



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

50th Session

Haikou, PR. China, 9 - 14 April 2018

Comments at Agenda Item 7(f) submitted by Australia, Canada, China, Egypt, European Union, Kenya and United States of America.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM WITHIN THE CLASSIFICATION TO PROVIDE CODES FOR COMMODITIES NOT MEETING THE CRITERIA FOR CROP GROUPING

Australia

Australia favours the creation of a new miscellaneous sub-group within each commodity Type to accommodate commodities that do not satisfy the criteria for crop grouping, for example under Type 04, 'Group 026 Miscellaneous nuts, seeds and saps' to classify commodities such as water chestnut, fox nut and lotus seed.

Canada

BACKGROUND

CCPR49 (2017) agreed to the development of a system that provides codes within the Classification for commodities that do not meet the crop criteria for grouping (e.g. water chestnut, foxnut, lotus seeds, etc.). The EWG was to further develop this system and submit it for consideration by the next session of CCPR. CCPR49 acknowledged that it would not be possible to select representative commodities for such commodities.

CURRENT STATUS

The EWG discussed 2 options for a system to provide codes within the Classification for commodities that do not meet the criteria for crop grouping:

- OPTION 1: create a separate Type within each Class to provide a list of commodities and codes that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in a crop group.
- OPTION 2: create "Other" subgroups within a crop group.

Option 1 was preferred by the EWG, although Canada supported the use of both possible options.

Codex members and observers have been asked to provide comments on the two options presented in CL 208/21-PR and CX/PR 18/50/11.

Canada's Position on the Development of a system within the Classification to Provide Codes for Commodities not Meeting the Criteria for Crop Grouping

- As a member of the Electronic Working Group on the Revision of the Classification, Canada provided comments through this working group on how to address commodities not meeting the criteria for crop grouping.
- Although Canada supports the use of both options for the classification system for commodities that do not meet the criteria for crop grouping, Canada is not opposed to creating a separate Type within each Class to provide a list of commodities and codes that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in a crop group (OPTION 1).
 - However as previously noted, OPTION 1 may affect previously agreed upon crop groups such as the Oilseeds Group023. This group contains the subgroup023D "Other Oilseeds" which contains oilseed commodities that do not fit in the other subgroups. If Option 1 is chosen, the Oilseeds group may need to be revisited prior to its final adoption.

China

1 Regarding commodities unable to be classified, China agrees with Option 1 to establish a new Type in each Class to collect commodities that do not meet grouping criteria, and assign a code to each commodity. China also suggests Group 29 in this type includes new commodities in the international trade but not in any of the groups previously discussed.

Egypt

Egypt agrees on the classification mentioned in Document no. CI 2018/21-PR related to:

Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed (CXM 4-1989) , development of a system within the Classification to provide codes for commodities that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in a crop group.

Egypt would like to provide the following comments Regarding Document no. CI 2018/21-PR:

Egypt supports the option (2) to create “Other” subgroups within a crop group.

European Union

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the document CX/PR 18/50/11.

The EU confirms its preference for the Option 1, proposed in Appendix I of the document CX/PR 18/50/11, i.e. to create an additional type 'Miscellaneous' within each class. The footnote 1 is very important for the understanding of the proposed new type and it could be better put as an explanation at the beginning of the type.

As regards the subgroup 023D 'Other oilseeds' (point 3 of CX/PR 18/50/11), the EU believes that in this case the nature of the crops is clear and those species meet the criteria to be considered as oilseeds, but because of the inhomogeneity of the members of the subgroup proper examples of representatives commodities cannot be established for the entire subgroup. This is a different situation than the one of the true 'miscellaneous' commodities, which are those which do not meet any criteria of the other groups within the same type.

Kenya

Position: Kenya supports option 1 that creates a separate type within each class to provide a list of commodities and codes that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in a crop group.

Rationale: some commodities that do not meet the crop criteria grouping hence a need for option 1. These commodities are traded and require MRLs therefore there is need for them to have a separate group called miscellaneous with the criteria for inclusion being commodities which do not meet the criteria for crop grouping and the establishment of representative commodities.

United States of America

General Comments

In recent years, the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) has agreed to revise all of the crop groups in the Food and Animal Feeds Classification. The request for comments in this CL covers a part of this ongoing effort. The United States has co-chaired or chaired the electronic Working Group from the start of this effort, has provided much of the documentation for the proposed crop groups, and strongly supports this project.

Specific Comments

The United States supports Option 1 to create a separate type within each Class to provide a list of commodities and codes that do not meet the criteria for crop grouping. If a commodity does not meet the criteria for crop grouping, then it should be omitted from the representative commodity table. However, this system (Option 1) will still provide codes for the miscellaneous commodities.