

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE:

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

ALINORM 87/19

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Seventeenth Session
Rome, 29 June - 10 July 1987

REPORT OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE
COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE
Thun, Switzerland, 16-20 June 1986

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

	<u>Para</u>
Introduction	1- 4
Adoption of the Agenda	5- 6
Appointment of Working Groups	7-10
Matters of Interest to the Committee	11-30
Report on Activities of FAO and WHO Complementary to the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission	31
Report on Standardization Work of the Economic Groups and International Organizations	32-33
The Codex Alimentarius Commission and the Promotion of Primary Health Care (PHC)	34-38
Monitoring of National Policies, Programmes, Services and Institutions related to Food Safety	39-49
Consideration of Draft European Regional Standard for Vinegar at Step 7	50-71
Consideration of Proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise at Step 4	72-138
Matters Related to the Codex European Standard for Natural Mineral Waters	139-151
Progress Report on Acceptance of Codex Standards and MRLs by Countries of the European Region	152-162
Pilot Study on Acceptances or Related Notifications of Position on Certain Codex Standards by Countries of the Codex Region of Europe	163-172
Survey on Cooperation and Implementation of Food Legislation ...	173-177
Future Programme of Work	178-183
Nomination of Coordinator	184-191
Other Business	192
Date and Place of Next Session	193

APPENDICES

	<u>Pages</u>
Appendix I: List of Participants	28-33
Appendix II: Draft European Regional Standard for Vinegar	34-38
Appendix III: Proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise at Step 5	39-43
Appendix IV: Draft Amendments to the Codex Standard for Mineral Waters (At Step 5)	44
Appendix V: Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis for Mayonnaise and Soluble Solids in Vinegar	45-46
Appendix VI: Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Food Additives in Mayonnaise	47-50
Appendix VII: GESEM Methods*	51
Appendix VIII: Report on Activities of WHO and FAO Complementary to the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission	52-61
Appendix IX: Pilot Study on Acceptances or Related Notifications of Position on Certain Codex Standards by Countries of the Codex Region of Europe	62
Appendix X: Cooperation and Implementation of Food Legislation (Blomberg paper)	63-67
Appendix XI: Monitoring of National Policies, Programmes, Services and Institutions Related to Food Safety and Food Control	68-71
Appendix XII: Progress Report on Publication of the Codex Alimentarius and on Acceptances of Codex Standards and Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues.	72-82

* Note: Appendix VII will be issued separately at a later date.

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Seventeenth Session
Rome, 29 June - 10 July 1987

REPORT OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE
COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE
Thun, Switzerland, 16-20 June 1986

INTRODUCTION

1. The Fifteenth Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe was held in Thun from 16-20 June 1986 by courtesy of the Government of Switzerland. The meeting was chaired by Mr. P. Rossier, the Coordinator for Europe.
2. The Session was opened by Mr. Rossier who welcomed delegates on behalf of Mr. Alphonse Egli, Federal Counsellor.
3. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Eddie Kimbrell (U.S.A.) recalled that the Codex Alimentarius Commission had been preceded by the Codex Alimentarius Europeus and emphasized the efforts towards harmonization of food standards. He pointed out that the time had come to give serious attention to the acceptance of standards and other recommendations elaborated by the Commission and expressed the hope that this Committee would continue as a forum to consider the views of the European countries on the matter.
4. The Session was attended by delegations from 19 countries and observers from the following international organizations: International Standards Organization (ISO), Comité des Industries des Mayonnaises de la CEE (CIMSCEE), Confédération Européenne du Commerce de Détail (CECD), Confédération des Industries Agro-Alimentaires de la CEE (CIAA), European Economic Community (EEC), Comité Permanent International du Vinaigre (CPIV), European Food Law Association (EFLA), Groupement Européen des Sources d'Eaux Minérales (GESEM) and the International Federation of Glucose Industries (IFG). A list of participants is attached as Appendix I to the Report.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Committee noted that certain working papers had been replaced by oral reports, in particular those referring to matters of interest, reports on activities of other organizations and reports on Acceptances.
6. The Committee agreed that it was appropriate to consider the future programme of work of the Committee, based on the decisions taken at this Session. It was agreed that the proposal for the nomination of the Coordinator would also be considered towards the end of the Session.

Appointment of Working Groups

7. The Committee noted that detailed technical comments on certain aspects of the Standards for Vinegar and Mayonnaise had been received and decided therefore to establish two working groups as follows:

Working Group on Food Additives and Contaminants in the Standard for Mayonnaise

8. The delegation of the United Kingdom accepted the chair for the Working Group (Dr. R. Burt) composed of the following delegations: Austria, Belgium, France, Hungary, Switzerland, United Kingdom and CIMSCEE. It was agreed that the Working Group would consider CX/EURO 86/5, CX/EURO 86/6 and CX/EURO 86/7 and make recommendations on Section 4 - Food Additives and Section 5 - Contaminants.

Working Group on Methods of Analysis and Sampling in the Standards for Mayonnaise and Vinegar

9. The Committee agreed that the Working Group should meet under the chairmanship of Dr. H. Woidich (Austria) and would include Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and CIMSCEE. The main purpose was to consider methods of analysis for mayonnaise as contained in CX/EURO 86/6. It was noted that the delegation of the United Kingdom had submitted a Conference Room document on the determination of soluble solids in vinegar. The Committee recalled that a method for the determination of soluble solids had been put forward for consideration by CCMAS, but that it had not endorsed the method at its 14th Session (see ALINORM 85/23, Appendix II). It agreed however, that the Working Group should examine the new method submitted by the U.K. and express an opinion on whether the present method should be further considered.

10. The Committee adopted the Agenda with a slight re-arrangement of items to accommodate the reports of the Working Groups.

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE ARISING FROM SESSIONS OF THE COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES

(1) Clause (d) of Revised Terms of Reference in the Light of the Interpretation of Rule VI.3 of the Rules of Procedure

11. The Committee recalled that it had postponed a decision on clause (d) of the Terms of Reference for Coordinating Committees adopted by the 14th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission until the Commission had agreed on an interpretation of Rule VI.3 (Voting procedures of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, paras. 16-18 of ALINORM 85/19). Clause (d) of the Terms of Reference adopted by the other Coordinating Committees reads as follows:

"develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively in intra-regional trade".

12. The Committee had held the view that such a clause would prevent the European region from developing any regional standards, since there were no products which were limited to the region of Europe only. The Committee had decided that clause (d) for the European Coordinating Committee should read as follows:

"develops regional standards for food products of particular interest for intra-regional trade".

The Committee noted that at present neither of the two versions appeared in the terms of reference for the Committee.

13. The difficulty of developing regional standards arising from the present terms of reference had been compounded by the uncertainty of interpreting Rule VI.3 of the Rules of Procedure.

14. The Committee was informed that during several sessions of the Commission some delegations had held the view that in the case of regional standards the whole of the Commission should decide on the elaboration, amendment or adoption of such standards to ensure that decisions taken at the regional level were in line with the general policy of the Commission. These delegations had urged the amendment of Rule VI.3 to this effect. The Committee noted that at the 16th Session of the Commission the representative of the Legal Counsel of FAO had held that Rule VI.3 as drafted permitted the countries in a region to elaborate regional standards and to decide on their contents, "but that this function was subject to the more general function of the Commission as a whole, which was to decide whether such a regional initiative was compatible or not with its overall programme, its aims and purposes as listed under Article I of the Statutes and, if not, to set aside the decision taken by the region or group of countries concerned."

15. The Committee noted that the Commission had agreed with this interpretation and that there was no need to amend Rule VI.3. The Commission had already regarded the matter as closed.

16. Several delegations expressed their concern on the possible consequences of this interpretation and proposed to seek further advice from the Committee on General principles.

17. The Representative of the European Food Law Association (EFLA) recalled the early developments in the life of the Commission which led to Rule VI.3 and informed the Committee that many lawyers within its membership were concerned that the interpretation given to the Commission by the representative of the FAO Legal Office would in practice prove to be ineffective, as it appeared to be still open to challenge under the provisions of Rule VI.3. It was suggested that Rule VI.3 should be amended as appropriate and, owing to the Commission's quorum difficulties, that the Directors-General of FAO and WHO should inform the total membership that they would seek the consent and approval of their Governing Bodies to the amendment of the Rule in accordance with the policy wishes of the Commission. Such action could avoid future controversy and debate concerning the Commission's authority and remove any ambiguity in this due to Rule VI.3 and its application. Some of the difficulties inherent in the interpretation co-existing with an unamended Rule VI.3 had already been illustrated by the issues set out in paragraph 343 of the Commission's report.

18. The Chairman recalled that the Committee had elaborated a Regional Standard for Honey and had encountered the same concerns from countries outside the Codex Region of Europe as those now expressed in conjunction with the Draft Standard for Vinegar. He pointed out that a revision of Rule VI.3 would be of assistance to all Coordinating Committees and that the initial establishment of a regional standard could provide the basis for a world-wide standard for the same commodity.

19. The Committee noted that a recommendation to refer the question of Rule VI.3 to the Committee on General Principles would have to be approved by the Executive Committee in view of the fact that the Commission had closed the subject. The Committee noted the kind offer of the representative of EFLA to prepare a paper on the matter for its next session.

20. In conclusion, the Committee (a) accepted the offer of the Chairman to ask the Executive Committee's approval to place an item on Rule VI.3 on the agenda of the forthcoming session of the Committee on General Principles (24-28 November 1986, Paris), and (b) to request the Commission to approve the following clause on regional standards for inclusion in the Committee's Terms of Reference: "develops regional standards for food products of particular interest for intra-regional trade".

(2) Amendment to the Codex European Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters (Codex Stan. 108-1981)

21. The Committee was informed that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene had advanced the Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collecting, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters (Appendix VII to ALINORM 85/13A) to Step 8 of the Procedure. The Code included provisions for microbiological end product specifications identical to those proposed for inclusion in Section 5.4 in the Regional European Standard for Natural Mineral Waters at Step 5.

22. The Commission had agreed with the Coordinator for Europe to adopt the specifications at Steps 5 and 8 as an amendment to the Regional Standard consequential to the adoption of the same provisions in the Code of Practice. Steps 6 and 7 were omitted.

23. The Committee was informed that CCFH had confirmed that the methods of analysis for these microbiological requirements would be available in the near future. The Committee noted that a detailed report on methods of analysis prepared by GESEM would be further considered under Item 10 of the Agenda.

24. The Committee was further informed that the proposed amendments concerning Section 3.2.16 and 4.2 on radio-activity for the above standard had been adopted at Step 5 of the Procedure. The Committee agreed to discuss the comments at Step 6 as contained in CX/EURO 86/8 under Item 10 of the Agenda.

(3) Packaging Materials in Foods (paras. 29-34 of ALINORM 85/19)

25. The Committee recalled that it had, at its 14th Session, requested the Secretariat to keep it informed on further action taken by the Commission or Codex Committees on food contact materials from which chemical substances might migrate into food.

26. The Committee was informed that the Commission had considered a comprehensive consultant paper entitled "Food Packaging - Health and Trade Problems and the Role of the Codex Alimentarius Commission".

The salient points of the paper included the following:

"The establishment of open-ended permitted lists of ingredients for the various types of food packaging together with appropriate global or specific migration limits were suggested as means of achieving a harmonized regulatory approach and of avoiding the creation of barriers to trade. The need for agreement on the methods for simulating food contact, and for agreement on the methods for estimation of migrants was stressed."

27. The Committee was informed that the matter of packaging was within the purview of the Commission "and represented a potentially large workload". The Commission also agreed that CCFA should deal with the problems and further consider the above paper. The Commission had emphasized that the activities and proposals of other organizations should be taken into account to avoid duplication of work.

28. The Committee agreed to follow future developments on this matter.

(4) Revision of Labelling Provisions in Existing European Regional Standards

29. The Committee was informed that the 16th Session of the Commission had adopted the revised text of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods and Guidelines on Labelling Provisions in Codex Standards. The Commission had requested all Codex Committees to review the labelling provisions in their standards with a view to aligning them with the General Standard, having regard to the above Guidelines.

30. The Committee agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a brief working paper on the actual proposals for amendment of the labelling sections of the existing European General Standard for the next session of the Committee. The Committee also agreed that the labelling sections of the Standards under elaboration would be reconsidered under the relevant Agenda items (Item 8 - Vinegar; Item 9 - Mayonnaise).

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FAO AND WHO COMPLEMENTARY TO THE WORK OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

31. The Committee was informed in detail by the Representatives of FAO and WHO of activities of their respective organizations complementary to the work of the Commission. During the following discussion, one delegate expressed the hope that FAO/WHO and IAEA could prepare a brief information note (which could be clearly understood) to eliminate any confusion that might exist in the public mind between a) the irradiated food process and b) accidental leakage of radiation. Information was provided on the WHO/EURO activity on the Surveillance and Inspection Procedures associated with irradiated food; a report of which was expected to be made available in Spring 1987. Reference was also made to a planned FAO/WHO/IAEA Training Workshop on Food Inspection for the Food Irradiation Process. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the information provided by FAO and WHO on their activities complementary to the work of the Commission, and agreed that this should be annexed to the report.

REPORT ON STANDARDIZATION WORK OF THE ECONOMIC GROUPS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

32. The observer of the EEC presented the following report on EEC activities of interest to the Committee:

"The Community had continued its activities in the field of harmonization of food legislation. Various directives had been adopted, such as, for example, those concerning ceramic packaging material and heat treated milk. The conclusion of the "Single Act" (amendment to the Treaty of Rome)

was intended among other matters to strengthen the internal market of the Community. For this purpose the Commission proposed a "new approach", the application of which will allow the elimination of intra-community obstacles. At the same time, a new general directive on methods of analysis opens greater possibilities of reference to international standards.

In addition, the Community, together with several non-Community countries (Finland, Sweden and Switzerland) was undertaking a programme coordinating research in the field of food technology within the framework of COST (Scientific and Technological Cooperation between 19 countries of western and southern Europe). This has led to four joint activities of about three or four years duration on physical properties (COST 90 and 90 bis) and on qualitative and nutritional properties (COST 91 and 91 bis) of certain foods. Apart from the establishment of a laboratory network, their activities have given several results in standardization work, as for example, the elaboration of methodology for the measurement of water activity.

At the present time the Commission Services are studying the possibility of extending this cooperation to other areas of food science and food technology".

33. The delegation of Hungary stated that a progress report on CMEA activities would be given under Item 11. (see para. 154)

THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND THE PROMOTION OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE (PHC)

34. Introducing Document ALINORM 85/39 the Secretariat pointed out that the CAC, during its 16th Session in 1985, had already discussed this paper under its agenda item dealing with the future direction of the work of the CAC (for details please see paras. 114-122 of ALINORM 85/47). The CAC had requested the Coordinating Committees to discuss further at the forthcoming sessions the possibilities for integrating food safety into the PHC delivery system at national level and particularly the various proposals in the paper under review. These proposals referred, among other things, to:

(i) the utilization of Codex Codes of Hygienic Practice as additional training material in food safety for community health workers, agricultural extension workers, home economists, nutritionists and similar staff working with the community, who need a knowledge of the basic principles of food safety;

(ii) the translation of at least selected parts of the Codex Alimentarius into national languages in order for Codex texts to be utilized by small industries and communities;

(iii) the need for the Secretariat to produce appropriate information material on the CAC and to inform from time to time, the Governing Bodies of FAO on those activities of the CAC, which are complementary to the promotion of Health for All/2000 and Agriculture Towards 2000, in order for these Governing Bodies to better implement the work of CAC;

(iv) the advisability of inviting a wider range of international or regional governmental and non-governmental organizations to attend sessions of the Committee;

(v) the need to consider the feasibility of introducing on the agendas of Coordinating Committees a permanent agenda item dealing with monitoring of national policies, programmes, services and institutions related to food control and food safety, in order to stimulate action at the national level leading to increased technical cooperation activities in food control and food safety between Member States themselves and between Member States, FAO and WHO.

35. The Secretariat indicated that this last proposal would be further elaborated under Agenda Item No. 7 - Monitoring of National Policies, Programmes, Services and Institutions related to Food Safety and Food Control (Doc. CX/EURO 86/3 - Part II). During the ensuing discussion the following points were made. In countries of the Region PHC had been adopted and was being further developed in order to reduce and minimize the inequality and inadequacy of the present national health care systems. Codex activities had a great influence in most countries in the formulation of food regulations. In this context food safety was seen as an important component of PHC. Poland reported that it had already translated certain Codex documentation to facilitate greater use and understanding of the work of the CAC and expressed the opinion that greater use should be made of existing Codes of Hygienic Practice to formulate appropriate regulations.

36. A plea was made for the Codex Secretariat to prepare information material explaining in laymen's terms the work of Codex. In response the Secretariat indicated that such background material on Codex was presently being prepared by a consultant. It was agreed that the provision of such information could be extremely useful in order to encourage public reaction to food safety and food control measures. Consumer organizations also had a valuable role to play in creating public awareness and in securing improvements in the quality of food products being marketed, as well as for the dissemination of information.

37. It was proposed that the documentary material on Codex currently under preparation, and referred to above, should be provided to all Regional Coordinating Committee Members to facilitate "getting the Codex message across" to Governments as well as members of the public.

38. Summing up, the Chairman expressed the need to create greater awareness among the general public and Governments of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its various Committees. It was also important to ensure harmonization of national regulations with Codex Standards. The time was also appropriate to consider new directions and roles for the Regional Coordinating Committee for Europe which would facilitate the integration of food safety into the primary health care delivery system at the national level.

MONITORING OF NATIONAL POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, SERVICES AND INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO FOOD SAFETY

39. In introducing Document CX/EURO 86/3 Part II, the Secretariat referred to the paper "The Codex Alimentarius Commission and the Promotion of Primary Health Care" (ALINORM 85/39; see also paras. 34-38 of this report) which contained the proposal that Regional Coordinating Committees might consider it worthwhile to monitor regularly national policies, programmes, services and institutions related to food safety and food control. This might help to

stimulate action at the national level which could in turn lead to increased technical cooperation activities in food safety among and within Member States. The CAC, during its 16th Session in 1985, had invited the Coordinating Committees to consider the feasibility of introducing on their agenda a permanent item dealing with monitoring of National Food Control and Safety Programmes. In order to facilitate such monitoring, FAO and WHO jointly had elaborated Guiding Principles on Evaluation of Programmes to Ensure Food Safety (WHO/EHE/FOS/86.1; FAO/ESN/MISC/86.1) which contained, inter alia, examples of indicators which could be used in certain circumstances for monitoring. The FAO/WHO Guiding Principles document had also been circulated with CL 1986/44 - June 1986 to all Codex Contact Points for information purposes.

40. The FAO/WHO Guiding Principles document was a provisional edition and the Secretariat would also welcome additional comments in writing by individual delegations resulting from discussions at the national level with representatives of various ministries and NGOs. These comments should arrive in Geneva not later than December 1986. The Secretariat in turn would use these comments, together with those coming from the Coordinating Committees for Africa, Asia and Latin America, to revise the present provisional edition of the FAO/WHO Guiding Principles on Evaluation of Programmes to Ensure Food Safety. The final edition is scheduled to be published during 1987.

41. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Coordinating Committee to the WHO, European Region "Targets for Health for All" - being targets in support of the European regional strategy for health for all. These have been endorsed by the 32 Member States of the Region, and have been incorporated by many countries in their National Health Planning Processes. In particular, Target 22 "Food Safety" stated that "By 1990 all Member States should have significantly reduced health risks from food contamination and implemented measures to protect consumers from harmful additives". Appropriate indicators are being developed in order to measure progress in achieving the target, and the draft FAO/WHO Guiding Principles document is being utilized as an evaluation mechanism in order to identify constraints and facilitate further actions.

42. In response to a question from the Chairman, the Secretariat explained the monitoring of national policies, programmes, services and institutions was being undertaken by the Regional Office as a part of the European Strategy for Health for All.

43. Referring to the EURO Target No. 22 "Food Safety", one delegate indicated that while the target addressed the questions of reduced health risks, many countries of Europe did not have epidemiological data systems to evaluate current risks, i.e. no base-line data. The Secretariat in response agreed with this assessment, and indicated that the development of such a system in itself would contribute towards reduced health risks from food contamination.

44. Mr. Sporn then introduced the concept of evaluation and monitoring as a process for producing practical information for use by food safety managers and scientists to make decisions regarding the programmes, services and institutions under their direction.

45. The Chairman then requested Mr. E. Kimbrell, Chairman of the CAC, on the views of the CAC concerning the role of the Codex Regional Committees in respect of food safety and food control, including the need for evaluation and monitoring. Responding, Mr. Kimbrell commended WHO for having looked at food safety in its broadest sense. He hoped that the European Regional Committee could discuss how it could interplay with WHO in support of its endeavours. Such a dialogue would also be useful to developing countries when attending other Regional Coordinating Committees. The proposal made by the Secretariat presented an opportunity for the European Regional Coordinating Committee to take a leadership role in food safety and food control. Mr. Kimbrell concluded by expressing the hope that the Committee would respond positively to this opportunity.

46. The Chairman in requesting the Committee to discuss the issue, endorsed the following proposals that had been made by the Secretariat, namely:

(i) to consider, on the basis of information and experience in Member States on their existing monitoring and evaluation systems/activities, ways and means which might be used for strengthening such activities at the national level;

(ii) to determine the role that the Coordinating Committee for Europe might play in stimulating such action and in monitoring the progress achieved;

(iii) to consider the feasibility of introducing on the agenda of the Coordinating Committee a permanent item dealing with monitoring;

(iv) to suggest improvements, if any, in the FAO/WHO Evaluation document.

47. During the brief discussion which followed, these points were made:

- that National Codex Contact Points could be used to encourage countries to provide better quality information on the incidence of food-borne diseases. In connection with collection of epidemiological data on food-borne diseases the FAO/WHO Collaborating Centre for Research and Training in Food Hygiene and Zoonoses, Berlin (West), could play a useful role, provided the quality of information submitted by countries was improved.

- The concept of Codex being used as a structure for improving the role of monitoring and evaluation in the promotion and development of food safety programmes was endorsed. However, it was important for both FAO and WHO to maintain and consolidate their level of support to and interest in, Codex work.

- The importance of developing effective monitoring of food safety through the establishment of well coordinated national systems was emphasized.

48. The Secretariat provided information concerning developments in the Latin American Region, where a common reporting system had been agreed to, based on the indicators contained in the FAO/WHO Guiding Principles document. The topic had also been discussed at the previous Regional Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia at its Fifth Session.

49. The Chairman indicated that the Secretariat document from the Regional Office for Europe relating to this item would be annexed to the report. He concluded that the discussion represented an important aspect of the work of the European Coordinating Committee, which would require careful follow-up by all parties.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR VINEGAR AT STEP 7

50. The Committee had before it the above Standard as contained in Appendix II to ALINORM 85/19 and comments thereon in CX/EURO 86/4 (Canada, Egypt, Finland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom) and Addendum 1 (Comité Permanent International du Vinaigre (CPIV)).

51. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Commission had not been able to adopt the above Standard at Step 8 of the Procedure. The delegations of Austria, Belgium, France, Norway and Sweden supported adoption of the Standard at Step 8. The delegations of Belgium, France and Portugal reiterated their reservations against the use of raw material of silvicultural origin. Other countries outside the region had raised serious objections against a regional standard for vinegar which did not cover all products presently sold as vinegar. They were of the opinion that the Standard could therefore represent a barrier to trade. The major objections related to the exclusion from the Standard of products obtained through acetic fermentation of food grade distilled alcohol of non-agricultural origin and from a restrictive requirement for total acidity in Section 2.3.

52. In conformity with the interpretation of Rule VI.3, the Commission had returned the Standard to Step 6 and requested all member countries to submit their comments on the Standard for further consideration by the Committee. (See para. 343 of the report of the 16th Session of the Commission).

53. The Committee, noting the discussions at the Commission and the written comments in CX/EURO 86/4 and Addendum 1, agreed that it had already fully considered similar comments at previous sessions and decided to limit further consideration of the Standard to the two major obstacles raised at the 16th Session of the Commission and to the review of the labelling provisions (see paras. 59-67). The delegation of Spain expressed its reservation to the use of raw materials of silvicultural origin.

Section 3.3 - Total Acid Content

54. The Committee noted a proposal from the delegation of Switzerland to lower the total acid content to 45g/litre or even 40g/litre on the grounds that products with a lower acid content might be acceptable on the market, since even diluted products were sometimes sold. Some delegations felt that lowering of the total acid content was equivalent to a lowering of quality and countries preferring a low acid content could deviate from this provision. They also felt that the present values had been thoroughly discussed and agreed to by the countries of the region. It was agreed to leave provision 3.3 unchanged.

Use of alcohol of non-agricultural origin as raw material

55. The Committee agreed with the Chairman not to re-open discussions on the use of distilled alcohol of silvicultural origin. The Committee was however opposed to permitting the use of alcohol of petrochemical origin

within the scope of this Standard and confirmed its decision that the Standard should only cover products obtained by double fermentation. The Committee recognized that products derived from such alcohol were used in many countries; however those products could not be denominated vinegar. The Committee re-affirmed its position that vinegar was a product obtained by double fermentation from the raw material listed in Section 3.1.

Section 4.5 - Food Additives and Contaminants

56. The Committee was informed that CCFA had endorsed the provisions for caramel colour (ammonia process) and the provisions on contaminants. The Committee noted that CCFA had not endorsed the provision for monosodium, monopotassium and calcium glutamate, mainly because CCFA was awaiting evaluation and completion of a study in Asia on the use of monosodium glutamate.

57. The Committee recalled that it had proposed a maximum limit for glutamates of 10g/kg and a technological justification for their use. The Committee agreed that Section 4.7.1 which excepted the use of glutamates in wine vinegar should be clarified, since glutamates were, nevertheless, used in wine vinegar with herbs.

58. The Committee agreed to lower the maximum limit for glutamate to 5g/kg and to amend the qualification to read "except for wine vinegar as defined in Section 2.1.1.1."

SECTION 8 - LABELLING

59. The Committee agreed to amend the preamble to this Section by including the revised reference as advised in the Guidelines on Labelling Provisions in the Codex Standard (Appendix V of ALINORM 85/22A).

60. The Committee was informed that the Guidelines also required the inclusion of labelling provisions by reference to the relevant provisions in the General Standard where applicable.

61. The Guidelines however, also permitted deviations from and additions to the provisions of the General Standard where this was justified by the nature of the product concerned. In such cases written justification should be provided to the CCFL when the Standard was submitted for endorsement.

62. The Committee agreed that no amendments were necessary to Section 8.1 - Name of the Food.

63. The Committee also agreed that the provisions for the List of Ingredients (8.2), Net Content (8.3), Name and Address (8.4), Country of Origin (8.5) and Lot Identification (8.6) could be included by reference to the relevant section of the General Standard.

64. The Committee noted that the General Standard contained additional mandatory labelling provisions which had not yet been considered in connection with the Standard. It was agreed that there was no need for mandatory provisions concerning Instructions for Use (Section 4.8 of the General Standard). The Committee noted that the General Standard gave a

detailed provision for the Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients under certain specified conditions, mainly claims (Section 5.1). It was also noted that the reference to "in the name of the food" to a particular ingredient did not trigger quantitative labelling. The Committee agreed to include a provision on Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients by reference to Section 5.1 of the General Standard.

65. Concerning Irradiated Foods, the Committee noted that Section 5.2 of the General Standard provided for the Labelling of Irradiated Foods, as well as for the Labelling of Irradiated Ingredients. CCFL had included a footnote indicating that this Section remained under review. In particular, this was the case for the labelling of irradiated ingredients. The Committee expressed the view that it was unlikely that vinegar as such was irradiated but there might be a possibility to use irradiated ingredients and that appropriate provisions would have to be included in the Standard. However, the Committee felt that it was premature to incorporate such provision at the present time.

66. The Committee agreed to include provisions for the exemption from mandatory labelling requirements of containers with a small surface area to be used in catering services by reference to Section 6 of the General Standard.

67. The Committee was informed that the Guidelines on Labelling Provisions in Codex Standards contained a definition for non-retail containers and guidance on appropriate labelling provisions. These provisions required the same amount of labelling but left certain options on whether this information should be placed on the label or in the accompanying document, noting that outer containers for pre-packaged units were considered to be non-retail containers. The Committee agreed to include a provision for the labelling of such containers in the Guidelines.

Methods of Analysis

68. For further discussion of Section 9.3 see paras. 136-138.

Status of the Standard

69. The Committee decided to advance the European Regional Standard for Vinegar to Step 8 of the Procedure and expressed the hope that the Commission would be able to adopt the Standard, since it had been thoroughly discussed and was of great importance to the countries of the Region.

70. The revised text of the Standard is contained in Appendix II.

71. The delegations of Belgium, France and Spain repeated their reservations to the inclusion of products of silvicultural origin in the Standards.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR MAYONNAISE AT STEP 4

72. The Committee had before it the above Standard as contained in CX/EURO 86/5 which had been revised in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 14th Session (paras. 64-98 of ALINORM 85/19).

73. The Committee also had before it a Working Paper prepared by CIMSCEE on technological justifications for the list of additives in Section 4 of the Standard, on proposals for Maximum Levels of Contaminants and on proposed Methods of Analysis. Government comments on the two documents (CX/EURO 86/6 and CX/EURO 86/7) had been received from Ireland and MARINALG. The latter had been wrongly attributed to France. The delegation of France had also submitted its comments, which were now given verbally.

74. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Technical Commission of CIMSCEE for the excellent work on the highly technical matters of food additives, contaminants and methods of analysis.

75. The Committee decided to consider the Standard section by section.

SECTION 1 - SCOPE

76. Several delegations were of the opinion that reference to human consumption in the Scope Section was not a clear indication that the Standard covered mayonnaise intended for direct human consumption and for use as an ingredient.

77. The Committee decided to delete the part of the sentence concerning "intended for human consumption". It was noted that for further clarification the Section on the Name of the Food could be slightly re-worded to reflect the relevant provisions in the General Standard.

SECTION 2 - DESCRIPTION

78. The Committee noted that this Section contained a provision in square brackets which would permit the substitution of vinegar by a solution of food acid.

79. The Committee agreed that if possible the products covered by the Standard should be in its composition and organoleptic properties as close as possible to the traditional product known as mayonnaise.

80. Several delegations were therefore of the opinion that it would be important to permit only fermentation vinegar as the essential constituent of the aqueous phase. It was further noted that the Section on Food Additives permitted the use of acidifying agents in the case where adjustment of acidity was desired. The delegation of Belgium proposed to delete the phrase in square brackets and to indicate that the aqueous phase consisted essentially of vinegar.

81. Several delegations expressed their opposition to the use of food acids. The delegation of the Netherlands felt that the Standard should take into account current manufacturing which included the use of food acids. It was of the opinion that appropriate labelling provisions would safeguard the consumer.

82. The Committee concluded that the majority of delegations were in favour of permitting vinegar only and decided therefore to delete the provision in square brackets.

83. The Committee was informed that only edible vegetable oils were used in the manufacture of mayonnaise and deleted reference to edible fats of vegetable origin.

SECTION 3 - ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY CRITERIA

Section 3.1 - Raw Materials

84. The Committee had an extensive discussion on Section 3.1.2 which required that raw materials should comply with the requirements of the relevant Codex Standards and where appropriate the Codes of Hygienic Practice. The Committee noted that the second sentence of Section 3.1.3 concerning pasteurization of egg products and Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 were specific provisions which were covered also by the general wording of Section 3.1.2. It was pointed out that the wording of Sections 3.1.3 - 3.1.5 was not compatible with Section 3.1.2 and would have to be amended if the Committee decided to maintain these specific provisions.

85. The Committee discussed at great length whether egg products should always be pasteurized. The Committee noted that such a provision had been included in the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products and in the relevant UN/ECE recommendations. It was also noted that in exceptional cases the use of egg products with added salt was permitted without pasteurization. The Committee agreed that such exceptions could be taken care of by specified deviations.

86. The Committee agreed that there was no need for this specific provision in Section 3.1.3 if appropriate reference to the "Egg Product Code" was made in Section 3.1.2. The Committee agreed to amend Section 3.1.2 as follows: "Raw materials shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Codex Standards and in particular the Codex Standards for Vinegar and for Edible Vegetable Oils and, where appropriate, with the relevant Sections of the Codes of Practice, in particular the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products. Raw Materials shall be stored, treated and handled under suitable conditions so as to maintain their chemical and microbiological characteristics".

87. The second sentence of Section 3.1.3 and Sections 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 were deleted.

Section 3.3 - Compositional Requirements

88. The Committee deleted reference to fats of vegetable origin. The delegation of Switzerland re-iterated its comments made at the previous session of the Committee that vegetable oil should be 75%. Since egg yolk contained approximately 1/3 fat, the total minimum fat was approaching 77% (see also paras. 84-90 of ALINORM 85/19). It was noted that the expression of fat content depended on the method of analysis. The present method determined total fat, but since there was a requirement for the determination of egg yolk, the fat derived from egg yolk could be determined and the amount of vegetable oil could be calculated by subtraction. The Committee decided to leave the provision unchanged.

89. The delegation of Hungary stated that in its country mayonnaise of a lower fat content would be produced for nutritional purposes, that is to lower the fat intake of the population. It therefore proposed to include such types of mayonnaise together with adequate labelling provisions. Several delegations pointed out that such modifications would classify the product in their countries as a dietetic food which was subject to specific regulations concerning distribution and sales.

90. The Committee agreed that the Standard should be restricted to mayonnaise as defined and did not pursue this proposal.

Section 3.4 - Optional Ingredients

91. The Committee noted that Section 3.4.1 could be interpreted as being an open list whereas Sections 3.4.2 - 3.4.11 set forth specific optional ingredients. The Committee decided that the list of optional ingredients should be limited to the provision 3.4.2 to 3.4.11 and that the wording of 3.4.1 should be used as a preamble.

92. Concerning Section 3.4.11 - "Starch, including physically and enzymatically modified starches" several delegations held the view that the provision was not necessary, since only chemically modified starches were used in the production of mayonnaise and these were provided for under Food Additives.

93. The delegation of the Netherlands enquired whether enzyme-treated starches were food additives or food ingredients, since they had been evaluated by JECFA. It was noted that conflicting information on the matter was provided in different documents. The Secretariat was instructed to seek clarification on this point.

94. The Committee deleted Section 3.4.11.

SECTION 4 - FOOD ADDITIVES

95. The Chairman of the Working Group on Food Additives presented the report of the Working Group.

96. The Committee expressed its thanks to the Chairman and the members of the Working Group for their excellent work and decided first to agree on the need for the individual classes of food additives before considering the additives themselves in detail.

97. In the general discussion the Committee recognized that the list of food additives was rather extensive and had been drawn up to cover most of the additives for use in Europe. It was pointed out that in no case would all the additives in the classes listed be used in the same product.

98. The delegation of Sweden expressed concern about the large number of additives and pointed out that some of the additives listed could have adverse reactions even if used in small amounts. She also indicated that the use of additives should be of benefit to the consumer and should be adequately justified. Furthermore, excessive lists of additives were hindering the adoption of Codex Standards.

99. Several delegations agreed with Sweden that the long list of food additives was of concern.

100. The delegation of Poland informed the Committee that its national regulations permitted only a few additives, but the standard would not cause unfavourable implications in Poland and that it was expected that Poland would permit free circulation of products complying with the Codex Standard, except for deviations on food additives.

101. It was agreed to accept at the present time the rationale of the Working Group, that is, to include all additives known to be used in the European Region and to establish a numerical maximum limit for substances which had an ADI.

Section 4.1 - Acidifying Agents

102. Several delegations spoke against the use of acidifying agents or wished at least to limit the number of options. The Observer of CIMSCEE informed the Committee that acidifying agents were used in many countries for organoleptic reasons and to adjust pH of products. Acetic acid was especially efficient as an inhibitor of microbiological growth; however the strong flavour had to be corrected by the use of other food acids.

103. The Committee decided to retain the list as in the Working Group report.

Section 4.2 - Antioxidants

104. The Committee noted that certain antioxidants such as BHA and BHT might be already contained in the vegetable oil used as ingredients. Others, such as ascorbic acid, were more active in the aqueous phase and calcium disodium EDTA was added at the emulsifying stage. It was also noted that the tocopherols were naturally present in most vegetable oils, but that adjustment might have to be made by the manufacturer. Certain delegations stated that in their opinion antioxidants were not needed in the manufacture of mayonnaise.

105. The Committee was informed that the need of antioxidants depended on climatic conditions and on the particular distribution systems in various countries. They were generally used to prevent rancidity and to prolong shelf life.

106. Several delegations were opposed to the use of calcium disodium EDTA, in particular because of its action as a sequestrant which could have a negative effect on physiologically active trace elements. It was noted that many countries permitted the use of calcium disodium EDTA and that JECFA had allocated an ADI to the substance. It was also noted that the additive should not be used for products consumed by small children.

107. The Committee noted that a justification for antioxidants had been provided in CX/EURO 86/6 and that the list would be forwarded to CCFA for endorsement. The views of the CCFA and further comments from Governments on these compounds would be considered at the next session of the Committee.

108. The Committee retained Section 4.2 as proposed by the Working Group.

Section 4.3 - Colours

109. The delegation of Sweden expressed the opinion that tartrazine and Sunset Yellow F.C.S. should be deleted, since they were the cause of adverse reactions.

110. Several delegations felt that colours should not be permitted, since they were deceiving the consumer. It was noted that only small amounts of colours would be used -to make colour adjustments. The delegation of Hungary was opposed to the use of artificial colours. The Committee agreed to retain Section 4.3 as proposed by the Working Group.

Section 4.4 - Emulsifiers

111. The Committee agreed with the view of the Working Group that emulsifiers were not required in the manufacture of mayonnaise and deleted the Section.

112. The delegation of France indicated that an emulsifier might be needed and that France would comment further on the matter. The delegation of Hungary expressed its opposition to the use of emulsifiers.

Section 4.5 - Flavours

113. The Committee noted that the two provisions were generally agreed.

114. Section 4.4.1 was amended to include reference to natural flavouring substances.

Section 4.6 - Flavour Enhancers

115. The Committee considered the note in the Working Group report that flavour enhancers were only necessary in mayonnaise to be used in the manufacture of prepared salads. The Committee agreed that these substances could be added when the salads were prepared and that there was therefore no need to include flavour enhancers in the Standard. The Observer of CIMSCEE pointed out that there might be technical difficulties from the manufacturing point of view and proposed to obtain information on this matter from CIMSCEE members.

Section 4.7 - Preservatives

116. The Committee noted that a specific maximum level for preservatives had been proposed for mayonnaise used in prepared salads. It considered however, that in such cases the amount of preservative could be increased and added at the salad mixing stage.

117. The delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that preservatives were usually already contained in the mayonnaise itself.

118. The Committee decided to retain only a provision for maximum levels applicable to mayonnaise as such.

Section 4.8 - Thickening and Gelling Agents

119. The Committee agreed with the Working Group that the class name for these substances should be "Stabilizers". The maximum level was adjusted to read: "lg/kg singly or in combination" (except for modified starches at 5 g/kg).

120. The Committee accepted a proposal from the delegation of Norway to add potassium alginate and tragacanth to the list at the same level of use. The provision for modified starches was amended to read "chemically modified starch".

121. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland questioned the need for stabilizers and were of the opinion that the justification given in CX/EURO 86/6 was not sufficient.

Section 4.9 - Non-nutritive Sweeteners

122. The Committee agreed to delete this Section, since the products would be used in prepared salads or in certain countries in dietetic foods which were not covered by the Standard.

Section 4.10 - Enzyme Preparation

123. The Committee was informed that enzymes could be classified as additives or as processing aids depending on their action in the product.

124. It was agreed that glucose oxidase should be considered as a food additive, since it continued its technological function in the final product.

Contaminants

125. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Working Group to include maximum levels for Arsenic, Lead, Copper and Iron.

126. It was agreed to place the provisions in square brackets for further Government comments.

127. The Committee agreed that the changes made to the food additives and contaminants section required consequential numbering changes to the Sections (see Appendix III to this report).

SECTION 5 - HYGIENE

128. The Committee was informed that the microbiological criteria in Section 5.2 were identical to the Code of Hygienic Practice for Eggs where appropriate methodology was also given.

129. The Committee was informed that according to the General Principles, microbiological criteria should not be made mandatory in a Standard before having been included in a relevant Code of Practice.

130. The Committee therefore agreed to amend Section 5 as follows:

"5.1 To the extent possible in good manufacturing practice, the product shall be free from objectionable matter.

5.2 When tested by appropriate methods of sampling and examination, the product shall be:

(a) free from microorganisms which may represent a hazard to health;

(b) shall not contain any substances originating from microorganisms in amounts which may represent a hazard to health.

5.3 It is recommended that the products covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene and the Recommended Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products."

SECTION 7 - LABELLING

131. The Secretariat was requested to amend the labelling provision in the Standard following the procedure outlined in the Vinegar Standard. It was noted that the provisions regarding the name of the food required further consideration, since the provisions in the General Labelling Standard were different in principle from the provisions included in this Standard. If necessary, the Secretariat would include options in square brackets.

SECTION 8 - METHODS OF ANALYSIS

132. The Committee received a report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis and expressed its appreciation to the Chairman and the members of the Group for their valuable contributions.

133. The Committee agreed with the proposals made by the Working Group concerning methods for the determinations of Total Fat Content of Egg Yolk. The report of the Working Group is contained in Appendix V to this report.

Status of the Standard

134. The Committee advanced the Draft Standard for Mayonnaise to Step 5 of the Procedure.

135. The amended text is contained in Appendix III to this report and the CIMSCEE document (CX/EURO 86/6) is attached as Annex I.

Method for the Determination of Soluble Solids in Vinegar

136. The Chairman of the Working Group, Prof. Woidich informed the Committee that the Working Group had examined the proposal for a new method submitted by the United Kingdom (see para. 11 of the report of the Working Group on Methods of Analysis in Appendix V).

137. The delegation of Spain stated that it had not been able to evaluate these new proposals and recalled that Spain had been asked at previous sessions to develop appropriate methodology which had been approved by the 14th Session of the Committee.

138. The Committee agreed with the delegation of Spain not to substitute the method at the present time, but to await advice from AOAC. It was further agreed to append the method to the Working Group Report and to request Government comments on it for discussion by CCMAS.

MATTERS RELATED TO THE CODEX EUROPEAN STANDARD FOR NATURAL MINERAL WATERS

Proposed amendment to the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters concerning Provisions on Radio-Activity at Step 6 of the Procedure

139. The Committee had before it the above proposed amendment as contained in Annex 1 to ALINORM 85/19 and comments thereon in CX/EURO 86/8 from Belgium, Egypt, Italy, Thailand and Turkey.

140. The Committee noted that the Commission at its 16th Session had adopted the proposed amendments at Step 5. The Chairman was of the opinion that the two provisions on radio-activity contained in this amendment required further careful consideration and that it was important to develop appropriate methodology.

141. The Committee recalled that the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters already contained provisions from Ra 226 activity and a provision in the contaminant section for total beta activity excluding K_{40} and H_3 . The Committee also recalled that the Working Group on this matter, which had met at the 14th Session of the Committee, had agreed that the provision on radio-activity should be advisory, but that the levels in natural mineral waters would have to be different from those applying to the monitoring of public water supplies. The detailed report of the Working Group is contained in Appendix V to ALINORM 85/19.

142. The representative of WHO outlined the differences between the WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water and the provisions proposed by the Working Group and recommended that they be harmonized.

143. The delegation of Italy felt that the levels of artificial radio-activity (fission and activation products) should be considered in the Section on Contaminants for which methods of analysis and sampling must also be defined. Concerning the limits for radio-activity indicated in the Standard, it was also necessary to define methods of analysis and sampling. He was of the opinion that because of the different sources of the mineral water it was not possible to accept the limits for drinking water in the WHO Guidelines. The last point was supported by several delegations. The delegation of the United Kingdom repeated its view that it saw no real difference between the two types of water and therefore the same limits should be adopted for natural mineral waters as were acceptable for drinking water.

144. The delegation of Switzerland supported by Belgium pointed out that gamma activity from fall-out affected all foodstuffs and that it was necessary to establish general guidelines for this type of activity. Attention was drawn to the document being prepared by WHO (see paras. 179-181) and the Committee agreed that the Guidelines should be sent together with a circular letter to all Codex Contact Points for comments. The Circular Letter would indicate the appropriate deadlines for comments so as not to hinder the development of the Guidelines which were urgently required by national

authorities. With regard to the levels of alpha and beta activity included in the amendments, the Committee noted that the written comments included proposals for different numerical values. The delegations of Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out that the maximum limit of 0.05 Bq/litre for beta activity was extremely low and that the sensitivity of the existing methodology was not sufficient to control such low limits. The Committee agreed that it was at present not in a position to discuss further the proposed amendment.

145. The Committee agreed to request further detailed comments on the amendments as contained in Appendix IV and expressed the hope that an ad hoc Working Group could examine the matter at the next session of the Committee.

Proposal for Amendment of the Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collecting, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters

146. The delegation of Norway, referring to its written comments, proposed to amend Section 3.7 by deleting reference to numerical values for the radius of protection of the extraction area. The delegation of Portugal pointed out that a numerical requirement was controversial because of the wide variation in mineral water sources.

147. The Secretariat pointed out that the Code had only recently been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Committee however agreed in principle to the amendment proposed by the Norwegian delegation and that it should be put before the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene which had been responsible for the elaboration of the Code.

Report by the Representative of GESEM on Methods of Analysis for Natural Mineral Waters

148. The representative of GESEM, Dr. Paul Bordier, presented to the Committee an extensive report of the work undertaken by GESEM concerning the development of appropriate Microbiological and Chemical Methods. Dr. Bordier informed the Committee that the report would be made available in English and French for inclusion in the report of this Committee for comment.

149. He outlined the salient points of the collaborative studies which had been carried out by a number of Working Groups and Laboratories under the guidance of a GESEM Coordinating Committee.

150. The Committee recognized the immense amount of work undertaken on its behalf by GESEM and asked Dr. Bordier to convey its deep appreciation to all concerned.

151. The Committee agreed to request comments on the GESEM report as contained in Appendix VII and to study the document in depth at its next session.

PROGRESS REPORT ON ACCEPTANCE OF CODEX STANDARDS AND MRLS BY COUNTRIES OF THE EUROPEAN REGION

152. The Secretariat gave an updating of the situation regarding the publication of the Codex Alimentarius. Volume I (General), Volume XVI (Milk

Standards) and Volume XVII (Food Contaminants) would be issued shortly to Governments. Volume XVIII (Cereals and Cereal Products) was being prepared. Volumes A to H containing Codes of Practice had also been distributed. A complete list of Volumes published so far is attached as Appendix XII to this report.

153. Regarding the acceptances, the Committee was informed that since the 16th Session of the Commission, notifications had been received from Czechoslovakia, Finland, Norway and Poland. Details of these notifications would be included in the acceptance document.

154. The delegation of Poland informed the Committee that the revision of the national food regulations had been completed. By the end of the year Poland would inform the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission of its position on acceptances of Codex Standards for Fruit and Vegetable Products. Due to the fact that the national food regulations concerning food additives were more restrictive than respective regulations of other countries, Poland would accept the standards for fruit and vegetable products on the basis of "free entry" subject to a specified list of food additives accepted by their Health authorities. It was hoped that Poland's position on acceptances of Codex Standards would be one of the ways which would facilitate international trade without the necessity of making changes in national legislation.

155. It was emphasized that the development of international trade was one of the main aims of the Codex activity and Poland with its realistic position on this subject fully supported this policy.

156. In 1984 at the 14th Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe the Hungarian delegation had given a report concerning the results of a comparative analysis between 96 Codex, CMEA and Hungarian Standards. With this study they wanted to help the harmonization of the prescriptions of the different European food standards, or at least to bring them nearer to each other.

157. A short time after this initiative, a widened comparative analysis was started under the organization and coordination of the CMEA Secretariat involving most of the European member countries. Hungary did not participate in this work by participated in the common work. As further actions were directed, and the results were evaluated by the CMEA Secretariat, Hungary was not authorized to give a report in detail of this study.

158. However, taking into consideration that the previous Hungarian report had aroused great interest at the last session of the Coordinating Committee and the work, as well as its aim, was highly appreciated by the Executive Committee and also the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Hungary considered it right to give some information on the progress of this extended work within the CMEA.

159. The results of the comparative analysis were evaluated by the CMEA Secretariat and discussed in detail by the experts of member countries at a separate meeting. After this discussion the Codex Standards were put into different groups on the basis of their applicability to the standardization within the Standing Committee of the Food Industry of the CMEA, as well as in the national standardization of the member countries. These groups were the following:

Group 1: It was recommended to apply these Codex Standards in the elaboration of CMEA Standards.

Group 2: During the revision of CMEA Standards it was appropriate to examine the possibility of the harmonization of the prescriptions and parameters with Codex Standards.

Group 3: During the revision of CMEA Standards it was not recommended to take into consideration the Codex document, because the CMEA prescriptions were higher compared with those of the Codex (only 1 Standard: Grapefruit juice).

Group 4: The application of these Codex Standards was possible without former discussion and agreement between member countries.

Group 5: On these Codex Standards a further comparative analysis was purposeless, because similar national standards did not exist in the CMEA member countries, and the structure of these documents was not applicable for Hungary.

Group 6: In spite of the fact that there were no existing similar national standards in the member countries, it was recommended to take these Codex Standards into consideration during the elaboration of CMEA standards, therefore, in the case of these standards, the comparative analysis was not yet complete and should be continued.

Group 7: It was necessary to make further comparative studies on the Codex limits of pesticide residues.

160. This information showed that the CMEA member countries, as well as the CMEA Secretariat, considered the harmonization or approach of the different international and national food standards and prescriptions very important, especially the Codex Standards.

161. The above evaluation was followed both in the CMEA and in national standardization on the basis of these groupings. The Codex Standards were taken into consideration either during the elaboration of new standards or during the revision of the existing ones, in this way helping the introduction of more unified and higher quality parameters which could promote the improvement of a higher quality of foodstuffs and also the international food trade.

162. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the delegation of Hungary for the information and expressed its satisfaction with the action by CMEA.

**PILOT STUDY ON ACCEPTANCES OR RELATED NOTIFICATIONS OF POSITION ON CERTAIN
CODEX STANDARDS BY COUNTRIES OF THE CODEX REGION OF EUROPE**

163. The Committee had before it Document CX/EURO 86/12 which had been prepared by a consultant (Dr. G.D. Kapsiotis).

164. The document was introduced by the Secretariat.

165. The Secretariat recalled that the 14th Session of the Committee had decided that a detailed study on the acceptability of three selected Codex Standards should be undertaken as a case study. A circular letter had been issued which requested not only details on the state of acceptances, but also information on impediments Governments might have to accepting the Standards and suggestions on how to improve the situation.

166. The Secretariat reviewed the replies which had been received from Argentina, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. The Secretariat put forward the view of the author that the lack of replies from the EEC countries might be due to reasons given in the reply from the Netherlands which was as follows:

"... it was not possible to respond to the questions contained in the questionnaire. As a member of the EEC, harmonization procedures concerning food legislation do in fact not permit unilateral action by the Netherlands with regard to acceptance of Codex Standards covered or not by EEC Directives. Pending the discussion in Brussels, between FAO and EEC, and the decisions taken by the next meeting of the Codex Committee on General Principles in Paris, in November 1986, we are not in a position to accept Codex Standards."

167. Evaluation of the replies showed that the majority of the replies on acceptance related to free circulation under specified conditions and that more definitive forms of acceptance were less frequent. The major obstacles to acceptance appeared to be that the Standards were too detailed in certain sections and that the provisions for food additives were too extensive and that, in particular, the limits for certain food additives were not acceptable.

168. The Committee noted that measures for the expediting of Codex Standards had been proposed. These included the examination of technical details in specific Standards, greater involvement of consumer interests, better information on the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and increased activities in the elaboration of the Standards.

169. The Committee concluded that the recommendations made in the document should be further considered.

170. The Committee also noted that the Commission itself and the Committee on General Principles were involved in a general discussion on improving the notification of acceptances and the outcome of their discussions would have an influence on the future activities of the Committee related to acceptances. It was pointed out that even if the Committee had commenced its work on the pilot study prior to the Commission's discussion, it was appropriate to postpone further consideration until its next session.

171. The delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that it had not responded to the questionnaire because the United Kingdom was in the process of re-examining its position on all Codex Standards and hoped to report its situation later in the year. Whilst it accepted the importance of the EEC developing a coordinated view on the acceptance of standards, it considered that members states of the EEC were permitted to act unilaterally in this respect where there were no harmonized EEC rules or none were under discussion.

172. The Committee decided to append the recommendation to the report (Appendix IX) and expressed its appreciation to the consultant for an effective analysis of the situation in the European Member countries of the Coordinating Committee.

SURVEY ON COOPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD LEGISLATION

173. The Committee had before it a Working Paper on the above subject (CX/EURO 86/13) prepared by Mrs. B. Blomberg of Sweden.

174. In introducing the paper, the author pointed out that "the purpose of the paper had been to study coordination in Member States between authorities responsible for food control and to examine the role of Codex Contact Points, their resources, involvement in decision-making and working relationships with the National authorities.

175. Replies had been received from a number of countries which had led to the following conclusions:

- The responsibility for food control activities was shared by two or more ministries and better coordination was needed;
- The role of Codex Contact Points varied considerably from country to country. Most of the Contact Points provided information on Codex work and coordinated comments on Standards and Codes;
- If resources so permitted, Codex Contact Points should extend their activities to more meetings with interested parties and should serve as a focal point for all international food safety activities.

176. The Committee thanked the author for the excellent paper and decided that in view of the importance of the subject, the paper should be further discussed at its next session.

177. It agreed to append the paper to the report and to request Governments to give serious consideration to the possibilities of improving the work of the Codex Contact Points.

FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK

178. The Committee decided to place the following items on the agenda for its next session:

- Draft Standard for Mayonnaise
- Amendments to Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters
- Methods of Analysis (GESEM Report)
- Labelling Provisions in European Regional Standards
- Activities of FAO and WHO
- Monitoring of Food Safety Activities in Europe
- Activities of Economic Groups and International Organizations on Standardization
- Acceptances; Codex Standards and MRLs
- Survey on Cooperation and Implementation of Food Legislation - Role of Codex Contact Points.

179. The delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that recently Governments in the region of Europe had taken different actions on radio-active contamination and proposed therefore that an international approach should be considered by developing appropriate Guidelines.

180. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Executive Committee was giving consideration to all aspects of the matter and it was expected that it would provide guidance to other Codex Committees.

181. Referring to the development of the WHO Guidelines on Intervention mentioned earlier (see para. 179), the representative of WHO recognized the usefulness of involving the Codex Contact Point network and indicated that it would be utilized in a pragmatic manner.

182. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany felt that it was useful to prepare a study on the action taken or envisaged by the European countries concerning the use of irradiation processes for foodstuffs. The Committee agreed that an appropriate questionnaire should be sent to Governments.

183. The Observer of the Food Law Association stated that EFLA would be in favour of a paper being prepared within Codex on the practices, processes and possible treatments employed in the production and trade of wines and spirits. The paper should embrace the trade, technical and legislative aspects. It would enable the Coordinating Committee to consider whether any proposals should be made to the Commission concerning any future work which might seem appropriate in accordance with the Commission's work priority criteria and views of members. EFLA would be willing to assist the Secretariat concerning the legislative and other relevant aspects of the paper. This proposal was also in line with the opinion expressed by the representative of the WHO Regional Office for Europe concerning the need for the Committee to consider undertaking work on wines. The Committee concurred with this proposal and requested the Secretariat to take action.

NOMINATION OF COORDINATOR

184. The Committee had before it a Conference Room Document No. 1 entitled "Nomination of Coordinator". The document set forth Rule II.4 of the Codex Alimentarius Commission which governed the appointment of a Coordinator.

185. The Committee noted that the present Coordinator for Europe, Mr. Pierre Rossier, had been re-elected to a second term by the Commission to serve as the Coordinator from the end of the 16th to the end of the 17th Session of the Commission.

186. The Committee was informed that the Government of Switzerland would be prepared to continue hosting the Coordinating Committee for Europe, provided that the term of the Coordinator could be extended up to the end of the 18th Session of the Commission.

187. It was pointed out that under the rules one term could be constituted by the three periods up to the third succeeding regular session of the Commission. The Committee unanimously agreed to the extension of Mr. Rossier's second term of office and requested the Commission to reconsider its

decision taken at the 16th Session and to extend Mr. Rossier's term of office until the end of the 18th Session of the Commission.

188. It was recognized that such a decision would require the advice of FAO Legal Counsel.

189. Should this solution not be possible, the Committee agreed that Professor H. Woidich of Austria should be proposed for nomination as Coordinator to serve for the same period of time.

190. The delegation of Austria stated that the Austrian Government was prepared to host the next session of the Committee.

191. The Committee expressed its warm appreciation to the two officers concerned and to their respective Governments.

OTHER BUSINESS

192. None.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

193. The Committee was informed that following the Commission's decision on the appointment of the Coordinator and consultation between the Secretariat and Coordinator, the date and place of the 16th Session of the Committee could be communicated in due course.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman of the Session:

Mr. Pierre Rossier
Chef de la Section Codex
Office fédéral de la santé publique
Division du contrôle des denrées alimentaires
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3001 Berne

DELEGATES

DELEGUES

DELEGADOS

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE

Dr. Wilfried Steiger
Federal Ministry of Health
and Environmental Protection
Radetzkystrasse 2
A-1030 Wien

Dr. Heinrich Neukirchen
Fachverband der Nahrungs-und
Genussmittelindustrie
Osterreichs
Zaunergasse 1-3
A-1037 Wien

Dr. Richard Wildner
Generalsekretär
Regierungsgebäude
Stubenring 1
A-1030 Wien

Prof. Dr. Herbert Woidich
Lebensmittelversuchsanstalt
Blaasstrasse 29
A-1190 Wien

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

Mr. Charles Cremer
Inspection des denrées alimentaires
Ministère de la santé publique
Cité administrative de l'Etat
Quartier Vésale
B-1010 Bruxelles

BELGIUM (Cont.)

Mr. Marcel Meyers
Premier Adjoint Technique
Ministère des Affaires Economiques
Rue du Commerce 44
1040 Bruxelles

Mr. Jacques Burton
Directeur Qualité
Chaudfontaine Monopole
Rue du Cristal
Chaudfontaine

FRANCE
FRANCIA

Mr. Jean-Yves Martin
Direction général de la concurrence,
de la consommation et de la répression
des fraudes
13, rue Saint-Georges
F-75009 Paris

Ms. Michèle Stervinou
Direction général de la santé
Ministère de la santé
1, Place de Fontenoy
F-75700 Paris

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

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

Dr. Wilhelm Schneider
Institut Fresenius
Im Maisel 14
D-6204 Tanusstein 4

Ms. Elisabeth Tegge
Regierungsdirektorin
Bundesministerium für Ernährung
Landwirtschaft und Forsten
Rochusstrasse 1
D-5300 Bonn 1

Mr. Michael Welsch
Geschäftsführer
Bund für Lebensmittelrecht und
Lebensmittelkunde
Godesberger Allee 157
D-5300 Bonn 2

HUNGARY
HONGRIE
HUNGRIA

Mr. Istvan Oláh
Head of Department
Secretary for the Hungarian
National Committee of Codex
Hungarian Office of Standardization
Ullői út 25
Budapest IX

ICELAND
ISLANDE
ISLANDIA

Mr. G. Hannesson
Director Laboratory
National Center for Hygiene, Food
Control and Environmental Production
P.O. Box 5276
Is-125 Reykjavik

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

Mr. Brendan Shanahan
Dept. of Industry and Commerce
Kildare Street
Dublin

ISRAEL

Mr. Daniel Reichman
Director
Food Control Administration
Ministry of Health
12 Haarba Street
Tel Aviv

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

Dr. Generoso Paolo Santaroni
Ricercatore
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Ardeatina 546
I-00100 Roma

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

Dr. Pieter H. Berben
Chief, Health Inspection
Ministry of Welfare, Health and
Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 439
Leidschendam

Dr. Jan J.L. Mees
Commission for the Dutch Food and
Agricultural Industry
Unilever N.V.
P.O. Box 760
NL-3000 DK Rotterdam

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

Mr. John A. Race
Food Inspection Board/Codex Alimentarius
P.O. Box 8139 Dep.
N-0033 Oslo 1

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

Mr. Andrzej Pszczolkowski
Deputy Chief of Section
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Quality Inspection Office
Zurawia 32/34 Str.
00-950 Warszawa

PORTUGAL

Mr. Antonio Martins Nunes
Directeur
Serviços de Aguas Minerais
Rua Diogo do Couto, 1-1^o
1100 Lisboa

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

Dr. Tovar Hernandez, Fernando
Secretario General
Comisión Interministerial
Ordenación Alimentaria
Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo
Paseo del Prado, 18-20
Madrid 14

Dr. Pedro García Gonzalez
Subdirector General de Información
del Mercado
Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo
Paseo del Prado 18-20
Madrid 14

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

Ms. Barbro Blomberg
Head of International Secretariat
Swedish National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

Dr. Yves Siegwart
Chef de Division
Office fédéral de la santé publique
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3001 Berne

Dr. Fritz von Beust
Nestec S.A.
CH-1800 Vevey

Mr. Olivier Bindschedler
Nestec S.A.
CH-1800 Vevey

Ms. Irina du Bois
Nestec S.A.
CH-1800 Vevey

Dr. Hans Illi
Office fédéral de la santé publique
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3001 Berne

Mr. Max Salvisberg
Thomi et Franck AG
Horbургstrasse 105
CH-4057 Basel

TURKEY
TURQUIE
TURQUIA

Ms. Reyhan Atmaca
Assistant Commercial Counsellor
Turkish Embassy
Lombachweg 33
CH-3006 Berne

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

Mr. Charles Cockbill
Head of Standards Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1 2AE

Dr. Richard Burt
Principal Scientific Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1 2AE

Mr. Edward Dyer
Technical Manager
CPC Limited
Paisley
Scotland

Mr. Edmund William Kingcott
Department of Health & Social Security
Alexander Fleming House
Elephant and Castle
London SE1 6BY

YUGOSLAVIA
YUGOSLAVIE

Prof. Dr. Ing. Vojko Ozim
University of Maribor VTS
Smetanova 17
62000 Maribor

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

ASSOCIATION FRANÇAISE DE NORMALISATION
(AFNOR)

Mme. Marie-Christine Héloire
AFNOR
Tour Europe, Cedex 7
92080 Paris La Défense
France

COMITE DES INDUSTRIES DES MAYONNAISES ET
SAUCES CONDIMENTAIRES DE LA CEE (CIMSCEE)

Mr. Michael Coenen
Secrétaire Général
Av. de Cortenburgh, 172
1040 Bruxelles
Belgium

Mr. Victor Staniforth
Chairman
Technical Committee
Av. de Cortenburgh, 172
1040 Bruxelles
Belgium

CONFEDERATION EUROPEEN DU COMMERCE DE DETAIL
(CECD)

Mr. Aad Van Ewijk
President
Food Law Committee
Avenue de la Joyeuse Entrée 11
Bruxelles
Belgium

CONFEDERATION DES INDUSTRIES AGRO-
ALIMENTAIRES DE LA CEE (CIAA)

Mr. Philippe Mouton
Directeur
CIAA
Rue de Loxum 6
B-1000 Bruxelles
Belgium

COMITE PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL DU VINAIGRE
(CPIV)

Dr. Hans-Joachim Mürau
Secrétaire Général
Comité International du Vinaigre
Reuterstrasse 151
D-5300 Bonn 1
West Germany

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Dr. Gilbert Vos
Administrateur Principal
DG III/A/2
EEC Commission
200, Rue de la Loi
B-1049 Bruxelles
Belgium

EUROPEAN FOOD LAW ASSOCIATION (EFLA)

Mr. G.O. Kermode
EFLA
3, Boulevard de la Clambre
B-1050 Bruxelles
Belgium

GRUPEMENT EUROPEEN DES SOURCES
D'EAUX MINERALES (GESEM)

Mr. Paul Bordier
Président de la Chambre Syndicale
des Eaux Minérales
10, rue Clément Marot
F-75008 Paris
France

Ms. Françoise Debuchy
Directeur de la Qualité
Société générale des eaux
minérales de Vittel
88800 Vittel
France

Ms. Denise Pepin
Professeur
Université Clermont-Ferant
Rue PP. H. Dunan
63001 Clermont-Ferant
France

Mr. Ronald Verbruggen
Directeur
Institut Henrijean
Rue Gervais 4
B-4880 Spa
France

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF GLUCOSE
INDUSTRIES (IFG)

Mr. Ernst G. Rapp
Director
CTC Europe
Ernest Claeslaan 4
B-1980 Tervuren
Belgium

CHAIRMAN OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS
COMMISSION

Mr. Eddie F. Kimbrell
Deputy Administrator
Agricultural Marketing Service
United States Department of
Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT

Mr. J.M. Hutchinson
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
I-00100 Roma

Ms. Barbara Dix
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
I-00100 Roma

Ms. Maria Lourdes Costarrica
Nutrition Officer
Food Quality and Consumer Protection Group
Food Quality and Standards Service
FAO
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
I-00100 Roma

Ms. Laura Constable
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
I-00100 Roma

Mr. J. Ian Waddington
Director
Environmental Health Service
WHO Regional Office for Europe
8, Scherfigvej
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø

Mr. R.F. Davies
Scientist
Food Safety Programme
World Health Organization
Av. Appia
CH-1211 Geneva 27

FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT (Cont.)

Mr. D. Sporn
Director
Evaluation and Analysis Staff
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
HFP-10, Fishers Lane
Rockville, Md. 20857

SWISS SECRETARIAT

Ms. Helène Griessen
Codex Alimentarius
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3001 Berne

DRAFT EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD FOR VINEGAR
(Advanced to Step 8)

1. SCOPE

This standard applies to products as defined in Section 2.1 below.

2. DESCRIPTION

2.1 Product Definition

2.1.1 Vinegar is a liquid, fit for human consumption, produced exclusively from suitable products containing starch or sugars or starch and sugars by the process of double fermentation, alcoholic and acetous, as further defined in Sections 2.1.1.1 to 2.1.1.8. Vinegar contains a specified amount of acetic acid. Vinegar may contain optional ingredients in accordance with Section 3.2.

2.1.1.1 Wine vinegar is a vinegar obtained from wine by acetous fermentation, except that the maximum level for volatile acids in the raw materials may be exceeded.

2.1.1.2 Fruit (wine) vinegar, Berry (wine) vinegar, Cider vinegar are vinegars obtained by acetous fermentation from wine of fruit or wine of berries or cider, except that the maximum level for volatile acids in the raw materials may be exceeded. The products may also be obtained from fruit by the process defined in Section 2.1.1.

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

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

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

2.1.1.6 Distilled malt vinegar is a vinegar produced by the distillation of malt vinegar, as defined in Section 2.1.1.5 above, under reduced pressure. It contains only the volatile constituents of the malt vinegar from which it is derived.

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

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

3. ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY CRITERIA

3.1 Raw Materials

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

(ii) Wine of grapes, fruit or berries, cider.

(iii) Distilled alcohol of agricultural origin.

(iv) Distilled alcohol of silvicultural origin.

3.2 Optional Ingredients

The following ingredients may be added to vinegar in amounts necessary to impart a distinctive flavour.

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

3.2.2 Whey.

3.2.3 Fruit juices or their equivalent of concentrated fruit juices.

3.2.4 Sugars as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

3.2.5 Honey as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

3.2.6 Food grade salt as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

3.3 Total Acid Content

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

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

3.3.3 All vinegars: not more than the amount detainable through the use of biological fermentation.

3.4 Residual Alcohol Content

Residual alcohol: not more than 05% v/v, except for 1% v/v in wine vinegar.

3.5 Soluble Solids

The soluble solids content, exclusive of added sugars or salt, of:

(i) Vinegars defined in Section 2.1.1.1 shall not be less than 1.3 grammes per 1000 ml per 1% acetic acid, and of

(ii) Vinegars defined in Section 2.1.1.2 shall not be less than 2.0 grammes per 1000 ml per 1% acetic acid.

4. FOOD ADDITIVES

	<u>Maximum Level</u>
4.1 Sulphur dioxide	70 mg/kg
4.2 L-ascorbic acid (as antioxidant)	400 mg/kg
4.3 Caramel colour (plain)	GMP
4.4 Caramel colour (ammonium sulphite process)	1 g/kg
4.5 Caramel colour (ammonia process) (For malt vinegar only)	1 g/kg

4.6 Flavours

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

4.7 Flavour Enhancers

4.7.1 * Monosodium, monopotassium and calcium glutamate 5g/kg
(Except for wine vinegar according to section 2.1.1.1)

* Subject to endorsement by CCFA.

4.8 Carry-Over Principle

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

4.9 Processing Aids

4.9.1 Nutrients for Acetobacter (such as yeast extracts and autolysates and amino-acids) and nutrient salts.

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

5. CONTAMINANTS

	<u>Maximum Levels</u>
5.1 Arsenic (As)	1 mg/kg
5.2 Lead (Pb)	1 mg/kg
5.3 Sum of Copper (Cu) and Zinc (Zn)	10 mg/kg
5.4 Iron (Fe)	10 mg/kg

6. HYGIENE

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

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

(a) shall be free from micro-organisms capable of development under normal conditions of storage in amounts which represent a hazard to health;

(b) shall not contain vinegar eels or substantial quantities of other suspended matters and sediments; and shall be free from turbidity caused by micro-organisms (mother of vinegar);

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

7. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

7.1 Fill of Container

7.1.1 Minimum Fill

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

8. LABELLING

In addition to Sections 2, 3, 7 and 8 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-Packaged Foods* (Ref. No. CODEX STAN 1-1985) the following provisions apply:

8.1 The Name of the Food

8.1.1 A product manufactured from only one raw material shall be denominated "x vinegar" where "x" is the name of the raw material used.

8.1.2 A product manufactured from more than one raw material shall be denominated "y vinegar" where "y" constitutes a complete list of the raw materials used in descending order of proportion.

* Thereafter referred to as General Standard.

8.1.3 The content of total acid shall be declared in close proximity to the name of the food by the term "x%" where "x" is the minimum total acid content in g/100 ml, calculated as acetic acid to the nearest whole number.

8.1.4 Where an ingredient has been added in accordance with sub-sections 3.2 and/or 4.6 which imparts to the food the distinctive flavour of the ingredient or ingredients the name shall be accompanied by an appropriate descriptive term.

8.2 List of Ingredients

A complete list of ingredients shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.2 of the General Standard.

8.3 Net Contents

The net contents shall be declared in volume in accordance with Section 4.3 of the General Standard.

8.4 Name and Address

The name and address shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.4 of the General Standard.

8.5 Country of Origin

The country of origin of the food shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.5 of the General Standard.

8.6 Lot Identification

Lot Identification shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.6 of the General Standard.

8.7 Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients

Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients shall be done in accordance with Section 5.1 of the General Standard.

8.8 Exemptions from Mandatory Labelling Requirements

Exemptions from Mandatory Labelling Requirements shall be in accordance with Section 6.1 of the General Standard as applicable.

8.9 Labelling of Non-Retail Containers

In addition to Sections 2 and 3 of the General Standard, the following specific provisions apply to the labelling of non-retail containers as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Committee (page of the 6th Edition of the Procedural Manual):

Information on Sections 8.1 to 8.7 shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the food, lot identification and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer shall appear on the container.

However, lot identification and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer 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

9.1 Determination of Total Acid Content (Expressed as CH₃COOH) (Type II)

According to AOAC method (direct titration) (Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC), 1980, XIIIth Edition, 30.071.

9.2 Determination of Residual Alcohol Content

According to

9.2.1 AOAC method (Specific gravity by pycnometer) (Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC, 1980, XIII Ed., 9.012-9.013, Type II).

9.2.2 OIV Method, Recueil des méthodes internationales d'analyses du vin, 1969, A-2-16, Type III.

9.3 Determination of Soluble Solids (Type I)

According to AOAC (Evaporation on water bath) (Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC, 1978, XI Ed., 30.051, Type I).

9.4 Determination of Sulphur Dioxide (Type II)

According to OIV method (iodometric titration), Recueil des méthodes internationales d'analyses du vin, 1969, A-17, Type II.

9.5 Determination of Arsenic (Type II)

According to AOAC colorimetric (Silver diethyl dithiocarbamate) method Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC, 1980, XIIIth Ed., 25.012-25.013, Type II).

9.6 Determination of Lead (Type II)

According to AOAC method (Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC, 1980, XIIIth Ed., 25.061-25.067, Type II).

9.7 Determination of Copper (Type II)

According to AOAC atomic absorption method (Official Methods of Analysis of the AOAC, 1980, XIIIth Ed., 25.044-25.048, Type II).

9.8 Determination of Zinc (Type II)

According to AOAC atomic absorption method (Official Method of Analysis of the AOAC, 1980, XIIIth Ed., 25.150-25.153, Type II).

9.9 Determination of Iron (Type II)

According to the IFJU method No. 15, 1964, Determination of Iron (photometric method). The determination shall be made after dry ashing as described in Section 5 - Remark (b). Results are expressed as mg iron/kg, Type II.

PROPOSED DRAFT EUROPEAN REGIONAL STANDARD
FOR MAYONNAISE AT STEP 5

1. SCOPE

This standard applies to mayonnaise, as defined in Section 2 below.

2. DESCRIPTION

Mayonnaise is a condiment sauce obtained by emulsifying edible vegetable oil(s) in an aqueous phase consisting of vinegar, the oil-in-water emulsion being produced by the hen's egg yolk. Mayonnaise may contain optional ingredients in accordance with Section 3.3.

3. ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY CRITERIA

3.1 Raw Materials

3.1.1 All ingredients shall be of sound quality and fit for human consumption. Water shall be of potable quality.

3.1.2 Raw Materials shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Codex Standards and in particular the Codex Standard for Vinegar and Edible Vegetable Oils and, where appropriate, with the relevant Sections of the Codes of Practice, in particular the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products. Raw Materials shall be stored, treated and handled under suitable conditions so as to maintain their chemical and microbiological characteristics.

3.1.3 Eggs and egg products shall be hens' eggs or hens' egg products.

3.2 Compositional Requirements

The minimum content of vegetable oil(s) shall be 77% and the technically pure egg yolk* content 6%, related to the total product.

3.3 Optional Ingredients

Food ingredients intended to influence significantly and in the desired fashion the physical and organoleptic characteristics of the product:

- 3.3.1 - hens' egg white
- 3.3.2 - hens' egg products
- 3.3.3 - sugars
- 3.3.4 - food grade salt
- 3.3.5 - condiments, spices, herbs
- 3.3.6 - fruits and vegetables including fruit juice and vegetable juice
- 3.3.7 - mustard
- 3.3.8 - dairy products
- 3.3.9 - water

* Technically pure means that 20% of albumen is tolerated related to the egg yolk.

4. FOOD ADDITIVES (Subject to endorsement by CCFA)

4.1 Acidifying Agents

Maximum Level

- 4.1.1 Acetic Acid)
- 4.1.2 Citric Acid)
- 4.1.3 Lactic Acid) Limited by GMP
- 4.1.4 Malic Acid)
- 4.1.5 Tartaric Acid) 5g/kg

4.2 Antioxidants

- 4.2.1 Alpha-tocopherol and mixed concentrates of tocopherols Limited by GMP
- 4.2.2 Ascorbic Acid 500mg/kg
- 4.2.3 Butylated hydroxyanisole 160mg/kg
- 4.2.4 Butylated hydroxytoluene 160mg/kg
- 4.2.5 Calcium disodium EDTA 75mg/kg

4.3 Colours

- 4.3.1 Curcumin.)
- 4.3.2 Tartrazine) 100mg/kg singly or in
- 4.3.3 Sunset Yellow F.C.F.) combination in all
- 4.3.4 Beta-carotene) types of mayonnaise
- 4.3.5 Beta-Apo-carotenal)
- 4.3.6 Beta-Apo-8' - carotenoic acid
- 4.3.7 Annatto extracts)
- 4.3.8 Chlorophyll) 500mg/kg in mayonnaise
- 4.3.9 Caramel (ammonia type) with herbs
- 4.3.10 Beet red 500mg/kg in mayonnaise
- with mustard
- 500mg/kg in mayonnaise
- with tomato

4.4 Flavours

- 4.4.1 Natural or nature identical flavouring substances) Limited by GMP
- as defined for the purpose of the Codex)
- Alimentarius Commission)
- 4.4.2 Artificial flavouring substances as defined) Limited by GMP
- for the purpose of the Codex Alimentarius Commission)

4.5 Preservatives

- 4.5.1 Benzoic acid and sodium and potassium salts) 1g/kg singly or in a
-) combination
- 4.5.2 Sorbic acid and potassium salt)

Maximum Level

4.6 Stabilizers

4.6.1	Carrageenan)	
4.6.2	Sodium alginate)	1g/kg
4.6.3	Potassium alginate)	
4.6.4	Propylene glycol alginate)	
4.6.5	Locust bean gum (carob gum))	
4.6.6	Guar gum)	
4.6.7	Sodium carboxy methyl cellulose)	
4.6.8	Xanthan gum)	
4.6.9	Tragacanth)	
4.6.10	Microcrystalline cellulose)	
4.6.11	Chemically Modified Starches)	5g/kg

4.7 Enzyme Preparation

4.7.1. Glucose oxidase (Aspergillus niger var.) Limited by GMP

5. CONTAMINANTS (Subject to endorsement by CCFA)

5.1	Arsenic (As)	0.3mg/kg
5.2	Lead (Pb)	0.3mg/kg
5.3	Copper (Cu)	2.0mg/kg
5.4	Iron (Fe)	5.0mg/kg

6. HYGIENE (Subject to endorsement by CCFA)

6.1 To the extent possible in good manufacturing practice, the product shall be free from objectionable matter.

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

- (a) free from microorganisms which may represent a hazard to health;
- (b) Shall not contain any substances originating from microorganisms in amounts which may represent a hazard to health.

6.3 It is recommended that the products covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the Recommended Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene and the Recommended Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products.

7. PACKAGING

The product shall be packed in containers which ensure the hygienic quality and the other qualities of the food.

8. LABELLING

In addition to the provisions of Sections 2, 3, 7 and 8 of the General Standard on Labelling of Pre-packaged Food (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

8.1 The Name of the Food

The name of the food to be declared on the label shall be "mayonnaise".

or

8.1.1 Products complying with provisions of this Standard shall be designated "mayonnaise".

8.1.2 The name "mayonnaise" may or shall be accompanied by an appropriate term to indicate its specific flavour or characteristic, e.g. tomato mayonnaise, mustard mayonnaise in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3.2 and 3.4.

8.2 List of Ingredients

8.2.1 A complete list of ingredients shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.2 of the General Standard.

8.3 Net Contents

8.3.1 The net contents shall be declared in volume in accordance with Section 4.3 of the General Standard.

8.4 Name and Address

8.4.1 The name and address shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.4 of the General Standard.

8.5 Country of Origin

8.5.1 The country of origin of the food shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.5 of the General Standard.

8.6 Lot Identification

Lot Identification shall be declared in accordance with Section 4.6 of the General Standard.

8.7 Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients

Quantitative Labelling of Ingredients shall be done in accordance with Section 5.1 of the General Standard.

8.8 Exemptions from Mandatory Labelling Requirements

Exemptions from Mandatory Labelling Requirements shall be in accordance with Section 6.1 of the General Standard as applicable.

8.9 Labelling of Non-Retail Containers

In addition to Sections 2 and 3 of the General Standard, the following specific provisions apply to the labelling of non-retail containers as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (page 123 of the 6th Edition of the Procedural Manual).

Information on Sections 8.1 to 8.7 shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the food, lot identification and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer shall appear on the container.

However, lot identification and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer 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

9.1 Sampling

(To be elaborated).

9.2 Determination of Total Fat

According to
Method 1/20 of the Bundesverband der Deutscher Feinkostindustrie
(endorsed by CIMSCEE)
(Type II)

9.3 Determination of Egg Yolk

According to the
Quinoline Molybdate Method of the Benelux
(Type I)
Calculation be be made according to the Amtliche Untersuchungsverfahren
nach, para. 35 LMBG of May 1980

ALINORM 87/19
APPENDIX IV

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE CODEX STANDARD
FOR MINERAL WATERS (At Step 5)

3.2 Limit for Certain Substances

3.2.16 Ra226 Activity

The Ra²²⁶ activity should not exceed 1 Bq/l.

4. CONTAMINANTS

4.2 Beta-Activity

Total beta-activity (exclusive of K⁴⁰ and H³) should not exceed 0.05 Bq/l.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS FOR MAYONNAISE
AND SOLUBLE SOLIDS IN VINEGAR

1. The Working Group consisted of delegates from the following countries and representatives of international organizations:

Austria:	H. Woidich (Chairman)
Switzerland:	M. Salvisberg
United Kingdom:	R. Burt
	E. Dyer
CIMSCEE:	V. Staniforth
	H. Coenen

2. The Group examined proposals laid down in document CX/EURO 86/6 concerning methods for the determination of total fat (in mayonnaise) and for the determination of egg yolk in mayonnaise. In this connection document CX/EURO 86/5 Appendix I - Proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise at Step 3, par. 3.3 was discussed.

3. The Ad Hoc Working Group had been asked to consider a new method for the determination of soluble solids in vinegar to replace the endorsed Codex method for that purpose. (CRD submitted by the United Kingdom.)

4. The Ad Hoc Working Group proposed the method for the determination of total fat in mayonnaise as laid down on p.18-20 in Annex I of document CX/EURO 86/6. This method should be endorsed as Type II Codex method.

5. The results of the examinations will be expressed as % total fat in the mayonnaise including fat derived from the egg yolk.

The proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise at Step 3 contains in Section 3.3 provisions for a minimum content of vegetable oils only, exclusive of egg fat.

In calculating the vegetable oil content, it is necessary to subtract the value of the egg fat from the estimated total fat content. One third of the egg yolk will be acceptable to be fat.

6. Determination of Egg Yolk

The Ad Hoc Working Group discussed the results of a collaborative study organized to compare 3 different methods for the determination of lecithin P₂₀⁵. The methods and the results of the collaborative study are published in document CX/EURO 86/6 p. 12-17 and p. 21-29.

7. The Ad Hoc Working Group agreed to recommend the Quinoline Molybdate Method as laid down in Annex III of CX/EURO 86/6 p. 28 and 29 with one deviation. The factor for the calculation of pure egg yolk from the estimated lecithin P_2O_5 will be $102 \pm 10\%$ rel. according to "Amtliche Untersuchungsverfahren nach Par. 35 LMBG Mai 1980" of the Federal Republic of Germany.

8. The variation of the factor is necessary due to the different lecithin content of eggs. This method will be proposed as Type I Codex method.

9. The Proposed Draft European Regional Standard of Mayonnaise fixed the egg content to 6% expressed as technically pure egg yolk. Technically pure means in this case that 20% of albumen is tolerated. The Ad Hoc Working Group is of the opinion that a figure of 15% is sufficient for the technically not avoidable amount of egg white in egg yolk.

10. CIMSCEE will be so kind and will prepare a document concerning other methods of analysis, which will be of interest in connection with the Proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise.

11. Determination of Soluble Solids in Sugar

The delegation of the United Kingdom had prepared a paper concerning results of a collaborative trial on the determination of soluble solids in vinegar. The present method (AOAC) uses only a single drying step which may result in the occlusion of acetic acid in the residue. Therefore a new method was tested using a three-stage drying process.

The present method should be replaced by the new method (see Appendix I). This method will also be considered by the AOAC for the first action approval in September 1986. If adopted, as seems probable, it would replace the present AOAC method.

APPENDIX VIREPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP OF EXPERTS ON FOOD ADDITIVES IN MAYONNAISE

1. The following members constituted the Ad Hoc Working Group:

Austria:	H. Woldich
Belgium:	M. Meyers
Hungary:	I. Oláh
Switzerland:	M. Salvisberg
United Kingdom:	R. Burt (Chairman)
	E. Dyer
CIMSCEE:	M. Coenen
	V. Staniforth

2. The Ad Hoc Working Group was asked to consider the technological justification for the use of food additives in mayonnaise. It also considered the maximum levels of contaminants which should be permitted in mayonnaise.
3. The Ad Hoc Working Group used as a basis for its discussions the document prepared by CIMSCEE (CX/EURO 86/6) on the proposed Draft European Regional Standard for Mayonnaise at Step 3 (CX/EURO 86/5). Government comments as given in CX/EURO 86/7 were also considered.
4. The Ad Hoc Working Group recognised that the scope of the proposed Draft Standard had not been agreed. It considered that mayonnaise for sale by retail was the major product but that mayonnaise produced for the use in manufacture of prepared salads might require the use of higher levels of some food additives or the use of additional food additives.
5. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered solely the technological need for the food additives as described in the CIMSCEE paper (CX/EURO 86/6). It agreed in addition that only additives currently being used in the manufacture of mayonnaise should be permitted. The Ad Hoc Working Group also agreed that while certain food additives might not be permitted in all countries, this should not prevent the additives being listed. For example, Switzerland did not permit any additives in mayonnaise.
6. The Ad Hoc Working Group noted that the maximum consumption of mayonnaise was very unlikely to exceed 50g/day/person and that the maximum permitted levels of the food additives listed would not contribute more than 1/6 of the ADI of the additives listed in the FAO/WHO Food Additives data system 30/Rev.1.
7. The Ad Hoc Working Group considered documents CX/EURO 86/5, CX/EURO 86/6 and CX/EURO 86/7 and recommended, despite restriction by the delegate of Switzerland, that the following food additives should be permitted in mayonnaise.

	<u>Additive</u>	<u>Maximum Level</u>
4.1	<u>Acidifying Agents</u>	
4.1.1	Acetic Acid)	
4.1.2	Citric Acid)	Limited by GMP
4.1.3	Lactic Acid)	
4.1.4	Malic Acid)	
4.1.5	Tartaric Acid	5g/kg

Note: Only the acids should be permitted and not the salts.]

4.2	<u>Antioxidants</u>	
4.2.1	Alpha-tocopherol and mixed concentrates of tocopherols	Limited by GMP
4.2.2	Ascorbic acid	500mg/kg
4.2.3	Butylated hydroxyanisole)	160mg/kg
4.2.4	Butylated hydroxytoluene)	
4.2.5	Calcium disodium EDTA	75mg/kg

Note: Tocopherols are naturally present in most vegetable oils at levels which exert an antioxidant effect but additional quantities might be added to ensure adequate stability in some products.]

4.3	<u>Colours</u>	
4.3.1	Curcumin)	
4.3.2	Tartrazine)	100mg/kg singly or
4.3.3	Sunset yellow F.C.F.)	in combination in
4.3.4	Beta-carotene)	all types of
4.3.5	Beta-Apo-carotenal)	mayonnaise
4.3.6	Beta-Apo-8' - carotenoic acid)	" "
4.3.7	Annatto extracts)	" "
4.3.8	Chlorophyll	500mg/kg in mayonnaise with herbs
4.3.9	Caramel (ammonia type)	500mg/kg in mayonnaise with mustard
4.3.10	Beet red	500mg/kg in mayonnaise with tomato

4.5	<u>Flavours</u>	
4.5.1	Nature identical flavouring substances) as defined for the purpose of the) Codex Alimentarius Commission)	Limited by GMP
4.5.2	Artificial flavouring substances as) defined for the purpose of the Codex) Alimentarius Commission)	Limited by GMP

4.6 Flavour Enhancers

- | | | |
|-------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4.6.1 | Monosodium glutamate | 5g/kg expressed as glutamic acid |
| 4.6.2 | Sodium inosinate | 0.5g/kg expressed as the acid |
| 4.6.3 | Sodium guanylate | 0.5g/kg expressed as the acid |

[Note: Flavour enhancers are only necessary in mayonnaise to be used in manufacture of prepared salads.]

4.7 Flavours

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| 4.7.1 | Benzoic acid and sodium and potassium salts) | 1g/kg singly or in a combination or |
| |) | |
| 4.7.2 | Sorbic acid and potassium salt) | 2g/kg only in mayonnaise to be used in the manufacture of prepared salads |

4.8 Stabilizers

- | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|---|-------|
| 4.8.1 | Carrageenan |) | |
| 4.8.2 | Sodium alginate |) | |
| 4.8.3 | Propylene glycol alginate |) | 1g/kg |
| 4.8.4 | Locust bean gum (carob gum) |) | |
| 4.8.5 | Guar gum |) | |
| 4.8.6 | Sodium carboxy methyl cellulose |) | |
| 4.8.7 | Xanthan gum |) | |
| 4.8.8 | Microcrystalline cellulose |) | |
| 4.8.9 | Modified starches |) | 5g/kg |

[Note: The Ad Hoc Working Group accepted the term "Stabilizer" was to be preferred.]

4.9 Non-nutritive Sweeteners

- | | | |
|-------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4.9.1 | Sodium saccharin | 250mg/kg) only in mayonnaise |
| | |) used for the |
| 4.9.2 | Aspartame | 150mg/kg) manufacture of |
| | |) prepared salads |

4.10 Enzyme Preparation

- | | | |
|--------|--|----------------|
| 4.10.1 | Glucose oxidase (<u>Aspergillus niger</u> var.) | Limited by GMP |
|--------|--|----------------|

8. The Ad Hoc Working Group agreed that emulsifiers are not required in the manufacture of mayonnaise and Section 4.4 in the Proposed Draft Standard should be deleted.

9. The Ad Hoc Working Group agreed that the maximum level of contaminants should be specified in a new section as follows:

Maximum Level

5.1	Arsenic	(As)	0.3mg/kg
5.2	Lead	(Pb)	0.3mg/kg
5.3	Copper	(Cu)	2.0mg/kg
5.4	Iron	(Fe)	5.0mg/kg

GESEM METHODS

This Appendix will be issued separately at a later date.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF WHO AND FAO COMPLEMENTARY
TO THE WORK OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
(Presented by Representatives of FAO and WHO)

A. REPORT OF JOINT FAO/WHO ACTIVITIES

1. Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

The evaluation and recommendations of the JMPR provide much of the technical basis for the work of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Since 1961, there have been 25 meetings of the JMPR, the most recent having been held in Geneva in 1985.

At its most recent session the JMPR evaluated or reevaluated some 50 agricultural pesticides and established Acceptable Daily Intakes and Maximum Residue Levels for several of them. The JMPR also discussed questions relating to the potential carcinogenicity of pesticide chemicals and ways of testing them in order to protect the health of consumers. The use of fumigants in grain protection was also discussed.

The official report of the meeting will be issued in the FAO Plant Production and Protection Series.

2. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA)

The evaluations and recommendations of the JECFA provide much of the technical basis for the work of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and for Commodity Committees.

Since 1956 there have been 30 meetings of the JECFA, the most recent of which was held in Rome in June 1986.

There were 39 substances evaluated at the 30th meeting including the food colours anthocyanins, brown FK, curcumin, erythrosine, fast green FCF; the antioxidants alpha-tocopherol, butylated hydroxyanisole, butylated hydroxytoluene, dodecyl gallate; the thickening agents and stabilizers carob bean gum.

During the meeting some buffering agents, seasoning agents and antimicrobial preservatives were also reviewed as well as some leavening agents such as gluco delta-lactone and sodium aluminium phosphate. Special attention was given to lead as a contaminant in the diet of infants and children.

The reports of all JECFA Sessions are published in the WHO Technical Reports series and are available from WHO, Geneva (although the reports of the earliest sessions may be out of print). The toxicological monographs prepared by each JECFA are published by WHO in the Food Additives Series. Specifications for the identity and priority of the substances, evaluated by JECFA are published in the FAO Food and Nutrition Papers, and are available, on request, from FAO.

FAO has also recently published a revised version of the FAO/WHO Food Additives Data System, which contains an index and summary of all evaluations by JECFA from 1956 to 1984. Annual supplements to this document (FAO Food and Nutrition Paper No. 30/Rev. 1) will ensure that information available to governments on food additives will be as current as possible.

At its 30th meeting the monograph "Principles for the Assessment of Food Additives and Contaminants in Food" was reviewed by JECFA. This important monograph reviews the basis for decision-making of JECFA in the testing of chemicals in food and the evaluation of test results.

In essence, the problems under consideration fall into three general categories: firstly, the determination of the test requirements for individual chemicals that are added to or occur in food; secondly, the assessment methods that are to be applied; and thirdly, the up-dating of the test procedures and methods of assessment that are required as the science progresses. The Principles will be published in the WHO Technical Report Series as an addendum to the 30th JECFA Report.

3. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Residues in Food of Chemicals used in Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Medicine (Veterinary Drugs)

In many meat and poultry producing countries, especially in those where intensive animal raising was practiced, as well as under modern fish farming conditions, the use of growth promoting agents was today common. Also, the application of prophylactic or curative drugs was widely practiced under these conditions in order to maximize meat, poultry and fish production. However, concern had been raised, that these chemical compounds might cause residues of public health significance in the edible tissues derived from these food animals. Several international meetings have already been held or are planned to address this problem. For this reason, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, at its 15th Session in July 1983, considered the need for Codex taking action in this field. The Commission was of the opinion that, in view of the complex scientific and technological aspects involved, the issue should first be examined by a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation and that the recommendations of this consultation might then be considered by the Commission and acted upon by, if appropriate, a newly established Codex Committee.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Residues of Veterinary Drugs was held at Headquarters from 29 October to 5 November 1984. Experts have been tentatively invited from 12 countries, including some European countries. For the purpose of this consultation the widest possible interpretation has been given to the term "Veterinary Drug"; viz., ... any substance applied or administered orally or parenterally to any food-producing animal, such as meat or milk-producing animals, poultry, fish or bees, whether for therapeutic, prophylactic or diagnostic purposes or for modification of physiological functions or behaviour.

The Committee was advised that the Consultation will be asked to avoid any detailed discussion of safety evaluation, methods of analysis, detection and control, but rather will be asked to recommend to the Codex Alimentarius Commission ways in which the existing body of scientific opinion and public concern can be translated into recommendations for action by governments.

4. Food Irradiation

The International Consultative Group on Food Irradiation came into being in May 1984. Among the present membership (20 countries), half of them are developing countries which is an indication of the degree of interest that developing countries have in this new technology. The Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Isotope and Radiation Applications of Atomic Energy for Agricultural Development will provide the Secretariat services for the Group.

The Group have met twice, in December 1984 and in October 1985. The third meeting will be held in Vienna next July.

FAO is developing a regional project on food irradiation in the Asian Region and collaborating with WHO on the preparation of a booklet on food irradiation to be published hopefully next year.

Ongoing activities of the International Consultative Group include:

- i) a Task Force Meeting on the use of irradiation to ensure hygienic quality of foods (IAEA Headquarters, Vienna, Austria, July 1986),
- ii) a Task Force Meeting on Marketing/Public Relations,
- iii) a Training/Workshop on Irradiation Feasibility Studies,
- iv) a Training/Workshop on Food Inspection for the Food Irradiation Process,
- v) a Training Workshop on Food Irradiation Practice,
- vi) Preparation of a Technical Guideline for Food Manufacturing and Irradiation Practice,
- vii) Preparation of a Model Regulation for Licensing Irradiation Facilities.

Details on these activities may be obtained from the Secretariat of the International Consultative Group, joint FAO/IAEA Division of Isotope and Radiation Applications of Atomic Energy for Food and Agricultural Development, Wagramerstrasse 5, 1400 Vienna, Austria.

5. Joint FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme

To promote the recognition, evaluation and control of environmental conditions and hazards that may affect human health, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Health Organization are actively participating in the health-related monitoring activities of the Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS). The purpose of GEMS, a programme established by the United Nations Development Programme (UNEP), is to co-ordinate and stimulate international monitoring activities, at regional and global levels, for the early detection and control of pollution in the environment. The health-related monitoring activities of GEMS are directed to providing information on environmental levels of pollutants in food, air, water and human tissues and fluids, in order to assess the health risks posed to man from exposure to environmental pollutants and to determine priorities for developing pollution control strategies at the national, regional, or global levels. An additional practical overall value of monitoring programme, is to develop at the country level, the scientific and managerial capability to detect and estimate health threats to populations and to develop the basis for making sound environmental management decisions.

The Joint FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme, initiated in 1976, is one of the major health-related activities of GEMS. The main objectives of the Programme are:

- (a) to collect and evaluate data on levels of certain chemicals in individual foods and in total diet samples;
- (b) to obtain estimates of the intake via food of specific chemicals;
- (c) to provide technical co-operation to the governments of countries wishing to strengthen food contamination programmes; and
- (d) to provide the relevant committees of the Codex Alimentarius Commission with information on levels of contaminants in connection with the establishment of Codex Standards.

Data on the levels of selected contaminants, (organochlorine and organo-phosphorous pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls, lead, cadmium and aflatoxins) in various foods and in total diet have been collected from 34 FAO/WHO Collaborating Centres and Participating Institutions which are active in the Programme in 31 countries, of which 12 are European countries. Data forms were submitted by the Collaborating Centres based on analysis of a number of samples varying from four to five to over 2,000. Means and methods of collecting, processing and reporting monitoring data on selected contaminants in foods and the diet have been developed utilizing a computer storage and retrieval system located at WHO. Data reports by country, by contaminants, and food group have been issued for 1981-82 in the document "Summary of 1980-81 Monitoring Data from Collaborating Centres" (FAO-ESN/MISC/83.4; WHO-EFP 83.57) and data for 1982-83 are under evaluation.

To promote comparability and quality control of the data submitted under the Joint Programme, work on analytical quality assurance was continued. A report "Analytical Quality Assurance - III" was published in 1985 (WHO/EHE/FOS/85.20). The results of these studies indicate that large differences exist between laboratories with regard to analytical capability. As a result, training and other assistance have been provided to improve on the quality of the data produced. Such inter-laboratory quality assurance studies are seen as an integral and essential part of this monitoring programme.

The Guidelines for the Study of Dietary Intakes of Chemical Contaminants had been issued as a result of a Joint FAO/WHO Meeting held in Rome in December 1982. The Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues have since endorsed the Guidelines and recommended them for use by governments. The Guidelines are now available (WHO Offset Publication No. 87) to Joint FAO/WHO Collaborating Centres for Food Contamination Monitoring as well as to Codex Contact Points and others to encourage collection of data on the intake of chemical contaminants from food with a view to evaluating the potential risk to human health from such exposure.

Both the Technical Advisory Committee (September 1985) which guides the development and implementation of the Programme and the Meeting of Government Delegated Experts on Health-related Monitoring (March 1982) reviewed the progress to date of this Programme and recommended that every effort should be made to improve the global coverage of the Programme and to cooperate to the extent possible with developing countries wishing to strengthen their national food contamination monitoring programme.

6. Joint Publications

6.1 Guidelines for Can Manufacturers

The contamination of canned processed foods by lead and tin is a recognized problem in food quality control. The problem is particularly severe in tropical countries, where a combination of elevated temperatures and the limited availability of high quality tinplate, combined with extended storage or shipping times can lead to levels of contamination above those recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. A publication "Guidelines for Can Manufacturers and Food Canners" has been prepared by an international group of authors to assist food processors in developing countries to meet the requirements of Codex standards for levels of lead and tin in canned foods. The publication is now available.

The book describes the processes of can corrosion and the various factors which influence the rate of corrosion. Practical advice to the processor in the choice of tinplate, manufacture of the preformed cans and handling of the cans during filling, is included. The publication also contains descriptions of methods for testing cans and for the analysis of foods.

B. REPORT ON FAO ACTIVITIES

1. FOOD CONTROL ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Technical assistance in the form of project implementation, consultations and/or other advisory services has been provided or launched in several countries (93 approximately) including 14 from Latin America and the Caribbean, 43 from Africa, 36 from the Asia Region and the Middle East and 2 from Europe.

1.1 National Food Quality Control Strategy and Infrastructure

To provide a certain measure of coherence in national food quality control systems, FAO has assisted several countries (20) globally, including Turkey to review national food quality control strategies or infrastructure by workshops or specific consultancies.

The subject matter being multisectorial covering agricultural, health and commerce sectors, these activities have been able to develop policies and programmes for general improvement of the food system.

Training courses, workshops and seminars in different matters related to food inspection and control are also held.

2. FOOD CONTAMINATION SURVEYS AND TRAINING IN THEIR CONTROL

Food contamination studies are being undertaken with assistance from FAO in developing countries covering several aspects of microbiological or chemical contaminations. The assistance includes the preparation of sampling programmes including training, provision of equipment and supplies, suggestions with regard to methodology and interpretation of results. At the same time, FAO is providing some laboratories with materials and reference substances such as mycotoxin or pesticide standards.

2.1 Mycotoxins

Although there exist many types of mycotoxins elaborated by different genera and species of moulds, only the carcinogenic (in animals and possibly in man) aflatoxins produced by the species Aspergillus flavus and A. parasiticus on many foods and feedstuffs have so far been subject to regulatory measures and limits affecting imports and often also domestic supplies in numerous industrialized countries. Training and assistance projects have been provided to a number of countries with special emphasis on mycotoxins (ie, Malawi and Kenya).

A fairly large FAO/UNDP/African Groundnut Council project has been in operation since 1978 for the control of aflatoxins in groundnuts. The project covers 6 countries: Sudan, Nigeria, Senegal, Gambia, Niger and Mali. The first phase of the project has been instrumental in strengthening laboratories, providing training to analysts, research and extension personnel and in giving support to establishment of detoxification plant process. The second phase, started in 1984, devotes more attention towards prevention of aflatoxin contamination.

In this important field, FAO in collaboration with WHO and UNEP, is currently preparing for the Second International Conference on Mycotoxins to be held at the beginning of 1987.

3. TRAINING

Training being a high priority activity of FAO, a large number of persons were given the opportunity to further expand their professional expertise through study tours abroad, particularly in food inspection, analysis and control of different types of food contaminants have been organized at national levels in various countries.

A training programme called the "FAO/UNEP/USSR Training Activities on Food Contamination with Special Reference to Mycotoxins" was conducted with UNEP support. Two training courses were held in the USSR during 1984 and 1985 and fellowships provided in 1985/1986.

FAO, UNEP and USSR are preparing a project in Tanzania to establish a model training centre for English-speaking East African countries, which will emphasize training for field and extension workers in the prevention of mycotoxin contamination. This project is expected to start in 1987.

It is important to mention too that FAO, UNEP and the governments of Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Thailand are preparing an inter-country project for establishing a Food Control Training Network in Asia which will strengthen cooperation and collaboration among developing countries of the Asia and Pacific Region in the field of food quality and safety. Other training activities are as mentioned above.

4. URBANIZATION - PROBLEMS OF FOOD CONTROL

The fact that rapidly growing urban populations are placing new and greater demands on food transportation and distribution systems and often lead to shipment of foods over much longer distances, leading to problems of food spoilage, decomposition and contamination, both chemical and microbiological is recognized. In this regard FAO/WHO are holding a Joint Expert Consultation in early December 1986 to review the food control problems associated with urbanization from a global point of view and arrive at recommendations for attempting to solve the problems encountered.

5. STREET FOODS

FAO has continued supporting activities to determine the types and levels of contaminants found in street foods. These activities also include the obtaining of socio-economic data from a number of countries.

As a follow-up to the studies in Latin America, FAO and PAHO sponsored in late 1985, a Latin American Workshop on Street Foods which took place in Lima, Peru with the participation of 17 countries and several organizations.

The principal recommendations of the workshop were: to improve street food regulations, to train street food handlers and consumers, to develop new technology and procedures for street food handling and to review the sanitary and epidemiological aspects of the street foods problem. Follow-up action with FAO assistance is being planned.

For the Asia Region, a workshop on street foods is programmed to be held in Jogjakarta, Indonesia in late 1986.

6. PUBLICATIONS

FAO has published several guidelines and manuals (some of them jointly with WHO, UNEP and other donor countries such as Sweden) covering different aspects of food control, and food safety, eg developing a food control system; food inspection; export inspection; food analysis - chemical and microbiological; prevention of mycotoxins contamination; surveillance of mycotoxins, etc. The Food Inspectors Manual has recently been revised and is now available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic.

A publication on "Post-harvest Losses in Quality of Foodgrains" has been prepared.

A publication "Food Inspection Sampling Techniques" is currently under preparation.

A publication on "Guidelines for Can Manufacturers and Food Canners" is now available.

C. REPORT ON WHO ACTIVITIES

1. Activities in the field of food safety

1.1 Consultation on veterinary public health aspects of prevention and control of Campylobacter infections, Moscow, 20-22.2.1984

Campylobacter jejuni is a relatively newly recognized, but important causative agent of enteric infections in man. The main reservoir for this organism is found in a number of domestic animal species (chickens, cattle, pigs, cats and dogs) but also in several species of wild birds. Humans become infected through the consumption of raw milk and undercooked or recontaminated poultry.

The consultation concluded that, in the long term, food animals free from Campylobacter should be raised. To prevent human disease today, it is essential to observe strict values of hygiene in the slaughter of animals and dressing of carcasses. Decontamination of carcasses was seen as an important tool in preventing Campylobacterosis. For this purpose lactic acid and irradiation could be used, as well as cooling of carcasses by aeration. Consumption of raw milk should be discouraged. Proper kitchen hygiene was also identified as an important step in the prevention of this disease in man.

The report of the consultation (VPH/CDD/FOS/84.1) is available from WHO/HQ.

1.2 Informal consultation on WHO/Food Industry cooperation for the improvement of Food Safety, Geneva, 1-2 May 1984

The recent Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Safety (Geneva, 1983) concluded that illness due to contaminated food is perhaps the most widespread health problem in the contemporary world and an important cause of reduced economic productivity. There is also now a consensus among food safety experts that in order to prevent foodborne illness, the safety of food should be guaranteed not only at the retail level but that responsibility should be extended to the consumer, especially to those responsible for storage, handling and preparation of food in the home. The Expert Committee therefore felt that public education is probably the single most important measure to prevent foodborne disease and unnecessary food losses, especially for rural populations which are largely independent of foods moving in trade, and therefore also of any form of control. However, although the principles for the prevention of foodborne diseases are technically the same all over the world, specific problems and appropriate modes of intervention will vary from one country to another, depending on environmental, economic, political, technological and socio-cultural factors. Consequently, in making recommendations to consumers, local needs and circumstances have to be considered.

This is a vast undertaking far beyond the scope of the Food Safety Programme alone. In seeking support for such a far-reaching operation, WHO was therefore looking towards the food industry itself, as it should be in the interests of food producers, processors and distributors to raise the general level of food hygiene. An informal consultation was therefore organized to obtain the initial reactions of the food industry, and to consider whether, and if so how, they could assist WHO in discharging its responsibility for promoting food safety as a means of reducing the incidence of foodborne disease.

The representatives of industry welcomed the initiative of WHO in calling this informal consultation, and concluded that the food industry might be able to assist the Organization in its efforts to meet this responsibility. To this end, WHO is presently working in collaboration with representatives of the food industry.

1.3 Hazard Analysis of Domestic Food Preparation

As described under C 1.2 above, health education forms a most important measure to prevent foodborne disease and food losses. But health education must be based on knowledge of prevailing food handling practices, prevailing beliefs, and the cultural values attached to these practices as well as the social and economic roles they fulfil.

WHO has commenced a pilot study in various locations in Peru to assess domestic food preparation, with particular emphasis on weaning food preparation, which will form the basis for the development of appropriate health education programmes. Similar studies are envisaged in various countries of all WHO regions.

1.4 Surveillance programme for the control of foodborne infections and intoxications in Europe

This programme is carried out under the aegis of the WHO Regional Office for Europe. (See Agenda Item No. 7 - Food Safety and Food Control in Europe, also Annex Food Safety Activities of the WHO Regional Office for Europe.)

2. International Programme on Chemical Safety

Progress Report 1982-84

Memoranda of Understanding have been signed with 19 countries which are actively participating in the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS), a collaborating activity between the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). There is now a network of 41 IPCS participating institutions in these countries.

The WHO participation in the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues falls in the framework of the IPCS. Reports on the latest sessions are given in the section on joint FAO/WHO activities.

The environmental and health risk of 6 sets of physical factors and 36 chemicals, such as PCBs, DDT, arsenic, hydrogen sulphide, 2,4D and aquatic biotoxins have been evaluated and the results published as Environmental Health Criteria documents. Work has been initiated on a further 48 chemicals or groups of chemicals. Additionally special summaries for decision makers with supplements containing practical information on legislation as well as on first aid treatment in case of intoxication by each chemical will be prepared.

Work on development of methodology in toxicology and related fields is continuing with activities such as principles for evaluating health risks from chemicals during pregnancy and childhood, monographs on subjects such as toxicokinetics and on neurobehavioural toxicology. A collaborative study is in progress on application of short term tests for genotoxicity and carcinogenicity. Methods for assessing and testing chemicals in food are also being evaluated.

An activity is being launched to help developing countries establish chemical poison control and toxicovigilance programmes. A number of training courses in chemical safety and related subjects are organised each year.

3. Health Legislation

WHO continues to publish the International Digest of Health Legislation in English and French editions. The journal, which appears quarterly, includes a section devoted to "Nutrition and food safety", covering national and international legal instruments in this sector. Every effort is made to avoid duplication with the FAO journal, Food and Agriculture Legislation. Material likely to be of interest to regulatory officials concerned with nutrition and food safety also appears, from time to time, in the "New and Views", "Book Reviews", and "In the literature" sections of the Digest.

The information available to WHO's Health Legislation unit (including the 35 volumes of the Digest published to date) is used as the basis for responding to requests from Member States for documentation on particular aspects of health legislation.

4. International Code for Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes

The Thirty-fourth World Health Assembly, in May 1981, adopted the International Code in the form of a recommendation. Since that time, the Commission has taken a number of steps pursuant to the Health Assembly's request that the Commission "give full consideration, within the framework of its operational mandate, to action it might take to improve the quality standards of infant foods, and to support and promote the implementation of the International Code" (resolution WHA34.22, operative paragraph 4).

For example, in November 1981 a circular letter (CL 1981/52(FSDU)) requested comments on any implications the International Code might have for the work of the Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, in respect of Codex standards, or draft standards, for products within the scope of the Code. Following the Committee's recommendation, a consultant was engaged by the Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme to prepare a paper (1) for the 14th Session of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses which met in Bonn-Bad Godesberg from 24 January to 1 February 1985.

(1) WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes and Codex Alimentarius Standards and Advisory Texts: Enquiry into the Question of Harmonization. Document CX/FSDU 84/9

The review paper submitted to the Committee analysed the origin, structure, nature, purpose and scope of the various provisions and the institutional setting in which they had been adopted. It concluded that none of the relevant Codex instruments or provisions was incompatible with the International Code and that existing differences resulted in complementarity rather than inconsistency. It did not, therefore, appear necessary to amend any of the Codex instruments in question. However, the paper did suggest that there might be practical or policy considerations in favour of establishing closer links between the WHO code and the appropriate labelling provisions of Codex standards.

The outcome of the Committee's consideration of this paper is reported in ALINORM 85/26, paragraphs 125-133, and will be taken up under Item 30 of the Commission's Agenda.

Since the preparation of the 1983 Report on Activities within FAO and WHO Complementary to the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (ALINORM 83/6), the Director-General of WHO reported to the Thirty-sixth World Health Assembly, in May 1983, on the status of compliance with and implementation of the International Code at country, regional and global levels. The Director-General concluded that, in the light of information on the implementation of the Code available from Member States since its adoption, and in the absence of any suggestions by them for change, it would have been premature at that time to have proposed any revision of the Code, its form or content. The Health Assembly unanimously endorsed this conclusion.

The second biennial report (1) to the Health Assembly on the status of implementation of the Code since its adoption, which summarized information provided for the most part by Member States themselves on action they were taking to give effect to the Code, was presented to the Thirty-seventh World Health Assembly in May 1984. The third biennial report (2) on this subject was presented to the Thirty-ninth World Health Assembly in May 1986.

5. Nutritional value and safety of products specifically intended for infant and young child feeding - World Health Assembly Resolution WHA34.23

In accordance with Health Assembly Resolution WHA34.23, various steps have been taken to assess changes that occur with time under various climatic conditions, particularly in tropical conditions, in the quality, nutritional value and safety of products used specifically for infant and young child feeding.

In addition to the convening of an informal consultation in October 1981 to review information on the subject, a WHO consultant visited three countries - India, the Philippines, and Trinidad and Tobago - during the period October 1982 to January 1983. A summary of the consultant's main findings was presented to the Health Assembly in May 1983; the complete report (1) was also presented to the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses at its 14th Session in January 1985. In the discussion that followed, the possible importance of storage-related deterioration in nutritional quality for the work of the Committee was pointed out.

The Government of Switzerland has expressed interest in making a voluntary contribution to help finance the launching of laboratory studies in collaboration with appropriate national research institutions. Final arrangements are being made for this purpose. The product samples necessary for testing are being provided by the infant-food industry, which also participated in the October 1981 meeting, provided relevant information on the basis of a questionnaire sent to individual manufacturers of infant formula, and commented on the technical aspects of the planned laboratory studies.

-
- (1) Document WHA37/1984/REC/1, Annex 5
 - (2) Document WHA39/1986/
 - (3) Document NUT/83.4

PILOT STUDY ON ACCEPTANCES OR RELATED NOTIFICATIONS
OF POSITION ON CERTAIN CODEX STANDARDS BY COUNTRIES
OF THE CODEX REGION OF EUROPE

IV. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of the responses to the Questionnaire indicates the variety of difficulties that countries face in adjusting their food regulations and standards to the provisions of the Codex Standards.

It appears that the introduction into the acceptance procedure of the "declaration of free circulation" without formally accepting the Codex Standards has facilitated responses from Governments. However, such a declaration does not represent an action, by the Government concerned, to harmonize its regulations with the relevant Codex Standard. As such it has an informative value only.

While the "declaration of free circulation" can be considered as a first step towards the use of Codex Standards in domestic and international trade, the Commission should emphasize that its mandate, as embodied in its Statutes, is to harmonize food legislation. In order to achieve this aim the following recommendations are proposed:

- The Codex Committee on General Principles and the Codex Alimentarius Commission itself should further review the format and/or the content of the Codex Standards and assess the need for certain detailed provisions which create difficulties in national food regulations due to divergent legal principles in member countries (Sampling, Defect Tables and others). However, further considerations should be based on concrete proposals made either by Commodity Committees or Coordinating Committees.
- The Coordinating Committee appears to be a suitable forum to obtain information from Member Countries and to evaluate the responses with regard to acceptances in detail and identify those provisions in standards which seem to be unacceptable to more than one member country. The Coordinating Committee could refer these provisions to the technical Codex Committee concerned for further consideration; such an action should be limited to provisions in a standard which obviously hinder acceptance. The Coordinating Committee could, at this Session, identify critical provisions from the examples given in Section II of this paper.
- The Coordinating Committee should extend the Pilot Study to cover all Codex Standards, possibly on a Codex volume by volume basis, at its subsequent Sessions. In view of the extent of such an exercise the questionnaire should be modified in an appropriate manner.
- While noting the statement made by The Netherlands concerning the EEC Countries and the separate study concerning CMEA Standards, the Coordinating Committee should make every effort to involve all member countries of the Region in the review of the acceptances and should request the support of the Committee on General Principles as well as that of the Codex Commission on this matter.
- In view of the response to the Questionnaire, the Coordinating Committee should emphasize that full cooperation of the member countries is essential to assure that the Codex Standards adopted by the Commission are concise and effective in order to meet with a wide acceptance. Such an active cooperation would also mean a better response to the Circular Letters issued by the Codex Secretariat.
- The results of this Pilot Study accompanied by the comments of the Coordinating Committee should be brought to the attention of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Agenda Item 13

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE

Fifteenth Session

Thun, Switzerland, 16-20 June 1986

COOPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD LEGISLATION

by

Barbro Blomberg^{*}

Introduction

The fourteenth session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Europe agreed to discuss cooperation and implementation of food legislation at its next session. The following survey has been prepared as a background for the discussion. The purpose of the survey has been to study coordination in Member States between authorities responsible for food control, and also to examine the role of Codex Contact Points, their resources, involvement in decision-making and working relationship with the national authorities.

In most countries in Europe central government responsibility for food safety and food control is shared by two or more ministries. Adequate coordination between ministries and between them and regional and local authorities concerned is important. How the work is coordinated is immaterial as long as it is effective. Experience shows that it is difficult to bring about cooperation that really works.

Some countries have tried to solve their coordination problems by setting up special coordinating committees. About one third of the countries in Europe have such committees. They may be only advising the government, or they may have some decisive functions delegated to them. A detailed review of co-

x/ Mrs Barbro Blomberg, Head of International Secretariat, National Food Administration, Uppsala, Sweden

ordinating committees, as well as other forms of coordination, was presented at the thirteenth session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Europe (document CX/EURO 82/8)¹. The conclusions of the discussions at the thirteenth session were that coordination may look fine on paper but not work in practice, and, on the other hand, examples of excellent informal communication without written rules were given. A new effort has now been made to find solutions which could be used as models and inspiration to those who want to improve the coordination of food safety work at the national level. In the following, examples are given from some countries of how to create links between decision-makers, enforcing authorities, trade, industry and consumers.

Coordination of food control

How a national food control is organized depends largely on the system of government of a country. There is always a central government administration responsible for initiating and developing policy and legislation. This responsibility may rest with the ministry of health for matters mainly related to public health, e.g. maximum tolerable limits for pesticide residues, or with the ministry of agriculture for matters related to production of foodstuffs or quality control. Other ministries involved may be ministries of trade, industry, tourism. The day-to-day field control work must be done in the local communities to ensure close contact with food manufacturers and traders as well as the consumers. Whether the service units are decentralized organs of the central government administration or local government bodies depends on national policy².

In Austria the Federal Ministry for Environmental Protection and Public Health has the general responsibility, but at the provincial level, food is controlled by the authorities of the "Länder". Like in other countries with a federal system, this system may cause special problems of coordination between the various levels of administration.

In Belgium the ministries concerned are those of health, economic affairs and agriculture. The control system is centralized, with a system of programmed sampling which was introduced nearly ten years ago³. Participation in international activities, such as the Codex Alimentarius work, is coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but the material input is the responsibility of the technical services of the ministries concerned.

In France the national Codex committee belongs to the "Direction de la concurrence, de la consommation et de la répression des fraudes". It is in a good position to maintain real concern for the interests of the consumers. The committee takes care of the interministerial coordination and is a forum for dialogue between different professional organizations.

In Hungary the cooperation between the ministries concerned is reported to work well. The ministries involved are the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Home Trade. In addition, the Hungarian Office for Standardization controls quality requirements and methods of sampling and analysis. Codex codes and standards are generally taken into consideration. In every committee for the elaboration of an act, order or instruction the same experts are involved who are also leading members of the national Codex committees, thus making the contact between the authorities and the national Codex committees very effective. In the comments submitted by Hungary for this survey it is also pointed out that involvement by the above mentioned experts in the education system of the universities is important, as well as in courses and seminars for producers, trade companies and control institutions.

In Ireland four government departments share the responsibility for food legislation; those of Agriculture, Health, Industry, Trade and Commerce, and Fisheries. The Department of Agriculture is the Codex Contact Point, although responsibility for Codex committees is divided between several departments. The implementation of food law is mainly the responsibility of the Department of Health. Locally employed health inspectors and public analysts take care of inspection and sampling.

In the Netherlands two ministries are responsible for food control, the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. Both ministries issue implementing regulations. The Codex Contact Point has no role in this respect. In making statutory regulations, the Crown is advised by the Commodity Act Advisory Committee in which ministries, industry and consumers are represented.

In Norway the Food Inspection Board has the task to coordinate all public food inspection activities, including laboratory services, analytical methods, the types of investigation to be carried out, import control, and legislation. There is also a Norwegian Codex Committee. However, the Food Inspection Board is to be reorganized. As a component of this reorganization it has been proposed that the National Codex Committee be dissolved, and that the responsibility for Codex work be taken over by the Board. The Codex secretariat would then be incorporated in the secretariat of the Board, with well defined responsibilities for Codex and other international matters.

In Sweden the Ministry of Agriculture has the responsibility for the basic food legislation. However, implementation and responsibility for food control at central level and other food safety activities, including international cooperation, has been delegated to the National Food Administration. It directs and coordinates food safety work, issues regulations, gives advice and recommendations on food matters, carries out investigations and research, and arranges courses and refresher training for food control staff. On the board of the National Food Administration relevant interests are represented, e.g. the Ministry of Health, trade, industry and consumers.

Role of Codex Contact Points

In order to define the role of the Codex Contact Points at national level one should look at their organization, location, resources, work programme and access to expert advice. At best they should, as suggested by the Norwegian Codex Contact Point, act "as an information office for all international food legislation and food safety matters".

In most countries in Europe the Codex Contact Point is part of the ministry of agriculture. This may work well, provided other interests - health, trade, consumer matters - are adequately taken care of.

As regards resources, they are, of course, never sufficient. One always could do more with more people and more money. To some extent, however, the lack of resources may be compensated for by better use of expert advice and by publication of reports, codes and standards in professional journals.

France has a national Codex Alimentarius Committee, comprising experts from several administrative authorities together with representatives of professional organizations in food and agriculture, of consumers and of the French organization for standardization (AFNOR). For each Codex committee there is a list of experts, in all about 175 persons. They are called to preparatory meetings within their respective fields of interest. Before the sixteenth session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission no less than 17 different expert meetings were held in France. An interesting feature is that expert meetings are held after various Codex sessions as well as before them. They are convened to inform about the outcome and conclusions and to plan further follow-up.

In Hungary the experts consider other international recommendations besides those by Codex Alimentarius, e.g. by CMEA, EEC and ISO.

In Ireland the Codex Contact Point (the Department of Agriculture) distributes circular letters and background documents for Codex meetings to appropriate interested bodies, and their comments are transmitted to the Commission. The mailing list has recently been expanded, mainly as regards the manufacturing industry and the public sector.

In Norway the Codex Contact Point and working groups are involved in the decision-making process in an advisory capacity. The Codex Contact Point assists in training matters and in planning programmes for visitors from abroad (FAO project fellows, etc.).

In Sweden the Codex Contact Point uses a list of about 100 specialists from other government authorities, industry, trade and consumer organizations. Before meetings of the Commission or the Codex Committees small groups of experts concerned are convened to preparatory meetings to define the Swedish standpoints. After Codex meetings, reports on the meetings are published in

the journal issued by the National Food Administration. This journal is widely spread and often quoted by mass media. A list of all Codex standards and codes has recently been published in the journal.

Conclusions

The role of the Codex Contact Point varies considerably from country to country. The main task is generally regarded to be to spread information about Codex work and to coordinate the country's comments on standards and codes.

It is natural here to concentrate on coordination of matters related to Codex work. Important international work is going on in other fora - EEC, CMEA, Council of Europe, GATT, etc. Those responsible for Codex work should keep themselves well informed and try to be involved in other aspects of international contacts as well. In the course of this survey it has been stressed that good contacts should be maintained with universities, with fellows and other visitors, and that a system should be created for regular national meetings of experts before - and perhaps also after - Codex meetings. Permission for those responsible for the Codex Contact Point to attend national meetings for coordination between different responsible authorities should be granted. This would be in line with the team approach which was strongly recommended by the joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Safety⁴.

References

1. Coordination of enforcement and application of food law, document for the thirteenth session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Europe, CX/EURO 82/8.
2. Food Safety Services, Public Health in Europe no. 14, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 1981 (a second edition is in preparation).
3. Symposium on Enforcement of Food Law, Rome 1978, report published by the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels - Luxembourg 1980.
4. The role of food safety in health and development, WHO Technical Report Series, no. 705, Geneva 1984.

CX 3/1

CX/EURO 86/3 Part II
May 1986

Agenda Item 7

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE
Fifteenth Session
Thun, Switzerland, 16-20 June 1986

MONITORING OF NATIONAL POLICIES, PROGRAMMES, SERVICES AND
INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO FOOD SAFETY AND FOOD CONTROL*

INTRODUCTION

In discussing the future direction of the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, the Codex Commission at its Sixteenth Session, considered document ALINORM 85/39 which had been prepared by WHO in response to a request made by the Executive Committee during its 31st Session (See ALINORM 85/3, paras. 154 and 158). The paper attempted to identify some precise actions which could be taken or initiated by the Commission in order to help implement Primary Health Care (PHC).

In this context, one of the proposals contained in document ALINORM 85/39 was that "The Coordinating Committees of the CAC should be invited to consider the feasibility of introducing on their agenda a permanent item dealing with monitoring of national policies, programmes, services and institutions related to food safety and food control in order to stimulate action at the national level leading to increased technical cooperation activities in food safety between Member States themselves and between Member States, FAO and WHO."

The Commission agreed that this proposal should be acted upon in the Regional Coordinating Committees (See ALINORM 85/47 paras. 114-122).

BACKGROUND

1. Status of Current National Policies and Programmes
Dealing with Food Safety

The diversity of the status of food safety from country to country is well known. Many countries have yet to formulate national food policies, responding appropriately to their health situation and economy, or, where these policies have been formulated, they often do not reflect appropriately the true nature and extent of current or emerging food safety problems. Some of the major constraints in the developing of effective food safety policies include:

* This paper was also published as CX/ASIA 86/8.

- (i) lack of appreciation of the true nature and extent of national food safety problems;
- (ii) lack of awareness of the consequences of contaminated food on the nation's health status and economic development;
- (iii) lack of organized consumer demand for food safety and quality;
- (iv) division and/or fragmentation of responsibilities for food safety and food control in different governmental departments and at various levels which in turn often leads to conflicts of interests;
- (v) insufficient allocation of resources including personnel to respond appropriately to the problem;
- (vi) lack of periodic evaluation and updating of food safety policies to meet contemporary problems.

2. Reasons for Monitoring and Evaluation

National authorities throughout the world frequently face a host of factors that make the development, implementation and maintenance of effective and efficient food safety and food control programmes difficult to achieve. Some of these factors are:

- (i) public demand for more and better services vis-a-vis available resources;
- (ii) rapid technological changes in the production, processing and distribution of foods;
- (iii) social changes such as rural to urban migrations and the changes in food habits which may result;
- (iv) serious constraints on the availability of resources for food safety activities.

Monitoring and evaluation offer authorities an opportunity to put these factors in perspective and establish an approach which will:

- (i) improve food safety management and performance;
- (ii) provide and upgrade needed public services;
- (iii) communicate the value of food safety and food control programme/ activities to appropriate officials and the public; and
- (iv) build public confidence in food safety and food control programmes and activities.

Monitoring itself involves the day-to-day follow-up of activities during their implementation to ensure that they are proceeding as planned and are on schedule. It keeps track of on going activities, milestones achieved, personnel matters, supplies and equipment, and money spent in relation to budgets allocated. Reliable information on these matters must, therefore, be provided by those performing the activities. Monitoring makes it possible to identify deviations so that activities can be put back on the right track.

Monitoring which is a prerequisite for evaluation, is done with the help of indicators, being variables which help to measure changes. In order to measure these changes reasonably accurately, indicators should be (a) valid (they should actually measure what they are supposed to measure); (b) objective (the answer should be the same if measured by different people in similar circumstances); (c) sensitive (e.g. to the changes in the situation); and (d) specific (they should reflect changes only in the situation concerned).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES TO ENSURE FOOD SAFETY (DOC. NO. WHO/EHE/FOS/86.1 AND FAO/ESN/MISC./86.1)

To facilitate programme management and development, FAO/WHO have chosen to develop a document for the monitoring and evaluation of programmes to ensure food safety to be used in conjunction with the existing Guidelines for Developing an Effective National Food control System ^{1/} as well as the Guidelines for Establishing of Strengthening National Food contamination Monitoring Programmes ^{2/}. A Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Safety, which met in Geneva in 1983, repeatedly pointed out throughout its report that continuous evaluation of all activities aimed at the improvement of food safety is essential.

The aim of this document therefore is to support the work of authorities in the development of food safety and food control programmes through the provision of information, suggestions and possible methodology whereby (i) progress in such programmes may be measured, and (ii) resource utilization may be maximized.

In particular this document is intended to:

- (i) create awareness among food safety and food control personnel that evaluation is an essential management tool which ought to be employed where possible for maximizing the contribution of food safety to health and development;
- (ii) help in reviewing and analyzing national need in food safety and determining appropriate measures necessary to meet those needs;
- (iii) guide food safety and food control personnel in the design, operation, choice of approaches and interpretation of results related to evaluation;
- (iv) provide examples of some of the objectives and basic indicators for the various subjects of evaluation.

Due to the differing stages of development of food safety and food control activities in countries, it is recognized that the consequent applicability and use of the proposed document will vary. However, owing to the importance of monitoring for programme development, emphasis is primarily placed on conditions and possibilities as they relate to

^{1/} FAO Food Control Series No 1, FAO, Rome.

^{2/} FAO Food Control Series No 5, FAO, Rome.

developing countries. In this context, it is realized that a number of countries neither have an established food safety programme nor formal management systems. Nevertheless in these countries there are officials charged with the responsibility for food safety who from time to time should monitor the progress of their programmes through different stages of implementation. Such monitoring is indispensable in that it can provide the basis not only for the formulation of policies, but also for determining appropriate measures for the future development of programme activities.

PROPOSALS FOR ACTION BY THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

On the basis of information provided by the delegations on their currently run monitoring and evaluation systems/activities with regard to food safety and food control, the Regional Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia may wish to:

- (i) consider the ways and means which might be used for strengthening such activities at national level;
- (ii) determine the role that the Coordinating Committee might play in stimulating such action and in monitoring the progress achieved; and
- (iii) suggest for improvements if any in the FAO/WHO document to make it more suitable for the needs of the European region.

Agenda Item 2

CX/EXEC 86/33/2

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

FAO HEADQUARTERS, ROME, 30 JUNE - 4 JULY 1986

PROGRESS REPORT ON PUBLICATION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS
AND ON ACCEPTANCES OF CODEX STANDARDS AND CODEX MAXIMUM
LIMITS FOR PESTICIDE RESIDUES

Publication of the Codex Alimentarius

1. Volumes II to XV of the Codex Alimentarius have been distributed in the three languages of the Commission - English, French, Spanish. Volume I is available in English and will also be available in French and Spanish before the Executive Committee's session. Volume XVI is available in English and French and will also be available in Spanish before the Executive Committee's session. Volume I and Volume XVI will shortly be issued to governments in the three languages of the Commission, as will also Volume XVII. A list of the titles of Volumes I to XVII is contained in the Appendix to this paper.
2. Volumes A to H of the Codex Alimentarius have also been distributed in the three languages of the Commission. A list of the titles of Volumes A to H is given in the Appendix to this paper.
3. Standards and Codes of Practice adopted at the 16th Session of the Commission will be published before long in the appropriate volumes of the Codex Alimentarius.

Acceptances

General

4. Details of all acceptances of Codex standards received up to 3 December 1984 are contained in the publication "Summary of Acceptances, Part I - Worldwide and Regional Codex Standards" (CAC/Acceptances, Part I - Rev. 3). Details of all acceptances of Codex maximum limits for pesticide residues received up to 19 September 1983 are to be found in the publication "Summary of Acceptances, Part II - Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues" (CAC/Acceptances, Part II - Rev.2).

5. Further information concerning progress on acceptances, both of Codex standards and Codex maximum limits for pesticide residues, was set out in document ALINORM 85/2, which was prepared for the 16th Session of the Commission.

6. The present paper reports on further acceptances received, as set out below, since the publication of document ALINORM 85/2.

Canada

Canada has notified revised Acceptance with Specified Deviations of the following international cheese standards:

- C.4 Edam Cheese
- C.5 Gouda Cheese
- C.6 Havarti Cheese

Canada has also notified Acceptance with Specified Deviations of the standards C.12 Limburger Cheese.

The above information will be brought to the attention of the FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products, which will meet in Rome from 2 to 6 June 1986.

Canada has indicated that it is continuing to review all the Codex standards which have been submitted to member countries for acceptance and that it is expected that Canada will be in a position to submit further acceptances prior to the 17th Session of the Commission.

China

The Codex standards and codes of practice are being used as reference material by the regulatory authorities and enterprises. For example the Codex MRLs are referred to in developing the regulations concerning safe use of pesticides.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica has communicated its position regarding the acceptance of Codex MRLs included in Volume XIII of the Codex Alimentarius. With the exception of DDT in carcass meat, endrin in poultry, ethion in carcass meat and edible offal of cattle, beans and tomatoes, lindane in carcass meat of pigs and cattle, Costa Rica has given either Full Acceptance or Target Acceptance (with a view to full acceptance) to the Codex MRLs.

Cuba

Cuba has notified Full Acceptance of the following Codex standards:

- Dextrose monohydrate (Codex Stan. 8 - 1981)
- Glucose Syrup (Codex Stan. 9 - 1981)
- Edible Maize Oil (Codex Stan. 25 - 1981)
- Canned Pineapple (Codex Stan. 42 - 1981)

Cuba has notified Acceptance with Specified Deviations in respect of the following Codex standards:

- Canned Tomatoes (Codex Stan. 13 - 1981)
- Canned Fruit Cocktail (Codex Stan. 78 - 1981)
- Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies (Codex Stan. 79 - 1981)
- Canned Tropical Fruit Salad (Codex Stan. 99 - 1981)
- Orange Juice (Codex Stan. 45 - 1981)
- Concentrated Orange Juice (Codex Stan. 64 - 1981)
- Pineapple Juice (Codex Stan. 85 - 1981)
- Canned Tuna and Bonito in Water or Oil (Codex Stan. 70 - 1981)
- Quick Frozen Lobsters (Codex Stan. 95 - 1981)
- White Sugar (Codex Stan. 4 - 1981)
- Lactose (Codex Stan. 11 - 1981)
- Powdered Sugar (Icing Sugar) (Codex Stan. 5 - 1981)

The deviations specified will be set out in detail in the next updating of the Summary of Acceptances.

Cuba has notified Free Entry for products in conformity with the following Codex standards:

- Canned Grapefruit

Cuba has also stated that it is in agreement with the following Codes of Practice which are considered by Cuba to be very useful for international trade:

- Code of Practice for the Processing and Handling of Quick Frozen Foods (CAC/RCP 8 - 1976)
- Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Acid and Acidified Low Acid Canned Foods (CAC/RCP 23 - 1979)
- Code of Practice for Lobsters (CAC/RCP 24 - 1979)
- Code of Practice for Smoked Fish (CAC/RCP 25 - 1979)
- Code of Practice for Salted Fish (CAC/RCP 26 - 1979)
- Code of Practice for Minced Fish prepared by Mechanical Separation (CAC/RCP 27 - 1983)
- Code of Practice for Crabs (CAC/RCP 28 - 1983)
- Code of Hygienic Practice for the Processing of Frog Legs (CAC/RCP 30 - 1983)
- Code of Hygienic Practice for Dried Milk (CAC/RCP 31 - 1983)

Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia has indicated its position regarding the acceptance of the MRLs included in the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Series of Codex maximum residue limits (CAC/RS 65 - 1974, CAC/RS 71 - 1976 and CAC/RS 100 - 1978, respectively). With the exception of MRLs for folpet, ortho-phenylphenol, carbaryl (cherries and plums), coumaphos, chlordimeform, heptachlor, HCB in meat, poultry and eggs, Czechoslovakia has given either 'full' or 'limited' acceptance to the Codex MRLs contained in the above three Series.

Finland

Finland has indicated that products in conformity with the following Codex standards may be freely distributed in Finland, subject to certain specified conditions. Details of the specified conditions will be set out in the next updating of the Summary of Acceptances:

- Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns (Codex Stan. 92 - 1981)
- Quick Frozen Lobsters (Codex Stan. 95 - 1981)
- Canned Shrimps or Prawns (Codex Stan. 37 - 1981)
- Canned Crab Meat (Codex Stan. 90 - 1981)
- Canned Tuna and Bonito in Water or Oil (Codex Stan. 70 - 1981)

India

The Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 and Rules, 1955, lay down Tolerance limits for 20 pesticides only. The Tolerance limits for these chemicals in all food articles except food grains and milled grains are the same as the Codex maximum limits. In the case of food grains and milled grains the tolerance limits specified are half the Codex limits.

India has made available a list of pesticides and the maximum limits specified for them under Indian legislation. This information will be set out in detail in the next updating of the Summary of Acceptances of Codex maximum limits for pesticide residues. In response to subsequent inquiries by the Secretariat, India has stated that a maximum limit for a pesticide residue can only be laid down under the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, if the pesticide in question is registered for use in food commodities under the Insecticide Act, 1968. Accordingly acceptance and non-acceptance of a pesticide depends on whether it is registered under the Insecticide Act, implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture. As regards the question of free distribution of food commodities containing pesticide residues conforming to the Codex maximum limits, it is not possible to give Limited Acceptance under the provisions of Indian legislation, but each case is decided on its merits.

Madagascar

No studies concerning maximum limits for pesticide residues in foods have ever been undertaken in Madagascar, so that no provisions have as yet been laid down in national legislation. Thus, food commodities which meet the Codex maximum limits for pesticide residues are accepted for distribution in the national territory.

Mauritius

Mauritius has written to say that its position concerning Codex maximum limits for pesticide residues is that of free entry for food products in conformity with the Codex maximum limits.

Mexico

Mexico has notified Limited Acceptance in respect of Codex MRLs for a number of pesticides. Clarification has been sought on certain aspects of the Mexican response.

New Zealand

New Zealand has notified Full Acceptance of the Standard for Whey Cheese (A-7) and to the Standard for Quick Frozen French Fried Potatoes. New Zealand has also notified Acceptance with Specified Deviations in respect of the following standards:

- Named Variety Process(ed) Cheese and Spreadable Process(ed) Cheese (A-8(a))
- Processed Cheese and Spreadable Processed Cheese (A-8(b))
- Processed Cheese Preparations (A-8(c))

Norway

In response to CL 1985/46, the appropriate Ministries have been working on their replies to the Commission. The following standards have been under consideration:

- Volume III- Codex Standards for Sugars (including Honey)
- Volume IV - Codex Standards for Processed Meat and Poultry Products and Soups and Broths
- Volume V - Codex Standards for Fish and Fishery Products
- Volume VII- Codex Standards for Cocoa Products and Chocolate
- Volume IX- Codex Standards for Foods for Special Dietary Uses
- Volume X- Codex Standards for Fruit Juices, Concentrated Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars
- Volume XI- Codex Standards for Edible Fats and Oils

The remaining standards will also be considered in due course, but our notification will probably not reach you in time for the inclusion in the progress report to be considered by the Commission in July.

Some of the standards will be given acceptance with specified deviations, the deviations mostly being due to national regulations on food additives.

Standards for products for which we do not have national standards will not be given acceptance. However, products conforming with the Codex standards may be freely distributed within the territorial jurisdiction on specified conditions, the conditions mainly being due to national

regulations on food additives. The reason for not giving acceptance to standards for products for which we have no national standards is the general policy in Norway to attempt to reduce the extent of detailed specific national regulation as far as possible.

Included are the completed forms of the standards Norway has evaluated so far. The forms are signed by the chairman of the Norwegian Codex Alimentarius Committee, Professor Anton Skulberg. Our report comprises the following standards:

Volume III- Codex Standards for Sugars (including Honey).

Sugar, white	Codex Stan	4-1981: Free dist.
Sugar, powdered	Codex Stan	5-1981: Free dist.
Sugars, soft	Codex Stan	6-1981: Free dist.
Dextrose, anhydrous	Codex Stan	7-1981: Free dist.
Dextrose, monohydrate	Codex Stan	8-1981: Free dist. 1)
Glucose syrup	Codex Stan	9-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Glucose sirup, dried	Codex Stan	10-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Lactose	Codex Stan	11-1981: Free dist. 2)
Honey	Codex Stan	12-1981: Accept. w.s.d.
Dextrose, powdered	Codex Stan	54-1981: Free dist.
Fructose	Codex Stan	102-1981: Free dist.

Volume XI- Codex Standards for Edible Fats and Oils.

Soya Bean Oil	Codex Stan	20-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Arachis Oil	Codex Stan	21-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Cottonseed Oil	Codex Stan	22-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Sunflowerseed Oil	Codex Stan	23-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Rapeseed Oil	Codex Stan	24-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Maize Oil	Codex Stan	25-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Sesameseed Oil	Codex Stan	26-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Safflowerseed Oil	Codex Stan	27-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Olive Oils	Codex Stan	33-1981: Free dist.
Mustardseed Oil	Codex Stan	34-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Low Erucic Acid Rapeseed Oil	Codex Stan	123-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Coconut Oil	Codex Stan	124-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Palm Oils	Codex Stan	125-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Palm Kernel Oil	Codex Stan	126-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Grapeseed Oil	Codex Stan	127-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Babassu Oil	Codex Stan	128-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Lard	Codex Stan	28-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Rendered Pork Fat	Codex Stan	29-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Premier Jus	Codex Stan	30-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Tallow	Codex Stan	31-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.
Margarine	Codex Stan	32-1981: Accept.w.s.d.
Minarine	Codex Stan	135-1981: Accept.w.s.d.
Fats and Oils not covered by Individual Standards	Codex Stan	19-1981: Free dist.u.s.c.

Information about the result of the considerations of the remaining standards will be sent later.

Full details of deviations will be published in the next updating of the Summary of Acceptances.

1) u.s.c. = under specified conditions

2) w.s.d. = with specified deviations

Thailand

Thailand has indicated that it is unable to accept the Codex Standard for Infant Formula. Thailand accompanied its notification of position regarding the above standard with a copy of a Notification of the Ministry of Public Health (No. 85) relating to modified milk for infants and setting out Thai requirements for this product.

United States of America

The U.S.A. has notified Acceptance with Specified Deviations in respect of the following Codex standards:

- Canned Peaches (No. 14)
- Canned Pineapple (No. 42, Rev.1)
- Canned Mushrooms (No. 55)
- Canned Green Peas (No. 58)
- Canned Raspberries (No. 60)
- Canned Pears (No. 61)
- Canned Strawberries (No. 62)

- Grapefruit Juice (No. 46)
- Lemon Juice (No. 47)

Free Entry subject to certain specified conditions has been notified in respect of the following Codex standards:

- Canned Asparagus (No. 56)
- Canned Tropical Fruit Salad (No. 99)
- Powdered Sugar (Icing Sugar) (No. 5)
- Powdered Dextrose (No. 54)
- Fructose (No. 102)

- Quick Frozen Raspberries (No. 69)
- Quick Frozen Peaches (No. 75)
- Quick Frozen Spinach (No. 77)
- Quick Frozen Blueberries (No. 103)
- Quick Frozen Leeks (No. 104)
- Quick Frozen Broccoli (No. 110)
- Quick Frozen Cauliflower (No. 111)
- Quick Frozen Brussel Sprouts (No. 112)
- Quick Frozen Green Beans and Wax Beans (No. 113)
- Quick Frozen French Fried Potatoes (No. 114)
- Quick Frozen Whole Kernel Corn (No. 132)
- Quick Frozen Corn-on-the-Cob (No. 133)

- Quick Frozen Guttled Pacific Salmon (No. 36)
- Quick Frozen Lobsters (No. 95)

- Canned Sardines and Sardine Type Products (No. 94)

The U.S.A. has notified Non-Acceptance of the following Codex standards, accompanied by statements indicating the conditions under which products covered by the standards concerned may be imported into the U.S.A. This is tantamount to Free Entry subject to certain specified conditions:

- Edible Caseinate (No. A.13)
- Sweetened Concentrated Labrusca Type Grape Juice (No. 84)
- Grape Juice (No. 82)
- Concentrated Grape Juice (No. 83)
- Cocoa Butters (No. 86)
- Canned Mandarin Oranges (No. 68)
- White Sugar (No. 4)
- Soft Sugars (No. 6)
- Quick Frozen Bilberries (No. 76)
- Citrus Marmalade (No. 80)

Details of all deviations and of conditions specified in connection with Free Entry will be set out in the next updating of the Summary of Acceptances.

Venezuela

Venezuela is not yet in a position to accept the Codex standards. This not because the standards are unacceptable, but is due to the state of development of our food industry which is not yet able to comply with them. Venezuela is following the work of the Codex with interest and hopes in the near future to be able to indicate its position regarding acceptance of the standards, according to one of the three ways laid down.

Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe has notified Full Acceptance of all Codex MRLs in Volume XIII of the Codex Alimentarius in respect of pesticides registered in that country.

Secretariat Note:

Any further communications received from member governments on the subject of acceptances will be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee at the forthcoming 33rd session.

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS

Food Standards

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Volume I | Explanatory Notes on the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission |
| Volume II | Codex Standards for Processed Fruits and Vegetables and Edible Fungi |
| Volume III | Codex Standards for Sugars (including Honey) |
| Volume IV | Codex Standards for Processed Meat and Poultry Products and Soups and Broths |
| Volume V | Codex Standards for Fish and Fishery Products |
| Volume VI | Codex Standards and Guidelines for the Labelling of Foods and Food Additives |
| Volume VII | Codex Standards for Cocoa Products and Chocolate |
| Volume VIII | Codex Standards for Quick Frozen Fruits and Vegetables |
| Volume IX | Codex Standards for Foods for Special Dietary Uses including Foods for Infants and Children and related Code of Hygienic Practice |
| Volume X | Codex Standards for Fruit Juices, Concentrated Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars |
| Volume XI | Codex Standards for Edible Fats and Oils |
| Volume XII | Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters (European Regional Standard) and Codex Standard for Edible Ices and Ice Mixes |
| Volume XIII | Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Foods |
| Volume XIV | Food Additives (evaluated for their safety in use in food) |
| Volume XV | Codex General Standard for the Irradiation of Food |
| Volume XVI | Codex Standards for Milk Products |
| Volume XVII | Food Contaminants |

Recommended International Codes of Hygienic and/or Technological Practice

- Volume A General Principles of Food Hygiene
 - Volume B Recommended International Codes of Practice for Fish
 and Fishery Products
 - Volume C Recommended International Codes of Practice for Meat
 and Poultry Products
 - Volume D Recommended International Codes of Practice for
 Processed Fruits and Vegetables
 - Volume E Recommended International Codes of Practice for
 Quick Frozen Fruits and Vegetables
 - Volume F Recommended International Code of Practice for Egg
 Products
 - Volume G Recommended International Code of Practice for Low-
 Acid and Acidified Low-Acid Canned Foods
 - Volume H Recommended International Code of Practice for Dried
 Milk
 - Volume J Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food
 (Already issued in the three languages of the
 Commission, but also to be re-issued as Volume J)
-