and spices and aromatic herbs (and their natural extracts) may be added to tomato juice.

(g) For the purposes of product fortification, essential nutrients (e.g. vitamins, minerals) may be added to products defined in Section 2.1. Such additions shall comply with the texts of the Codex Alimentarius Commission established for this purpose.

---

[3] Termed “white sugar” and “mill sugar” in the Codex Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999, Amd. 1-2001).

[4] Termed “dextrose anhydrous” in the Codex Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999, Amd. 1-2001).

3.2 QUALITY CRITERIA

The fruit juices and fruit nectars shall have the characteristic colour, aroma and flavour of juice from the same kind of fruit from which it is made.

The fruit shall retain no more water from washing, steaming or other preparatory operations than technologically unavoidable.

3.3 AUTHENTICITY

Authenticity is the maintenance of the product's essential physical, chemical, organoleptical, and nutritional characteristics of the fruit(s) from which it comes.

3.4 VERIFICATION OF COMPOSITION, QUALITY AND AUTHENTICITY

Fruit juices and nectars should be subject to testing for authenticity, composition, and quality where applicable and where required. The analytical methods used should be those found in Section 9, Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

4. FOOD ADDITIVES

Food additives listed in Tables 1 and 2 of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives in Food Categories 14.1.2.1 (Fruit juice), 14.1.2.3 (Concentrates for fruit juice), 14.1.3.1 (Fruit nectar) and 14.1.3.3 (Concentrates for fruit nectar) may be used in foods subject to this Standard

5. PROCESSING AIDS – Maximum Level of Use in line with Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP)

Function	Substance
Antifoaming Agent	Polydimethylsiloxane[5]
Clarifying Agents Filtration Aids Flocculating Agents	Adsorbent clays (bleaching, natural or activated earths)
	Adsorbent resins
	Activated carbon (only from plants)
	Bentonite
	Calcium hydroxide[6]
	Cellulose
	Chitosan
	Colloidal silica
	Diatomaceous earth
	Gelatin (from skin collagen)
	Ion exchange resins (cation and anion)
	Kaolin
	Perlite
	Polyvinylpolypyrrolidone
	Potassium tartrate[6]
	Precipitated calcium carbonate[6]
	Rice hulls
	Silicasol
	Sulphur dioxide[6, 7]
	Tannin

5 10 mg/*l* is the maximum residue limit of the compound allowed in the final product.
6 Only in grape juice.
7 10 mg/l (as residual SO_2).

Function	Substance
Enzyme preparations[8]	Pectinases (for breakdown of pectin), Proteinases (for breakdown of proteins), Amylases (for breakdown of starch) and, Cellulases (limited use to facilitate disruption of cell walls).
Packing gas[9]	Nitrogen
	Carbon dioxide

6. CONTAMINANTS

6.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The products covered by the provisions of this Standard should comply with those maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentrarius Commission for these products.

6.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

The products covered by the provisions of this Standard should comply with those maximumm levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for these products.

7. HYGIENE

7.1 It is recommended that the products covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

7.2 The products should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

8. LABELLING

In addition to the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 1-1991), the following specific provisions apply:

8.1 CONTAINERS DESTINED FOR THE FINAL CONSUMER

8.1.1 The Name of the Product

The name of the product shall be the name of the fruit used as defined in Section 2.2. The fruit name shall be filled in the blank of the product name mentioned under this Section. These names may only be used if the product conforms to the definition in Section 2.1 or which otherwise conform to this Standard.

8.1.1.1 Fruit Juice defined under Section 2.1.1

The name of the product shall be "_____ juice" or "juice of _____".

8.1.1.2 Concentrated Fruit Juice defined under Section 2.1.2

The name of the product shall be "concentrated ____ juice" or "____ juice concentrate".

---

8 Enzyme preparations may be used as processing aids provided these preparations do not result in a total liquefaction and do not substantially affect the cellulose content of the processed fruit.

9 May also be used e.g., for preservation.

8.1.1.3 Water Extracted Fruit Juice defined under Section 2.1.3

The name of the product shall be “water extracted_____ juice” or “water extracted juice of _____”.

8.1.1.4 Fruit Purée defined under Section 2.1.4

The name of the product shall be “ _____ purée” or “Purée of _____”

8.1.1.5 Concentrated Fruit Purée defined under Section 2.1.5

The name of the product shall be “concentrated _____ purée” or “ _____ purée concentrated”

8.1.1.6 Fruit Nectars defined under Section 2.1.6

The name of the product shall be “ ____ nectar” or “nectar of ____”.

8.1.1.7 In the case of fruit juice products (as defined in Section 2.1) manufactured from two or more fruits, the product name shall include the names of the fruit juices comprising the mixture in descending order of proportion by weight (m/m) or the words "fruit juice blend", " a fruit juice mixture", "mixed fruit juice" or other similar wording.

8.1.1.8 For fruit juices, fruit nectars and mixed fruit juice/nectar, if the product contains or is prepared from concentrated juice and water or the product is prepared from juice from concentrate and directly expressed juice or nectar, the words “from concentrate” or “reconstituted” must be entered in conjunction with or close to the product name, standing out well from any background, in clearly visible characters, not less than 1/2 the height of the letters in the name of the juice.

8.1.2 Additional Requirements

The following additional specific provisions apply:

8.1.2.1 For fruit juices, fruit nectars, fruit purée and mixed fruit juices/nectars/purées, if the product is prepared by physically removing water from the fruit juice in an amount sufficient to increase the Brix level to a value at least 50% greater than the Brix value established for reconstituted juice from the same fruit, as indicated in table of the Annex, it shall be labelled “concentrated”.

8.1.2.2 For products defined in Sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.5, where one or more of the optional sugar or syrup ingredients as described in Section 3.1.2 (a) and (b) are added, the product name shall include the statement called “sugar(s) added” after the fruit juice or mixed fruit juice’s name. When food additive sweeteners are employed as substitutes for sugars in fruit nectars and mixed fruit nectars, the statement, “with sweetener(s),” shall be included in conjunction with or in close proximity to the product name.

8.1.2.3 Where concentrated fruit juice, concentrated fruit purée, concentrated fruit nectar or mixed concentrated fruit juice/nectar/purée is to be reconstituted before consumption as fruit juice, fruit purée, fruit nectar or mixed fruit juices/nectars/purées, the label must bear appropriate directions for reconstitution on a volume/volume basis with water to the applicable Brix value in the Annex for reconstituted juice.

8.1.2.4 Distinct varietal denominations may be used in conjunction with the common fruit names on the label where such use is not misleading.

8.1.2.5 Fruit nectars and mixed fruit nectars must be conspicuously labelled with a declaration of “juice content __%” with the blank being filled with the percentage of purée and/or fruit juice computed on a volume/volume basis. The words “juice content __%” shall appear in close proximity to the name of the product in clearly visible characters, not less than 1/2 the height of the letters in the name of the juice.

8.1.2.6 An ingredient declaration of “ascorbic acid” when used as an antioxidant does not, by itself, constitute a “Vitamin C” claim.

8.1.2.7 Any added essential nutrients declaration should be labelled in accordance with the *Codex General Guidelines on Claims* (CAC/GL 1-1979, Rev. 1-1991), *Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling* (CAC/GL 2- 1985, Rev. 1-1993) and the *Codex Guidelines for Use of Nutrition Claims* (CAC/GL 23-1997).

For fruit nectars in which a food additive sweetener has been added in order to replace wholly or in part the added sugars or other sugars or syrups, including honey and/or sugars derived from fruits as listed in Sections 3.1.2 (a) and (b), any nutrient content claims related to the reduction in sugars should conform to the *Codex General Guidelines on Claims* (CAC/GL 1-1979, Rev. 1-1991), *Codex Guidelines for Use of Nutrition Claims* (CAC/GL 23-1997) and *Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling* (CAC/GL 2-1985, Rev 1-1993).

8.1.2.8 A pictorial representation of fruit(s) on the label should not mislead the consumer with respect to the fruit so illustrated

8.1.2.9 Where the product contains added carbon dioxide the term “carbonated” or “sparkling” shall appear on the label near the name of the product.

8.1.2.10 Where tomato juice contains spices and/or aromatic herbs in accordance with Section 3.1.2(f), the term “spiced” and/or the common name of the aromatic herb shall appear on the label near the name of the juice.

8.1.2.11 Pulp and cells added to juice over that normally contained in the juice shall be declared in the list of ingredients. Aromatic substances, volatile flavour components, pulp and cells added to nectar over that normally contained in the juice shall be declared in the list of ingredients.

8.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Information for non-retail containers not destined to final consumers shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the product, lot identification, net contents and the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor or importer, as well as storage instructions, shall appear on the container, except that for tankers the information may appear exclusively in the accompanying documents.

However, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor or importer may be replaced by an identification mark, provided that such a mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents.

9. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

1. METHODS OF ANALYSIS ENDORSED

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCIPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Ascorbic acid-L (additives)	IFU Method No 17a (1995)	HPLC	II	E
Ascorbic acid-L (additives)	ISO 6557-1: 1986	Fluorescence spectrometry	IV	E
Ascorbic acid-L (additives)	AOAC 967.21 IFU Method No 17 ISO 6557-2: 1984	Indophenol method	III	E
Carbon dioxide (additives and processing aids)	IFU Method No 42 (1976)	Titrimetry (back-titration after precipitation)	IV	E
Cellobiose	IFU Recommendation No.4 October 2000	Capillary gas chromatography	IV	E
Citric acid[10] (additives)	AOAC 986.13	HPLC	II	E
Citric acid[10] (additives)	EN 1137: 1994 IFU Method No 22 (1985)	Enzymatic determination	III	E
Glucose and fructose (permitted ingredients)	EN 12630 IFU Method No 67 (1996) NMKL 148 (1993)	HPLC	III	E
Glucose-D and fructose-D (permitted ingredients)	EN 1140 IFU Method No 55 (1985)	Enzymatic determination	II	E
Malic acid (additives)	AOAC 993.05	Enzymatic determination and HPLC	III	E
Malic acid-D	EN 12138 IFU Method No 64 (1995)	Enzymatic determination	II	E
Malic acid-D in apple juice	AOAC 995.06	HPLC	II	E
Malic acid-L	EN 1138 (1994) IFU Method No 21 (1985)	Enzymatic determination	II	E

[10] All juices except citrus based juices.

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCIPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Pectin (additives)	IFU Method No 26 (1964/1996)	Precipitation/photometry	I	E
Benzoic acid and its salts	ISO 5518:1978 ISO 6560: 1983	Spectrometry	III	E
Benzoic acid and its salts; sorbic acid and its salts	IFU Method No 63 (1995) NMKL 124 (1997)	HPLC	II	E
Preservatives in fruit juices (sorbic acid and its salts)	ISO 5519: 1978	Spectrometry	III	E
Saccharin	NMKL 122 (1997)	Liquid chromatography	II	E
Soluble solids	AOAC 983.17 EN 12143 (1996) IFU Method No 8 (1991) ISO 2173: 2003	Indirect by refractometry	I	E
Sucrose (permitted ingredients)	EN 12146 (1996) IFU Method No 56 (1985/1998)	Enzymatic determination	III	E
Sucrose (permitted ingredients)	EN 12630 IFU Method No 67 (1996) NMKL 148 (1993)	HPLC	II	E
Sulphur dioxide (additives)	Optimized Monier Williams AOAC 990.28 IFU method No. 7A (2000) NMKL 132 (1989)	Titrimetry after distillation	II	E
Sulphur dioxide (additives)	NMKL 135 (1990)	Enzymatic determination	III	E
Sulphur dioxide (additives)	ISO 5522:1981 ISO 5523:1981	Titrimetry after distillation	III	E
Tartaric acid in grape juice (additives)	EN 12137 (1997) IFU Method No 65 (1995)	HPLC	II	E
Total nitrogen	EN 12135 (1997) IFU Method No 28 (1991)	Digestion/titration	I	E

2. METHODS TEMPORARILY ENDORSED

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Acetic acid	EN 12632 or IFU Method No 66 (1996)	Enzymatic determination		TE
Alcohol (ethanol)	IFU Method No 52 (1983/1996)	Enzymatic determination		TE
Anthocyanins	IFU Method No 71 (1998)	HPLC		TE
Ash in fruit products	AOAC 940.26 EN 1135 (1994) IFU Method No 9 (1989)	Gravimetry		TE
Beet sugar in fruit juices	AOAC 995.17	Deuterium NMR		TE
Benzoic acid as a marker in orange juice	AOAC 994.11	HPLC		TE
Determination of C^{13}/C^{12} ratio of ethanol derived from fruit juices	JAOAC 79, No.1, 1996, 62-72	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Carbon stable isotope ratio of apple juice	AOAC 981.09 JAOAC 64, 85 (1981)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Carbon stable isotope ratio of orange juice	AOAC 982.21)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Carotenoid, Total/individual groups	EN 12136 (1997) IFU Method No59 (1991)	Precipitation/fractionation		TE
Carotenoids, Total	ISO 6558-2:1992	Column chromatographic separation and spectrometry		TE
Centrifugable pulp	EN 12134 IFU Method No 60 (1991/1998)	Centrifugation/% value		TE

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Chloride (expressed as sodium chloride)	EN12133 IFU Method No 37 (1968)	Electrochemical titrimetry		TE
Chloride in vegetable juice	AOAC 971.27 (Codex general method) ISO 3634:1979	Titration		TE
Essential oils	AOAC 968.20 IFU 45b	(Scott) distillation, titration		TE
Essential oils (in citrus fruit)	ISO 1955:1982	Distillation and direct reading of the volume		TE
Fermentability	IFU Method No 18 (1974)	Microbiological method		TE
Formol number	EN 1133 (1994) IFU Method No 30 (1984)	Potentiometric titration		TE
Free amino acids	EN 12742 IFU Method No 57 (1989)	Chromatography		TE
Fumaric acid	IFU Method No 72 (1998)	HPLC		TE
Glucose, fructose, sorbitol	EN 12630 IFU Method No 67 (1996) NMKL 148 (1993)	HPLC		TE
Gluconic acid	IFU Method No 76 (2001)	Enzymatic determination		TE
Glycerol	IFU Method No 77 (2001)	Enzymatic determination		TE
Hesperidin and naringin	EN 12148 (1996) IFU Method No 58 (1991)	HPLC		TE
HFCS & HIS in apple juice (permitted ingredients)	JAOAC 84, 486 (2001)	CAP GC Method		TE
Hydroxymethylfurfural	IFU Method No 69 (1996)	HPLC		TE

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Hydroxymethylfurfural	ISO 7466:1986	Spectrometry		TE
Isocitric acid-D	EN 1139 IFU Method No 54 (1984)	Enzymatic determination		TE
Lactic acid- D and L	EN 12631 (1999) IFU Method No 53 (1983/1996)	Enzymatic determination		TE
L-malic/total malic acid ratio in apple juice	AOAC 993.05	Enzymatic determination and HPLC		TE
Naringin and neohesperidin in orange juice	AOAC 999.05	HPLC		TE
pH-value	EN 1132 (1994) IFU Method No 11 (1968/1989) ISO 1842:1991	Potentiometry		TE
Phosphorus/Phosphate	EN 1136 (1994) IFU Method No 50 (1983)	Photometric determination		TE
Proline	EN 1141 (1994) IFU Method No 49 (1983)	Photometry		TE
Quinic acid in cranberry juice cocktail and apple juice	AOAC 986.13	HPLC		TE
Recoverable oil	AOAC 968.20 IFU Method No 45b	Distillation and titration Scott method		TE
Relative density	EN 1131 (1993) IFU Method No 1 (1989) & IFU Method No General sheet (1971)	Pycnometry		TE
Relative density	IFU Method No 1A	Densitometry		TE
Sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium	EN 1134 (1994) IFU Method No 33 (1984)	Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy		TE
Sorbitol-D	IFU Method No 62 (1995)	Enzymatic determination		TE

PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCPLE	TYPE	STATUS
Stable carbon isotope ratio in the pulp of fruit juices	ENV 13070 (1998) Analytica Chimica Acta 340 (1997)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Stable carbon isotope ratio of sugars from fruit juices	ENV 12140 Analytica Chimica Acta.271 (1993)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Stable hydrogen isotope ratio of water from fruit juices	ENV 12142 (1997)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Stable oxygen isotope ratio in fruit juice water	ENV 12141(1997)	Stable isotope mass spectrometry		TE
Starch	AOAC 925.38 IFU Method No 73	Precipitation		TE
Sugar -beet derived syrups in frozen concentrated orange juice $\delta^{18}O$ Measurements in water	AOAC 992.09	Oxygen isotope ratio analysis		TE
Titrable acids, total	EN 12147 (1995) IFU Method No Method No 3, (1968) ISO 750:1998	Titrimetry		TE
Total dry matter	EN 12145 (1996) IFU Method No 61 (1991)	Gravimetric determination		TE
Total solids	AOAC 985.26	Microwave oven drying		TE
Vitamin C	AOAC 967.22	Microfluorometry		TE
Vitamin C	CEN/TC275/WG9 N60	DNA		TE

ANNEX

MINIMUM BRIX[11] LEVEL FOR RECONSTITUTED JUICE AND RECONSTITUTED PURÉE AND MINIMUM JUICE AND/OR PURÉE CONTENT FOR FRUIT NECTARS (% V/V)[12] AT 20°C

Botanical Name	Fruit's Common Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and Reconstituted Purée	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Actinidia deliciosa (A. Chev.) C. F. Liang & A. R. Fergoson	Kiwi	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Anacardium occidentale L.	Cashewapple	11.5	25.0
Annona muricata L.	Soursop	14.5	25.0
Annona squamosa L	Sugar Apple	14.5	25.0
Averrhoa carambola L.	Starfruit	7.5	25.0
Carica papaya L.	Papaya	(*)[13]	25.0
Chrysophyllum cainito	Star Apple	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Citrus paradisi Macfad	Grapefruit	10.0[14]	50.0
Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai var. Lanatus	Water Melon	8.0	40.0
Citrus paradisi, Citrus grandis	Sweetie grapefruit	10.0	50.0
Cocos nucifera L.[15]	Coconut	5.0	25.0
Cucumis melo L.	Melon	8.0	35.0
Cucumis melo L. subs*p. melo* v*ar. inodorus* H. Jac*q*	Honeydew Melon	10.0	25.0
Cucumis melo L subsp. *melo* var. *inodorus* H. Jacq.	Casaba Melon	7.5	25.0
Cydonnia oblonga Mill.	Quince	11.2	25.0
Diospyros khaki Thunb.	Persimmon	(*)[13]	40.0
Empetrum nigrum L.	Crowberry	6.0	25.0
Eribotrya japonesa	Loquat	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Eugenia syringe	Guavaberry Birchberry	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Eugenia uniflora Rich.	Suriname Cherry	6.0	25.0
Ficus carica L.	Fig	18.0	25.0

[11] For the purposes of the Standard the Brix is defined as the soluble solids content of the juice as determined by the method found in the Section on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

[12] If a juice is manufactured from a fruit not mentioned in the above list, it must, nevertheless, comply with all the provisions of the Standard, except that the minimum Brix level of the reconstituted juice shall be the Brix level as expressed from the fruit used to make the concentrate.

[13] No data currently available. The minimum Brix level of the reconstituted juice shall be the Brix level as expressed from the fruit used to make the concentrate.

[14] Acid corrected as determined by the method for total titratable acids in the Section on Methods of Analysis.

[15] This product is 'coconut water' which is directly extracted from the coconut without expressing the coconut meat.

Botanical Name	Fruit's Common Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and Reconstituted Purée	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Fortunella Swingle sp.	Kumquat	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Fragaria x. ananassa Duchense*(Fragaria chiloensis* Duchesne *x Fragaria virginiana* Duchesne)	Strawberry	7.5	40.0
Genipa americana	Genipap	17.0	25.0
Hippophae elaeguacae	Sea Buckthorn	(*)[13]	25.0
Hipppohae rhamnoides L.	Buckthornberry = Sallow-thornberry	6.0	25.0
Litchi chinensis Sonn.	Lychee	11.2	20.0
Lycopersicum esculentum L.	Tomato	5.0	50.0
Malpighia sp. (Moc. & Sesse)	Acerola (West Indian Cherry)	6.5	25.0
Malus domestica Borkh.	Apple	11.5[16]	50.0
Malus prunifolia (Willd.) Borkh. *Malus sylvestris* Mill.	Crab Apple	15.4	25.0
Mammea americana	Mammee Apple	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Morus sp.	Mulberry	(*)[13]	30.0
Musa species including *M. acuminata* and *M. paradisiaca* but excluding other plantains	Banana	(*)[13]	25.0
Passiflora edulis	Yellow Passion Fruit	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Passiflora quadrangularis	Passion Fruit	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Phoenix dactylifera L.	Date	18.5	25.0
Pouteria sapota	Sapote	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Prunus domestica L. subsp. *domestica*	Plum	12.0	50.0
Prunus armeniaca L.	Apricot	11.5	40.0
Prunus avium L.	Sweet Cherry	20.0	25.0
Prunus cerasus L.	Sour Cherry	14.0	25.0
Prunus cerasus L. cv. Stevnsbaer	Stonesbaer	17.0	25.0
Prunus domestica L. subsp. *domestica*	Prune	18.5	25.0

[16] It is recognized that in different geographical areas, the Brix level may naturally differ from this value. In cases where the Brix level is consistently lower than this value, reconstituted juice of lower Brix from this origin introduced into international trade will be acceptable, provided it meets the authenticity methodology listed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars and the level will not be bellow 10ºBrix for, pineapple juice and apple juice.

Botanical Name	Fruit's Common Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and Reconstituted Purée	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Prunus domestica L. subsp. *domestica*	Quetsche	12.0	25.0
Prunus persica (L.) Batsch *var. nucipersica* (Suckow) c. K. Schneid.	Nectarine	10.5	40.0
Prunus persica (L.) Batsch *var. persica*	Peach	10.5	40.0
Prunus spinosa .	Sloe	6.0	25.0
Punica granatum L.	Pomegranate	12.0	25.0
Pyrus arbustifolia (L.) Pers.	Aronia/Chokeberry	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Pyrus communis L.	Pear	12.0	40.0
Ribes nigrum L.	Black Currant	11.0	30.0
Ribes rubrum L	Red Currant	10.0	30.0
Ribes rubrum L.	White Currant	10.0	30.0
Ribes uva-crispa L.	Goosberry	7.5	30.0
Rosa sp. L.	Rosehip	9.0	40.0
Rubus chamaemorus L.	Cloudberry	9.0	30.0
Rubus fruitcosus L.	Blackberry	9.0	30.0
Rubus hispidus (of North America) *R. caesius* (of Europe)	Dewberry	10.0	25.0
Rubus idaeus L. *Rubus strigosus* Michx.	Red Raspberry	8.0	40.0
Rubus loganobaccus L. H. Bailey	Loganberry	10.5	25.0
Rubus occidentalis L.	Black Raspberry	11.1	25.0
Rubus ursinus Cham. & Schltdl.	Boysenberry	10.0	25.0
Sambucus nigra L. *Sambucus canadensis.*	Elderberry	10.5	50.0
Solanum quitoense Lam.	Lulo	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Sorbus aucuparia L.	Rowanberry	11.0	30.0
Spondia lutea L.	Cajá	10.0	25.0
Spondias tuberosa Arruda ex *Kost.*	Umbu	9.0	25.0
Syzygiun jambosa	Pome Apple	(*)[13]	(*)[13]
Theobroma cacao L.	Cocoa pulp	14.0	50.0
Theobroma grandiflorum L.	Cupuaçu	9.0	35.0

Botanical Name	Fruit's Common Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and Reconstituted Purée	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Vaccinium macrocarpon Aiton *Vaccinium oxycoccos* L.	Cranberry	7.5	30.0
Vaccinium myrtillus L. *Vaccinium corymbosum* L. *Vaccinium angustifolium*	Bilberry/Blueberry	10.0	40.0
Vaccinium vitis-idaea L.	Lingonberry	10.0	25.0
Rosa canina L.	Cynorrhodon	(*)[13]	40.0
Rubus chamaemorus L. *Morus* hybrid	Mulberry	(*)[13]	40.0
Ribes uva-crispa	Red Gooseberry	(*)[13]	30.0
Sorbus domestica	Sorb	(*)[13]	30.0
Citrus aurantium L.	Sour Orange	(*)[13]	50.0
Ribes uva-crispa L.	White Goosberry	(*)[13]	30.0
Rubus vitifolius x *Rubus idaeus* *Rubus baileyanis*	Youngberry	10.0	25.0
	Other: High acidity		Adequate content to reach a minimum acidity of 0.5
	Other: High pulp content, or Strong flavour		25.0
	Other: Low acidity, Low pulp content, or Low/medium flavour		50.0

DRAFT MINIMUM BRIX[1] LEVELS FOR RECONSTITUTED JUICES AND RECONSTITUTED PURÉES AND MINIMUM JUICE AND/OR PURÉE CONTENT FOR FRUIT NECTARS (% V/V)[2] AT 20°C

(At Step 8)

Fruit's Common Name	Botanical Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and reconstituted purée	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Grape	Vitis *Vinifera* L. or *hybrids thereof* Vitis *Labrusca* or *hybrids thereof*	16.0	50.0
Guava	*Psidium guajava* L.	8.5	25.0
Mandarine/Tangerine	*Citrus reticulata* Blanca	11.8[3]	50.0
Mango	*Mangifera indica* L	13.5	25.0
Passionfruit	*Pasiflora edulis Sims. f. edulus Passiflora edulis Sims. f. Flavicarpa O. Def.*	12[3]	25.0
Tamarind (Indian date)	*Tamarindus indica*	13.0	Adequate content to reach a minimum acidity of 0.5

1 For the purposes of the Standard the Brix is defined as the soluble solids content of the juice as determined by the method found in the Section on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

2 If a juice is manufactured from a fruit not mentioned in the above list, it must, nevertheless, comply with all the provisions of the Standard, except that the minimum Brix level of the reconstituted juice shall be the Brix level as expressed from the fruit used to make the concentrate.

3 Acid corrected as determined by the method for total titratable acids in the Section on Methods of Analysis.

PROPOSED DRAFT MINIMUM BRIX[1] LEVELS FOR RECONSTITUTED JUICES AND RECONSTITUTED PURÉES AND MINIMUM JUICE AND/OR PURÉE CONTENT FOR FRUIT NECTARS (% V/V)[2] AT 20°C

(At Step 5/8)

Fruit's Common Name	Botanical Name	Minimum Brix Level for Reconstituted Fruit Juices and Reconstituted Purées	Minimum Juice and/or Purée Content (% v/v) for Fruit Nectars
Lemon	*Citrus limon* (L.) Burm. *f. Citrus limonum* Rissa	8.0[3]	According to the legislation of the importing country
Lime	*Citrus aurantifolia* (Christm.) (swingle)	8.0[3]	According to the legislation of the importing country
Orange	*Citrus sinensis (L.)*	11.8 – 11.2[3] consistent with the application of national legislation of the importing country but not lower than 11.2[4]	50.0
Pineapple	*Ananas comosus (L.) Merrill Ananas sativis L. Schult. f.*	12.8[3, 5]	40.0

1 For the purposes of the Standard the Brix is defined as the soluble solids content of the juice as determined by the method found in the Section on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

2 If a juice is manufactured from a fruit not mentioned in the above list, it must, nevertheless, comply with all the provisions of the Standard, except that the minimum Brix level of the reconstituted juice shall be the Brix level as expressed from the fruit used to make the concentrate.

3 Acid corrected as determined by the method for total titratable acids in the Section on Methods of Analysis.

4 It is recognized that in different geographical areas, the Brix level may naturally differ from this range of values. In cases where the Brix level is consistently lower than this range of values, reconstituted juice of lower Brix from this origin introduced into international trade will be acceptable, provided it meets the authenticity methodology listed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars and the level will not be below 10ºBrix.

5 It is recognized that in different geographical areas, the Brix level may naturally differ from this value. In cases where the Brix level is consistently lower than this value, reconstituted juice of lower Brix from this origin introduced into international trade will be acceptable, provided it meets the authenticity methodology listed in the General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars and the level will not be bellow 10ºBrix for, pineapple juice and apple juice.