



**Agenda Item 2**

**CX/ASIA 10/17/2  
August 2010**

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR ASIA**

Seventeenth session

Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 22 – 26 November 2010

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND  
OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES**

**I. MATTERS ARISING/REFERRED FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (32<sup>ND</sup> AND 33<sup>RD</sup> SESSION)**

**A. Items for Information**

*Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 8 or Step 5/8<sup>1</sup>*

1. The 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission adopted the three draft Standards submitted by the CCASIA at Step 8 (including those submitted at Step 5 with a recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7).
2. The following paragraphs provide additional information on the comments made and the decisions taken on certain items.

Draft Regional Standard for Gochujang<sup>2</sup>

3. The Commission adopted the draft Standard with an amendment in Section 2.1 (d) to replace “in an appropriate manner” with “or other appropriate means,” recognizing that the prevention of spoilage of the product could be achieved by other means than heating, as suggested by Japan in their written comments.

Draft Regional Standard for Ginseng Products<sup>3</sup>

4. The Commission adopted the draft Standard with the editorial amendments to footnote 2 to Section 3.2 concerning a ginsenoside pattern, the titles of Section 6.2 and 7.6 and an AOAC method mentioned in Sections 7.1 and 7.2, as suggested by Japan and the Republic of Korea in their written comments.

Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Fermented Soybean Paste<sup>4</sup>

5. The Commission agreed to amend Section 2.1 (d) of the proposed draft Standard with the same justification provided for the draft Regional Standard for Gochujang and to introduce the editorial amendment to Section 3.1.2 (c), as suggested by Japan and the Republic of Korea in their written comments. The Commission noted that the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) had not endorsed the food additive provision for monopotassium tartrate and asked the CCASIA to provide a numeric maximum use level.
6. The Commission adopted the proposed draft Standard at Step 5/8, with the omission of Steps 6 and 7, with these amendments and without the provision for monopotassium tartrate (INS 336(i)).

*Proposed Draft Standards at Step 5<sup>5</sup>*

The 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission adopted at Step 5 the proposed draft Regional Standard for Edible Sago Flour.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP Appendix III

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP para. 25

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP para. 26

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP paras 27, 28

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP Appendix IV

***Near-Eastern Regional Standard for “harissa” (hot pepper paste)***<sup>6</sup>

7. The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the 62<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Executive Committee that in development of the standard of “harissa” (hot pepper paste) the CCNEA should seek close collaboration with the CCASIA, which is elaborating the Regional Standard for Chilli Sauce. This matter will be considered under Agenda Item 4(b).

***Terms of Reference of FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees***<sup>7</sup>

8. Following the discussions in the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCGP, the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission confirmed that the full freedom was given under the current Terms of Reference of FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees to issue regional opinions on all themes under discussion in Codex of strategic importance to the region concerned and to promote the adoption of regional positions on strategic subjects, and therefore there was no need to modify the Terms of Reference.

**B. Items for Action*****Consideration on the Impact of Private Standards***<sup>8</sup>

9. The 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission considered a paper (CX/CAC 10/33/13) prepared by FAO/WHO on private food safety standards (PFS) which addressed the following issues: the extent to which PFS are consistent with Codex and the impact of these standards on market access and public health, particularly in developing countries. The paper did not cover the issue of whether the SPS agreement should apply to PFS, which was a question that would continue to be discussed within the WTO SPS committee.

10. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to consider the replies to CL 2010/32-ASIA on problems encountered with private standards and make recommendation for follow up by the next session of the Commission.

***Proposed draft Standard on Processed Cheese***<sup>9</sup>

11. The 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission agreed to defer decision on the discontinuation on work on a standard for processed cheese until its 34<sup>th</sup> Session. The Commission further agreed to request the interested Coordinating Committees to discuss the necessity and the scope of regional standards for processed cheese and report their findings to the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission. The Commission would then base its decision on the discontinuation of work on the basis of the findings and recommendations of the coordinating committees.

12. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to consider the replies to CL 2010/32-ASIA on the necessity and the scope of regional standards for processed cheese.

***Development of Guidelines for Traceability/Product tracing***<sup>10</sup>

13. The 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems to request the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee to discuss whether there was a need for further guidance on traceability/product tracing and report back to the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.

14. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to discuss the need for further guidance on traceability/product tracing for further consideration by the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.

---

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP para. 120 and ALINORM 09/32/3 paras 76, 77

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP para. 222

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 10/33/REP paras 218 – 243

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 10/33/REP paras 89 – 93

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 196

## II. MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

### A. Endorsement

#### *Regional Standard for Gochujang*

##### 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS)<sup>11</sup>

15. The 30<sup>th</sup> CCMAS considered the validation studies carried out by the Republic of Korea for the determination of capsaicin (CRD 4) and endorsed the method as Type IV, as the inter-laboratory study had not been completed.

16. The 30<sup>th</sup> CCMAS endorsed the AOAC 984.13 method for the determination of crude protein and the AOAC 934.01 method for moisture as Type I, in view of the information provided by the Republic of Korea on the validation of these methods in collaborative studies.

#### *Regional Standard for Fermented Soybean Paste*

##### 41<sup>st</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA)<sup>12</sup>

17. The 41<sup>st</sup> CCFA endorsed the food additive provisions with some editorial amendments, except for the provision for monopotassium tartrate (INS 336(i)) at GMP since it has a numerical ADI and agreed to **request** the CCASIA to provide a numerical maximum level for this substance.

18. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to provide a numerical maximum level for monopotassium tartrate (INS 336(i)) for endorsement by CCFA and adoption by the Commission for inclusion in the Regional Standard for Fermented Soybean Paste.

##### 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL)<sup>13</sup>

##### 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS)<sup>14</sup>

19. The 37<sup>th</sup> CCFL and 30<sup>th</sup> CCMAS endorsed the labelling provisions and the method of analysis as proposed, respectively, with some editorial corrections.

#### *Draft Regional Standard for Edible Sago Flour*

##### 42<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA)<sup>15</sup>

20. The 41<sup>st</sup> CCFA did not endorse the provision of 2500 mg/kg (treatment level) for chlorine dioxide (INS 926), for which the 7<sup>th</sup> JECFA (1963) had recommended a maximum level of treatment of 0-30 mg/kg for flour and 30-75 mg/kg for flour for special purpose, also noting that no specification for chlorine dioxide existed. The CCFA agreed that it would reconsider the level for chlorine dioxide for food category 6.1.2 “flours” of the GSFA and advise the CCASIA accordingly.

21. The 42<sup>nd</sup> CCFA agreed to revise the provision for chlorine dioxide (INS 926) in the GSFA to 30 mg/kg (level of treatment) to be consistent with JECFA evaluation and to recommend the CCASIA to revise the provision in the standard for sago flour accordingly.

22. The 42<sup>nd</sup> CCFA agreed to clarify the scope of food category 06.2.1 “Flour” to include sago flour and to revise the title of food category 06.0 “Cereals and cereal products, derived from cereal grains, from roots and tubers, pulses, legumes, excluding bakery wares of food category 07.0” and the descriptors of food categories 06.2 “Flours and starches (including soybean powder)” and 06.2.1 “Flours”. The revision of the food category system of the GSFA was adopted by the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission<sup>16</sup>.

23. As a consequence of this decision, the CCFA considered that it was appropriate to use a general reference to the relevant provisions of Tables 1 and 2 of the GSFA in the section on food additive of the standard for sago flour.

---

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 09/32/23 paras 77 – 79

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 09/32/12 paras 51 – 52

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 09/32/22 para. 11

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 09/32/23 para. 80

<sup>15</sup> ALINORM 09/32/22 paras 53 – 55 and ALINORM 10/33/12 paras 16 – 19

<sup>16</sup> ALINORM 10/33/REP, para. 18 and Appendix III

24. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to revise the section on food additives taking into account the above recommendations. This matter will be considered under Agenda Item 3(a).

37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL)<sup>17</sup>

30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS)<sup>18</sup>

25. The 37<sup>th</sup> CCFL and 30<sup>th</sup> CCMAS endorsed the labelling provisions and the method of analysis as proposed, respectively, with some editorial corrections.

## **B. Items for information**

### **62<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC)**

#### ***Proposed Draft Standard for Non-fermented Soybean Products***<sup>19</sup>

26. With regard to the difficulties met by CCASIA to establish a classification and definitions for non-fermented soybean products, the CCEXEC agreed to recommend that the CCASIA should consider as a first stage the products that would be more easily standardised, in order to facilitate the progress of work on such products, in view of their importance for the region.

### **26<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on General Principles (CCGP)**

#### ***Timely Availability of Documents***<sup>20</sup>

27. The 26<sup>th</sup> CCGP considered a discussion paper (Ref. CX/GP 10/26/10), prepared by Chile, on ways to approach the timely and simultaneous distribution of documents and the lengths and content of reports taking into account concerns raised at the Commission and from the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean (CCLAC). The Committee agreed that the document would be discussed in the CCLAC and submitted for information to the other coordinating committees and the issue would remain on the agenda of the CCGP for discussion at its next session.

## **C. Items for action**

### **64<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC)**

#### ***Implementation of the Codex Strategic Plan 2008-2013 - General Implementation Status***<sup>21</sup>

28. The 64<sup>th</sup> CCEXEC reviewed the checklist presented in CX/CAC 10/33/10, noted that many activities were ongoing or would be addressed under other agenda items, and in addition made the following comments and recommendations, relevant to the coordinating committees.

#### **Goal 4: promoting Cooperation between Codex and other relevant international organizations and Goal 5 (Promoting Maximum and Effective Participation of Members)**

29. The CCEXEC, while noting that Activity 4.5 “Promote interdisciplinary coordination at the national and regional level” was completed in 2009, recommended that it should be continued and that the questionnaire sent in 2008 on interdisciplinary coordination at the national and regional level should be circulated again for consideration by the forthcoming sessions of Coordinating Committees.

30. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to consider the replies to CL 2010/32-ASIA on activities 4.5 “Promote interdisciplinary coordination at the national and regional level” and 5.5 “Enhance participation of non-governmental organizations at international, regional and national levels” for further consideration by the Executive Committee.

#### **Development of new Strategic Plan for 2013-2018**

31. After some discussion, the CCEXEC recommended that an electronic working group consisting of the Chair and the Vice-Chairs should prepare a questionnaire or a revised proposal for a new Strategic Plan, as feasible, which would be distributed in a Circular Letter for comments and consideration by all Coordinating

<sup>17</sup> ALINORM 09/32/22 para. 11

<sup>18</sup> ALINORM 09/32/23 para. 80

<sup>19</sup> ALINORM 09/32/3 para. 34

<sup>20</sup> ALINORM 10/33/33, paras 99 – 104

<sup>21</sup> ALINORM 10/33/3A paras 44 – 56

Committees. The revised proposal would be submitted for consideration to the next session of the Executive Committee.

### ***New Options for Physical Working Groups***<sup>22</sup>

32. The 64<sup>th</sup> CCEXEC agreed that a survey should be carried out through a letter to Committee Chairs to collect information about their experience with physical working groups. The Committee recommended that the Commission ask the Committee on General Principles to consider new options for physical working groups. If the CCGP did not meet in 2011, the Committee proposed to consider this question at its next session, on the basis of a discussion paper that would be prepared by electronic consultation by the Chair and Vice-Chairs and other interested members of the CCEXEC, involving committee chairs as required, and taking into account the discussions held in the regional Committees. The next session of the Committee would present its recommendations to the Commission who could then ask the Committee on General Principles to consider new options for working groups. The Committee agreed with the proposal of one coordinator to forward the following options to the Coordinating Committees, especially as the proposed process referred to the involvement of regional representatives.

- Limiting the number of participants in physical working groups (pWGs) by requiring that membership be restricted to two or three relevant experts from each of the Codex Regions (This provision would limit the total number of working experts in a group to a much more practical limit of 12-18 members, instead of 30-50 members);
- Develop a mechanism that would ensure Codex Trust Fund support for developing country representatives to working groups organised along these lines (This provision would ensure developing country participation, as at the present time, it is a stated goal but nothing is done to ensure that it occurs);
- Develop a set of expected responsibilities that would apply to the expert representatives from the various regions to the countries in their region. For example, working group experts could be expected to circulate draft working group documents for comments to countries in their region (This provision would ensure that the process remains as transparent as the present process).

33. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to consider the above options for further consideration by the Executive Committee.

### **37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL)**

#### ***Modified standardized common names***<sup>23</sup>

34. The 37<sup>th</sup> CCFL considered a discussion paper on modified standardized names. The CCFL recognized that there was a diversity of views on whether or not the CCFL should provide horizontal guidance on the use of modified standardized common names for the purpose of nutrition claims in the context of the implementation of the Global Strategy on Diet Physical Activity and Health and, therefore, it was not reasonable to either completely discontinue discussing the issue nor to request starting new work at the present time.

35. In order to be better informed for a further analysis of this issue, the CCFL decided that Codex Commodity Committees and FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees should be invited to provide advice, in particular concerning the relevance and implications to their work of horizontal guidance or related texts from the CCFL on modified standardized common names for the purpose of nutrition claims.

36. The Coordinating Committee **is invited** to provide its advice to the CCFL on the relevance and implications to their work of horizontal guidance or related texts from the CCFL on modified standardized common names for the purpose of nutrition claims.

---

<sup>22</sup> ALINORM 10/33/3A para. 164 – 177

<sup>23</sup> ALINORM 09/32/22 paras 125 – 134