

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.net

REP11/LAC

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

34th Session

Geneva, Switzerland, 4 – 9 July 2011

REPORT OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Acapulco, Mexico

8 – 12 November 2010

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION E



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.net
CX 3/15.2

CL 2010/54-LAC
November 2010

TO: - Codex Contact Points

- Interested international organizations

FROM: Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission,
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme,
Fax: +39 (06) 5705 4593
Email: codex@fao.org
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Roma, Italia

SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE
FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (REP 11/LAC)

The Report of the 17th Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean will be reviewed at the 34th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Geneva, Switzerland, 4-9 July 2011).

PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION AT THE 34TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Proposed Draft Standards at Step 5/8 of the Procedure

1. Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote (para. 60 and Appendix II).
2. Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Lucuma (para. 67 and Appendix III).

Governments and international organizations wishing to make comments on the above documents should do so in writing in accordance with the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* (Part 3 – Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission) and send them to the above address, preferably by e-mail, **before 28 February 2011**.

PART B: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

3. Matters of importance to the region (para. 146).

Governments wishing to present items (including a discussion paper) on matters of regional interest to be considered at the next session of the Committee should send them in writing to the above address, preferably by e-mail, **before 15 June 2012**.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 17th Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean reached the following conclusions:

MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE 34TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Adoption of proposed draft standards

The Committee agreed to forward:

- The Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote and the Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Lucuma for their adoption at Step 5/8 (omitting steps 6/7) (paras. 60 and 67, Appendixes II and III respectively).

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

The Committee:

- agreed that the issue of traceability/product tracing had been sufficiently discussed; that the available documentation contained adequate guidance for countries; and that the discussion did not therefore need to be reopened (para. 8);
- agreed to submit a series of recommendations regarding measures that the Commission and FAO/WHO could take in connection with private food safety standards (para. 14);
- agreed that a standard for processed cheese was necessary; that the scope of such a standard should address the composition and optional ingredients and should refer to general standards for other aspects; and that two standards could be drawn up, one for processed cheese in general and another for processed cheese preparations (paras. 20-21);
- took note of the comments of the member countries on the new options for the physical working groups but without reaching an agreement on the merit of those options (paras. 24-25);
- agreed that translation software should be tested and that host governments and the Codex Secretariat should keep closely to deadlines for the delivery of documents to facilitate their timely and simultaneous distribution; and that, as regards the length and content of reports, current practice should be continued whereby the report contained a summary of the main aspects of the negotiation process or the relevant discussion points, including differing opinions and minority opinions (paras. 35 and 39);
- provided answers and information to the questionnaire seeking suggestions for the development of the Codex Strategic Plan 2013-2018 (paras. 43-49);
- took note of the written comments submitted on Activity 4.5 (Promote interdisciplinary coordination at the national and regional level) and Activity 5.5 (Enhance participation of non-governmental organizations at international, regional and international levels) of the Codex Strategic Plan 2008-2013 (para. 51);
- agreed that it was important for the main focus of the Trust Fund to remain on Objective 1; that there should be a mechanism to continue supporting the physical participation of countries that had graduated from the Fund but could not afford to participate; that there should be a reconsideration of Trust Fund criteria for countries that had graduated from the Fund and, in this connection, proposed additional criteria; and that the duration of the Fund should be extended (paras. 81-83, 90-93);
- identified capacity building requirements relating to: national food control systems, national Codex structures, participation of consumers in the setting of food standards, use of Codex standards; nutritional issues; participation in Codex work and in FAO/WHO activities relating to scientific advice (paras. 94-127);
- put forward Costa Rica as the new Coordinator for its appointment by the 34th Session of the Commission (para. 128);
- supported the preparation of a global standard for panela; expressed its opinion on the use of Note 161 in the General Standard for Food Additives and the revision of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Committee on Pesticide Residues as regards the elimination of maximum residue limits without scientific justification; and agreed to draft a discussion paper on procedures to adopt regional positions to be examined at the next session (paras 135, 141, 144 and 146).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Conclusions	page iii
Report of the 17th Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean	page 1
Status of Works	page 16
	Paragraphs
Introduction	1
Opening of the Session	2
Adoption of the Provisional Agenda (Agenda Item 1)	3 - 5
Matters arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other subsidiary bodies (Agenda Item 2a)	
Development of guidelines for traceability/product tracing	6 - 8
Consideration of the impact of private standards	9 - 16
Proposed draft standard for processed cheese	17 - 21
New options for physical working groups	22 - 25
Length and content of reports and simultaneous and timely availability of documents	26 - 39
Development of the Codex Strategic Plan 2013-2018	40 - 50
Implementation of the Codex Strategic Plan 2008-2013 (Agenda Item 2b)	51
Consideration of Proposed Draft Codex Standards at Step 4	
Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote (Agenda Item 3a)	52 - 60
Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Lucuma (Agenda Item 3b)	61 - 67
Activities of FAO and WHO complementary to the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission Agenda Item 4a)	
Capacity building	68 - 73
Provision of scientific advice	74 - 75
FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for enhanced participation in Codex (Agenda 4b)	76 - 93
National food control systems, national structures for Codex matters and consumer participation in food standards setting (Agenda Item 5)	94 - 109
Use of Codex Standards and related texts at national and regional level (Agenda Item 6)	110 - 115
Nutritional issues at national and regional levels (Agenda Item 7)	116 - 123
Participation in Codex work and in FAO/WHO activities on scientific advice (Agenda Item 8)	124 - 127
Nomination of the Coordinator (Agenda Item 9)	128 - 129
Issues of significance to the Region (Agenda Item 10)	130 - 131
Other business (Agenda Item 11)	132
Development of a global standard for panela	133 - 135
Use of Note 161 in the General Standard for Food Additives	136 - 141
Revision of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Committee on Pesticide Residues	142 - 144
Development of regional positions by the CCLAC	145 - 146
Date and place of the next session (Agenda Item 12)	147
Appendixes	
<u>Appendix I</u> – List of Participants	page 17
<u>Appendix II</u> – Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote	page 24
<u>Appendix III</u> – Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Lucuma	page 28

INTRODUCTION

1. The 17th Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean was held in Acapulco from 8 to 12 November 2010, at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. The Chairperson of the Committee, Mr Christian Turégano Roldán, Director General, General Bureau of Standards, appointed Ms Ingrid Maciel, International Standardization Director, Ministry of Economy, to act as Vice-chairperson of the Committee. The Session was attended by 61 delegates from 21 member countries, 4 observers from 2 member countries outside the Region, 3 regional organizations and 1 international organization. The list of participants is provided in Appendix I to this report.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. The Session was officially opened by Mr Christian Turégano Roldán. Mr Simón Treviño Alcántara, Director General of Agricultural Development, welcomed the Committee. Dr Maya Piñero, Senior Food Safety and Quality Officer, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and Dr Genaro García, Regional Food Safety Adviser of the PAHO/WHO Veterinary Public Health Unit, Prevention and Control of Disease, addressed the Committee on behalf of FAO and WHO. Dr Karen Huleback, Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, also addressed the Committee.

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda item 1)¹

3. The Committee agreed to consider the following matters in addition to those scheduled for discussion in the provisional agenda under Item 11 (Other Business):

- Development of a global standard for panela (Colombia);
- Use of Note 161 in the General Standard for Food Additives (Costa Rica);
- Revision of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Committee on Pesticide Residues (Costa Rica);
- Development of regional positions by the CCLAC.

4. The Committee adopted the provisional agenda as its agenda for the Session with the above proposals, on the understanding that discussion of these matters would be subject to the availability of time.

5. The Committee agreed that, in view of its heavy agenda, only additional comments to those submitted in writing to the session would be recorded in the report.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 2a)²

6. The Committee noted that matters contained in Part I of the document were presented for information only. The Committee further noted that matters presented in Part II contained a number of questions directed to FAO/WHO coordinating committees by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Codex committees and provided the following comments, recommendations, and conclusions:

Development of guidelines for traceability/product tracing

7. The 32nd Session of the Commission (2009) had endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems to request FAO/WHO coordinating committees to discuss whether there was a need for further guidance on traceability/product tracing and to report back to the 34th Session of the Commission.

8. The Committee agreed that the issue of traceability/product tracing had been sufficiently discussed in Codex and that the Principles for Traceability/Product Tracing as a Tool within a Food Inspection and Certification System (CAC/GL 60-2006) contained adequate guidance for countries and thus the discussion did not need to be reopened.

Consideration of the impact of private standards

9. The Committee discussed the topic based on replies given and other interventions made on the basis of the four questions contained in CL 2010/34-LAC.

10. The Committee noted the contributions from several members on the growing problems encountered with private standards, such as:

- Insistence on stricter provisions than Codex standards, thus marginalizing the SMEs which formed a large part of the producers in the region.
- Deployment as deceptive advertising through the claim that food complying with one standard was safer than food complying with another.
- Formulation in a non-transparent manner and in some cases based on commercial rather than scientific grounds.
- High cost of certification.

¹ CX/LAC 10/17/1.

² CL 2010/34-LAC Parts 1 and 3; CX/LAC 2010/46-LAC Part 1; CX/LAC 10/17/2; CX/LAC 10/17/2-Add.1 (Comments from Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Panama, Uruguay and the IDF). Additional comments from IFT (CRD 1), Chile (CRD 6), Mexico (CRD 8 and 9) and Brazil (CRD 14).

11. The Committee noted the studies carried out by FAO and WHO and presented at the 32nd and 33rd Sessions of the Commission and the request of the Commission to report on the financial implications, but noted that the overall cost of caused by private standards to SMEs and other actors in the supply chain were difficult to calculate, as the loss of potential business also needed to be taken into account together with the cost of higher food prices to consumers. This meant that overall costs could easily be underestimated.

12. The Committee agreed to transmit the information on specific cases from CCLAC members to the Commission (questions 1 to 3) and to concentrate the discussion on actions that the Commission and FAO/WHO could take in the context of private standards (question 4).

13. The Committee stressed the need for Codex to take action, especially on preventing the proliferation of private standards, but recognized that the legal issue of the status of private standards and the extent to which governments could control them was a trade matter that needed to be dealt with by the WTO SPS and TBT Committees.

14. The Committee agreed to submit the following recommendations to the Commission:

- Codex and its sister organizations (IPPC and OIE) needed to be strengthened and to work in closer cooperation with each other and with the WTO SPS and TBT Committees.
- An intergovernmental task force could be established comprising the CAC, OIE and IPPC, tasked with monitoring standards produced by other non-governmental organizations and reporting back to the WTO SPS and TBT Committees.
- The Codex Secretariat should continue to participate actively in the WTO SPS Committee.
- Members should actively promote the work of Codex, stressing its scientific basis, and should use modern information technology in the formulation of Codex standards and related texts.
- A request for an increase in budget for scientific advice should be addressed to WHO and FAO to hasten Codex response to food safety matters.
- Codex standards should be the only reference for food safety.
- Marketing on the basis of private safety standards, particularly when those standards were more stringent than the Codex standards, should be considered as misleading advertising.

15. The Committee noted the opinion of some members that members should be encouraged to abide by Article 13 of the WTO SPS Agreement.

16. The Committee also noted the information provided by the Chairperson of the Commission that the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI), a private initiative aimed at setting benchmarks for private standards to facilitate trade, had agreed to a project with FAO for benchmarking to a Codex standard.

Proposed draft standard for processed cheese

17. The Committee recalled that the 33rd Session of the Commission had decided to revoke existing Codex standards for processed cheese (CODEX STAN 285, 286 and 287). The Commission had also discussed the discontinuation of work on a standard for processed cheese but, recognizing the importance to many countries of having an international standard for processed cheese, had agreed to defer decision on this matter until its 34th Session. The Commission had requested interested FAO/WHO coordinating committees to discuss the need for and scope of regional standards for processed cheese, with a view to taking a decision on the discontinuation of work on an international standard for processed cheese on the basis of the recommendations of the FAO/WHO coordinating committees.³

18. Following this decision, the Codex Secretariat had requested comments in CL 2010/34-LAC on: i) the need for a standard on processed cheese and the rationale for such a standard, in other words, whether there was a problem or potential problem in the trade of these products, and; (ii) the scope of such a standard, i.e. the compositional aspects of products to be covered by the standard.

19. The Delegation of Mexico stated that there was no need for such a standard as this topic had been discussed at length at the 9th meeting of the Committee on Milk and Milk Products and at the last session of the Commission.

20. The Committee agreed to transmit to the Commission its opinion that a Codex standard for processed cheese was necessary as the revocation of existing standards meant that there was no longer harmonized international guidance. Diversified national legislation and the absence of international standards could lead to trade barriers, misleading trade practices and problems of market access. Specific problems noted related to differences in trade practices and tariffs. Also mentioned was the countries' lack of resources for research to develop their own standards. A further observation was that formulating a new standard for processed cheese did not prevent the use of innovative technologies.

³ ALINORM 10/33/REP, paras 89 – 93.

21. As to the scope of a standard for processed cheese, the Committee agreed that this should address the composition and optional ingredients and refer to general standards in other aspects (for example food additives should be addressed in the General Standard for Food Additives). It was mentioned that there could be two standards, one for processed cheese in general and another for processed cheese preparations.

New options for physical working groups

22. The Chairperson of the Commission introduced the item and recalled that the 64th Session of the Executive Committee had discussed new options for physical working groups so that they could operate more effectively and efficiently in smaller groups, while increasing the possibility of ensuring input from all regions. In this regard, the Executive Committee had decided to submit the proposals to the FAO/WHO coordinating committees, especially as they referred to the involvement of regional representatives.

23. It was proposed to give Codex committees the option to set up physical working groups with membership restricted to two or three relevant experts from each of the Codex regions. To ensure transparency and inclusiveness, it was proposed to develop a set of expected responsibilities for regional expert representatives, such as circulating draft working group documents to the countries in their region for comment. A new mechanism for the Codex Trust Fund could also be developed to support developing country representatives in such working groups.

24. While some delegations felt that they could agree to such new options if there was a clear procedure in place on how to select the regional experts, others considered that restricting the possibility of each member country participating contrasted with the need for transparency.

25. The Committee did not agree with additional options for physical working groups that restricted the possibility of each member country participating in such working groups and informed the Executive Committee accordingly.

Length and content of reports and simultaneous and timely availability of documents: *Discussion paper on timely and simultaneous distribution of documents and length and content of reports*

26. The Committee recalled that the 32nd Session of the Commission had agreed⁴ that Chile, supported by other countries, would prepare a discussion paper for the Committee on General Principles that would include recommendations on ways to ensure the timely distribution of documents and on the length and content of reports. The 26th Session of the Committee on General Principles in 2010⁵ had briefly considered the paper and had agreed that it would be discussed at the CCLAC and submitted for information to the other FAO/WHO coordinating committees and that the item should remain on the agenda of the CCGP.

27. The delegation of Chile introduced the document containing proposals for the topics of timely and simultaneous availability of documents and length and content of reports. The Delegation indicated that timely availability should also imply simultaneous distribution, but it did not propose holding one language version back until the others were ready.

Simultaneous and timely distribution of documents

28. In regard to the timely availability of documents, the Delegation of Chile made the following proposals: (1) increase the availability of translation services by providing additional funds for such services, for example using the Trust Fund or SDTF; (2) strengthen the Codex Secretariat and; (3) use machine translation.

29. The Codex Secretariat indicated that the delay in document distribution was not so much a problem of funding but rather of timing and organization as the original working documents arrived late, sometimes because of delays in the Secretariat and sometimes because delivered late by working groups or members. Additional resources for translation would thus not solve the problem. The Secretariat further recalled that the translation of documents was the responsibility not only of the Secretariat, but also of the host governments in the case of all Codex committees, with the exception of the FAO/WHO coordinating committees, the Executive Committee and the Commission, and that the translation services provided by FAO were not for the exclusive use of Codex. They had been reduced over time with an increasing trend towards outsourcing. More funds for translation would need to be requested from the governing body of FAO. The Secretariat noted, concerning option (2), that this could speed up some documents, but only those under the Secretariat's direct responsibility, and possibly the finalization of certain reports.

30. Concerning proposal (3) on machine translation, the Chair of the CCLAC informed the Committee that, in line with the Executive Committee's proposal, part of the report of the current meeting would be machine translated and submitted to delegations for review alongside the document translated by translators.

31. The Delegation of Mexico, as host country of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, informed the Committee that it was not always possible to have all documents in all languages at the same time, as some arrived at the last minute and translation costs were higher if the work was urgent. As regards the availability of committee reports, the delegations indicated that there was sometimes a delay between the dispatch of the finalized version by the host government and its posting on the Codex website.

32. A delegation noted that there had also been complaints from French-speaking countries about the late availability of documents. Host countries should adhere strictly to deadlines. More time could be scheduled between meetings to facilitate this. If one language version was missing, the other versions should not be distributed.

⁴ ALINORM 09/32/REP, para 194.

⁵ ALINORM 10/33/33, paras 99 – 103.

33. The Codex Secretariat indicated that the majority of Codex delegations had to work in languages that were not their national language and thus depended on the early availability of at least one version of the documents.
34. The PAHO/WHO Representative suggested that requests for a strengthening of CCLAC activities, including the use of machine translation, should be forwarded to the annual meeting of the PAHO/WHO Directing Council through the Region's ministers of health.
35. The Committee agreed that translation software should be tested and that host governments and the Codex Secretariat should keep closely to deadlines.

Length and content of reports

36. With regard to the length of reports, the Delegation of Chile mentioned that its proposals took into account the fact that the reports were very useful for countries that were unable to attend meetings and that were interested not only in the outcome of those meetings, but also in the related discussions and negotiation process.
37. They thus proposed that while the main objective of reporting the results could be maintained, there should also be either: (1) a summary of the main aspects of the negotiation process or the relevant discussion points, including differing opinions (as well as minority opinions); or (2) an appendix providing a more detailed account of the content of the negotiation process with the positions of individual countries; or (3) expedited and facilitated access to recordings of members' contributions to the negotiating process at the relevant session in all languages.
38. The Codex Secretariat indicated that reports were prepared in accordance with Rule X.1 of the Codex Rules of Procedure and the guidance provided in the *Guidelines on the conduct of meetings of Codex committees and ad hoc intergovernmental task forces*. This was also in line with the decision adopted at the 62nd session⁶ of the Executive Committee and with Chile's proposal under option (1).
39. The Committee agreed that report drafting should continue to follow current practice, in line with proposal (1), as it was important that the debate be part of the report, and not an appendix, and audio-recordings might not be easy to make available.

Development of the Codex Strategic Plan 2013-2018

40. The Committee recalled that the 33rd Session of the Commission had directed the Bureau to prepare a questionnaire to seek suggestions from the FAO/WHO coordinating committees for the next Strategic Plan 2013-2018. The Secretariat had distributed the questionnaire in CL 2010/46-LAC.
41. The Chairperson of the Commission stated that the Strategic Plan was an important tool available to the Commission and Executive Committee to measure progress of each committee and if necessary suggest corrective action. The current Plan was the first to include indicators of success and had also been developed by the Bureau. For the new Strategic Plan 2013-2018, the Bureau had decided to widen from the beginning the input sought from all stakeholders and partner organisations.
42. The Committee discussed the five questions individually.
- a. *Are the current five goals still relevant? What changes would you propose (if any)?*
43. The Committee agreed that the current goals were still pertinent and placed special emphasis on the need to strengthen the capacity of developing countries to generate data and support to the bodies providing scientific advice to Codex.
- b. *The 2003-2007 Framework did not include measurable indicators, as does the current Strategic Plan. Should the next Strategic Plan include measurable indicators? Is the current "table" format useful or would you suggest changes? For example, is it useful to track "ongoing" activities?*
44. The Committee agreed that there should be indicators in the Plan to measure efficacy (if the goal had been achieved) and efficiency (how the goal had been achieved and how the resources had been used).
- c. *What are the most significant challenges facing Codex? What goals/activities should be included in the next Plan to insure that these challenges receive the necessary attention?*
45. The following issues were mentioned:
- Reacting in a timely manner to new topics and needs, such as new chemical hazards, viruses and diseases; or new technologies, such as of nanotechnology, that needed to be examined;
 - Updating of standards to reflect scientific progress;
 - Dealing with the proliferation of private standards;
 - Ensuring that Codex standards remain fundamentally based on scientific evidence;
 - Commercial interest should not influence decisions or stop a process and delay Codex work;
 - MRLs should not be removed without scientific basis;

⁶ ALINORM 09/32/3, para 140.

- Actively promoting the application and understanding of Codex texts;
- Increasing the speed of Codex standard-setting.

d. *Given the fact that developing country participation in the work of Codex is presently a major issue, what goals/activities should be included in the next Plan to ensure that this issue receives the necessary attention in 2013-2018?*

46. The following issues were mentioned:

- Special attention should be given to promoting the effective participation of all members;
- Technical assistance should be given to national Codex committees;
- There should be a review of the allocation of Trust Fund money to generate more effective participation (see item 4b);
- The capacity of developing countries to generate data should be strengthened.

e. *Do current Codex structures and procedures adequately meet present needs of members (i.e. various “step procedure” options, critical review by CCEXEC, etc.)? What changes might be considered?*

47. The current structure was seen as appropriate on the whole and the following additional remarks were made:

- The need to observe deadlines set for the submission of documents;
- The Procedural Manual should provide guidance on reaching an equitable geographical distribution of Codex committees;
- The conditions under which a standard could be held at step 8 should be reviewed;
- Discussion on how to reach consensus in Codex should be ongoing in order to foster a better understanding of what this meant in the context of Codex.

f. *The Commission operates in an environment of change and technological advancement. Should issues such as the food safety consequences of climate change and new production technologies such as nanotechnology be reflected in the new Strategic Plan? If so, how?*

48. The Committee was of the opinion that relevance and prudence should reign when taking on new topic areas and that it was important to avoid widening the spectrum too much. The Committee did not agree that Codex should start discussions on the impact of climate change on food safety, but instead felt that it should concentrate on concrete areas closer to its expertise and mandate, such as the impact of nanotechnology on food safety. If a new topic such as climate change was discussed, Codex needed to ensure that this did not conflict with the UN Convention on Climate Change.

49. The Committee agreed that a strategic plan was a plan of action that was measurable through indicators and that, while it was open to new topics, these should be directly related to food safety.

50. The Representative of FAO informed the Committee that FAO/WHO had held an expert consultation on the use of nanotechnology in food, which had stressed the need for risk assessment in this area. The impact of climate change on food safety had been one of the issues discussed at a recent FAO conference on climate change.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODEX STRATEGIC PLAN 2008-2013 (Agenda Item 2b)⁷

51. The Committee took note of the written comments submitted on Activity 4.5 (Promote interdisciplinary coordination at the national and regional level) and Activity 5.5 (Enhance participation of non-governmental organizations at international, regional and national levels) of the Strategic Plan and had no additional comments to make on these matters.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AT STEP 4

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX REGIONAL STANDARD FOR CULANTRO COYOTE (Agenda Item 3a)⁸

52. The Delegation of Costa Rica, as coordinating country of the electronic Working Group on Culantro Coyote, introduced CRD 18 containing a revised version of the Proposed Draft Standard based on the written comments submitted to this session.

53. The Committee considered the revised text and made the following comments and conclusions:

54. The Delegation of Panama requested a clarification of the term “bundle” and a rewording of the definition of the product.

⁷ CL 2010/18-LAC Part A and CL 2010/34-LAC Part 2. CX/LAC 10/17/3 (Comments from Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic and Panama). Additional comments from Cuba (CRD 5); Mexico (CRD 7); Peru (CRD 10); Haiti (CRD 11); Jamaica (CRD 12); and Chile (CRD 15).

⁸ CX/LAC 10/17/4. CX/LAC 10/17/4-Add.1 (Comments from Argentina, Colombia and Panama). CRD 18 Revised Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote (Costa Rica).

Minimum requirement - provisions for moisture

55. The Delegation of Colombia felt that the provisions for minimum requirements needed to indicate that the product should be free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage, as excess moisture could cause damage (spoilage) to the produce. It was noted that provisions for moisture were generally applied in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and should therefore be retained in this standard.

56. The Delegation of Costa Rica explained that while this was a common provision for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, it did not apply to culantro coyote due to the post-harvest handling of this produce whereby the bundles of culantro coyote went through a process of washing cycles, as the leaves separated from their central stem and therefore lost moisture. The Delegation noted that washing the culantro coyote kept it moist; that there was no drying in the processing of culantro coyote, as the bundles would dehydrate very rapidly; and that moist culantro coyote leaves were considered to cool better and dehydrate less, thus extending a bundle's shelf life. The Delegation further explained that due to the nature of the produce (i.e. a low-growing herb), the leaves were subject to microbial and chemical contamination, so washing also helped to preserve the safety and quality of the final product.

Quality classes - percentages of defects for Class II

57. The Delegation of Colombia noted that the percentages of defects listed for Class II were high and should be reduced to 10%, which was the value normally used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables for this class. A value of 20% would allow a considerable amount of produce to be defective, greatly affecting its appearance when supplied fresh to the consumer, which would not be acceptable.

58. The Delegation of Costa Rica explained that the percentages of white blemishes had been reduced to 15% in view of phytosanitary concerns associated to this defect. However, the percentages for the presence of broken and split leaves were kept at 20% because, although the produce was marketed fresh and whole (intact), it did not oxidize or alter its taste when split. In addition, the produce was usually consumed in the form of split leaves. The Delegation further explained that the 20% presence of broken and split leaves for this class was also connected to the post-harvest treatment (three washing cycles) which could cause some mechanical damage to leaves. In this regard, it was noted that leaves of this class should not be used for decorative purposes.

59. In view of the above explanation, the Committee agreed to retain the 20% presence of broken and split leaves for Class II. The Delegation of Colombia expressed its reservation on this decision.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT REGIONAL STANDARD FOR CULANTRO COYOTE

60. The Committee agreed to forward the Proposed Draft Regional Standard to the 34th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix II).

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX REGIONAL STANDARD FOR LUCUMA (Agenda Item 3b)⁹

61. The Delegation of Peru, as coordinating country of the electronic working group on Lucuma, introduced CRD 17 containing a revised version of the Proposed Draft Standard based on the written comments submitted to this session.

62. The Committee considered the revised document and made the following comments and conclusions:

63. The Delegation of Colombia felt that provisions for sizing should not be associated with quality classes and that the second table in Section 3 should therefore be removed. The Delegation noted that associating quality classes and sizing grades was not a usual practice in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

64. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that examples existed of such a practice, for instance asparagus where sizing ranges were associated to quality classes. This was not common practice in the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables but could be justified on the basis of industry/trading practices and the nature of the produce.

65. The Delegation of Peru explained that Table 2 reflected current trading practices for lucuma and that these helped preserve the quality of the product, as there might be varieties adapted to the provisions of the quality class but not worthy for such class in terms of their shape (size).

66. In view of the above explanation, the Committee agreed to retain the second table associating the quality classes with the size of the fruit in Section 3. The Delegation of Colombia expressed its reservation on this decision.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT REGIONAL STANDARD FOR LUCUMA

67. The Committee agreed to forward the Proposed Draft Regional Standard to the 34th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix III).

⁹ CX/LAC 10/17/4. CX/LAC 10/17/4-Add.1 (Comments from Argentina and Colombia). CRD 17 Revised Proposed Draft Codex Regional Standard for Lucuma (Peru).

ACTIVITIES OF FAO AND WHO COMPLEMENTARY TO THE WORK OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (Agenda Item 4a)¹⁰**PART I: CAPACITY BUILDING****FAO**

68. The Representative of FAO introduced Part I of the document that complemented the document on food safety capacity building activities presented at the 33rd Session of the Commission and the document presented at the 31st Session of the FAO Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean¹¹. He explained that in the conclusions of the 31st Session of the FAO Regional Conference for LAC, all the sub-regions had identified food safety as a priority in their work programmes and in their capacity building needs.

69. The Representative stressed that there were more than 15 ongoing national FAO technical assistance projects in the region, together with three sub-regional and 5 regional projects. In addition, two draft sub-regional TCP projects on strengthening food control safety systems had been developed for Caribbean countries. The ongoing work on regional project TCP/RLA/3213 on designing food safety policy and strengthening food control systems was briefly explained as a highly significant project involving 13 LAC countries with key outputs such as the development of indicators for measuring food safety impact, the evaluation of existing food control systems needs, and national action plans.

70. Additional activities were mentioned, including training on good hygienic practices for indigenous food products for the Aymara people in the Andean sub-region; guidance and practical documents on food safety in emergency and disaster situations (Chile, Haiti); a training workshop on new Codex electronic tools held prior to the meeting of the Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses; an activity on risk assessment and development of risk-based standards held prior to the 17th Session of the CCLAC; and a food safety communication and radio campaign in the languages of the indigenous populations.

71. With regard to training materials, the Representative mentioned the new manual on the safety evaluation of genetically modified organisms; and three new FAO/RLC regional electronic courses on good hygienic practices, food control systems and risk analysis.

72. The Forum held on integrating food security and food safety policies was highlighted as a unique approach in the region. The importance of recent conferences on climate change and the FAO document relating to its effect on food safety and the FAO/WHO expert consultation on nanotechnology were also mentioned.

WHO/PAHO

73. The Representative of WHO/PAHO referred to the following food safety capacity building activities:

- A PRE-INFAL workshop on “Regional and Global Networks for Food Safety and its Importance for Risk Analysis Processes” (Brasilia, Brazil, 22 November 2010);
- 5th Assembly of the Inter-American Network of Food Analysis Laboratories (INFAL) (Brasilia, Brazil, 23-26 November 2010);
- First Global Forum of Emergency Focal Points – International Food Safety Authorities Network (INFOSAN) (Abu Dhabi, Arab Emirates, 13-16 December 2010);
- Training on risk analysis. Phase 1: Manuals on food risk assessment and management and training workshops (ANVISA-WHO/PAHO) (Brazil, 2008-2010, ongoing);
- Training on risk analysis. Phase 2: Training and application of qualitative and quantitative risk assessment for food risk management priority (ANVISA-WHO/PAHO) (Brazil, beginning of 2011);
- Training and application of GAP, GMP, HACCP and audits for the production of safe food (Ministry of Agriculture of Brazil and WHO/PAHO);
- Workshop for the characterization of the food safety system by using tools developed by IICA and PAHO called Handbook for Performance Level Characterization, Vision and Strategy of Food Safety Systems. The outcome of this inter-sectoral workshop is a status report on: legislation and regulations; epidemiological surveillance and monitoring of contaminants; and risk analysis programmes and education on food safety. This report helps set a baseline and identify priorities for technical assistance (Mexico, first trimester 2011).

¹⁰ CX/LAC 10/17/6.

¹¹ LARC/10/INF/9.

PART II: PROVISION OF SCIENTIFIC ADVICE

74. The FAO JECFA Secretary, referring to Part II of CX/LAC 10/17/6 and to the workshop on food safety risk assessment held prior to the meeting, highlighted ongoing FAO and WHO activities in the area of scientific advice. She reported that JEMRA was currently developing web-based support tools for: i) decision-making in the control of Salmonella and Campylobacter in poultry and; ii) performance assessment of microbiological sampling plans. She also indicated that countries interested in taking part in the pilot testing of the tools should contact FAO and WHO for more details. She encouraged delegations to consider the information in the document on how to request, use and contribute to the scientific advice process, by taking part in the prioritization of topics, disseminating calls for data and experts issued by FAO and WHO to the widest possible audience, and generating and submitting relevant local data.

75. In addition, she informed the Committee that FAO had developed a strategy for the provision of scientific advice for 2010-2013 to attract extra-budgetary resources¹², within the framework of the FAO/WHO Global Initiative for Food-related Scientific Advice (GIFSA), and that this strategy aimed to enhance the provision of scientific advice, facilitate the dissemination of scientific information, strengthen national and regional scientific capacity, and build scientific networks.

FAO/WHO PROJECT AND TRUST FUND FOR ENHANCED PARTICIPATION IN CODEX (Agenda Item 4b)¹³

76. The Codex Secretariat introduced the item and recalled that the 33rd Session of the Commission and the 64th Session of the Executive Committee had extensively discussed the mid-term review of the Codex Trust Fund (CTF)¹⁴. Subsequently, FAO/WHO had submitted five interlinked questions to the FAO/WHO coordinating committees to gather information and feedback on critical issues in each region for use as a basis for determining the strategic and operational direction of the CTF in the next six years. The Secretariat further recalled that the three main objectives of the CTF were to: (1) widen participation in Codex; (2) strengthen overall participation in Codex, and; (3) enhance scientific/technical participation in Codex.

77. The Committee noted that there had been general agreement at the 33rd Session of the Commission that the CTF had helped developing countries increase their participation in Codex, thus largely meeting Objective 1. There was agreement on the need to gradually shift CTF resources from Objective 1 to Objectives 2 and 3 (as quality of participation was an important factor); however, the 64th Session of the Executive Committee had called for caution in this regard as physical participation was still an important aspect.

Question 1: Should there be a shift in emphasis from Objective 1 to Objectives 2 and 3?

78. Some delegations felt it was necessary to emphasize Objectives 2 and 3. Funding of participation had been successful but had in many cases only led to passive participation. More active and effective participation was needed.

79. Several delegations stated that if Objectives 2 and 3 were strengthened, resources for Objective 1 would decrease but many countries still needed funds to travel to Codex meetings. They felt that capacity building activities were already organised by FAO and WHO, and that those objectives could in general be financed from other sources.

80. A delegation proposed that the fund should recognise that countries had different needs. Some countries had the funds to send delegates but needed other forms of assistance.

81. After discussion, the Committee agreed that it was important for the main focus of the Trust Fund to remain on Objective 1, therefore question 2 was not considered.

Question 3: Should there be a mechanism to continue support for the physical participation for those who need it most (including graduates who cannot sustain participation)?

82. The Committee agreed that there should be a mechanism for countries that had graduated from the Fund but were unable to afford participation.

Question 4: Should there be re-consideration of the criteria for allocation of support?

83. The Committee agreed that the graduation/eligibility criteria for the Trust Fund should be changed.

84. Many delegations mentioned that there should be criteria to measure whether the participation of a country in a given meeting had been effective.

85. One delegation did not agree with the way funds were currently distributed on the basis of per capita income. This placed a particular burden on smaller countries, as travel costs were the same for all but the administrative budget of small economies was more limited. The criteria should thus take country size into account.

86. The FAO Representative stated that the index used to classify the eligibility of countries had been taken from the United Nations and World Bank statistics, and that according to these criteria most countries from the region had already graduated.

¹² Available in English, French and Spanish at http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/agns/advice_en.asp; http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/agns/advice_fr.asp and http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/agns/advice_es.asp.

¹³ CL 2010/46-LAC Part 2. CX/LAC 10/17/7 (comments of Colombia, Costa Rica and Panama). Additional comments of Mexico (CRD 9) and Brazil (CRD 14).

¹⁴ CX/CAC 10/33/14-Add.1.

87. Several delegations proposed that Trust Fund applications should be evaluated on the basis of quality of previous participation and preparation for meetings, such as providing written comments on national positions and other criteria to measure the impact of participation.

88. Other delegations said that it could be difficult for new delegations to participate effectively from the first meeting and that some countries had never participated twice in a meeting. Also mentioned was the problem of who would evaluate applications on the basis of such criteria, especially given that the Trust Fund secretariat was already overburdened with work.

89. The Committee agreed to use as a basis the criteria contained in the report of its 16th session¹⁵ and to discuss how to adapt these criteria in an in-session working group chaired by Costa Rica.

90. The Committee agreed with the conclusions of the in-session working group and proposed additional criteria to be used for re-assessing eligibility for further funding from the Codex Trust Fund for countries that had graduated from the fund in accordance with existing criteria. Countries that still met requirements and were eligible for funding under existing criteria would continue to be evaluated and funded based on those criteria.

91. Countries that had graduated and were thus currently not eligible for funding but whose circumstances meant they still needed financing and support for their effective participation in Codex, and that wished to continue using the Fund's resources for a further period of five years, should submit justification for the continuation of support.

Once their re-entry to the Fund had been justified, they could be selected according to the following criteria:

- (1) Submission of their national position on the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission or any of its committees. "National position" meant the results of preparatory work to topics of interest.
- (2) Justification of the relevance and importance of their participation in the Codex Alimentarius Commission or any of its committees, based on impact on public health and on economic, commercial, normative or institutional aspects. For commodity committees, the desired participation should be justified on the basis of relevant information on the countries' exports and imports.

92. Countries could submit their proposals in the form of a project document (as is done to justify a new work in Codex). The proposals would be evaluated by the Codex Trust Fund administration.

Question 5: Should the lifespan of the Codex Trust Fund be extended?

93. Also in light of the replies given to the previous questions, the Committee fully agreed that the lifespan of the CTF should be extended.

NATIONAL FOOD CONTROL SYSTEMS, NATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR CODEX MATTERS, AND CONSUMER PARTICIPATION IN FOOD STANDARDS SETTING (Agenda Item 5)¹⁶

94. The Committee noted written comments submitted in response to CL 2010/18-LAC Part B and, in particular, recorded the following comments in relation to the need for capacity building in food control systems, national structures for Codex matters, and consumer participation in food standards setting. One general observation was that regional reference laboratories needed to be established to enhance food safety systems.

95. Several delegations mentioned the ongoing detailed evaluation of the needs and priorities of the food control system, for the purpose of strengthening that system, as part of regional project FAO TCP/RLA/3213. The outcome of this evaluation would be an additional contribution to the information provided under this Agenda Item.

BOLIVIA

Capacity building in food control systems

96. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

- capacity building for laboratories for the detection of pesticide and veterinary drug residues in food;
- capacity building to implement an internal and external alert system;
- capacity building to implement a risk analysis system based on the guidelines of the Codex Alimentarius;
- strengthening capabilities for the detection of food contaminants (e.g. mycotoxins, heavy metals, etc.);
- strengthening the improvement of systems for the quality assurance of analytical results in official laboratories;
- strengthening inspection and certification capabilities of the current food safety control and monitoring system;
- strengthening capabilities for the implementation of food safety assurance systems (HACCP).

¹⁵ ALINORM 09/32/36, Appendix 2.

¹⁶ CL 2010/18-LAC Part B. CX/LAC 10/17/8 (Comments from Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay). Additional comments from Mexico (CRD 7); Peru (CRD 10); Haiti (CRD 11); Jamaica (CRD 12); and Chile (CRD 15).

Capacity building in national Codex structures

97. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

- training for delegates to strengthen their participation in meetings including negotiation techniques;
- training for members of the National Codex Alimentarius Committee and members of the committees to improve the wording and substance of national positions;
- strengthening research institutions for the development of studies supporting Codex activities.

BRAZIL**Capacity building in food control systems**

98. The Delegation indicated that capacity building was needed to increase awareness and knowledge about food safety and quality issues among consumers and consumer organizations by improving risk communication activities such as sanitary alert systems.

COLOMBIA**Capacity building in food control systems**

99. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

- capacity building for laboratories, risk-based inspection systems and consumer participation in the system;
- strengthening and articulation of information systems;
- narrowing the existing gap between Codex standards and other technical sanitary references, which delayed the updating of standards;
- strengthening technical and analytical capacity of laboratories;
- strengthening scientific data generation resulting from information systems and coordination of the country's research agendas in relation to food safety.

Capacity building in national Codex structures

- establishment of effective mechanisms for communication, cooperation and integration of Codex contact points and national Codex committees for countries of the Andean Region and the CCLAC;
- technical assistance to improve communication and response of stakeholders, including industry, the scientific community and the general public, to the functioning and importance of Codex in the country.

COSTA RICA

100. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

Capacity building in food control systems

- technical advice to help the country implement the action plan for strengthening the food control system based on the successful experiences of other countries;
- technical and financial assistance for the development of a food safety information system in order to establish a digital system that combines existing information from each institution connected with food safety;
- technical assistance for the development of risk-based inspection protocols;
- training and awareness on national activities and document management systems.

Capacity building in national Codex structures

- development of an awareness and information campaign to publicize, among the production and academic sector, the importance of participating in Codex work and its mirror committees.

Capacity building in consumer participation in food standards setting

- development of an awareness and information campaign to raise consumer' awareness of Codex work.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

101. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

Capacity building in food control systems

- strengthening the participation of national experts at FAO/WHO scientific meetings/consultations e.g. JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA.
- development of a national food safety policy;
- lack of an executive body coordinating different government sectors involved in food safety;
- technical assistance to integrate risk-based inspection, including training in risk-based inspection and microbiology;
- technical assistance for laboratory accreditation with ISO 1705;
- technical assistance to determine the impact of food-borne diseases on the economy and public health.

102. The Delegation also indicated shortcomings concerning the availability of laboratories to perform validated tests or analyses. There were no available techniques for conducting special tests, such as determining dioxins and furans in food and carrying out analyses of hormone residues in meat and radioactivity tests in food and water. Similarly, although the country had the necessary equipment for the analysis of pesticide residues in fruit and vegetables, such tests were not yet performed. Its laboratories needed to be upgraded, as did its facilities, technical staff, equipment and techniques, and its quality management programmes and systems.

103. The Delegation referred to the following limitations of the inspection services:

- the skills and training of inspection service staff needed to be improved. The profile of inspectors and/or auditors needed to change to include staff capabilities and, above all, values, besides the professional aspects;
- deficiencies in the inspection activities of institutions responsible for implementing current regulations.

104. There was therefore a need for technical assistance in updated inspection programmes and in programmes to strengthen the training of staff involved in different regulatory and inspection activities, including programmes for the certification of laboratory testing and the calibration of control and measurement equipment.

MEXICO

105. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

Capacity building in food control systems

- raising the awareness of government sectors in order to implement food safety and quality throughout the food chain;
- dissemination of courses and manuals on good agricultural practices and food handling;
- strengthening information databases;
- providing staff training through specialized courses on food-risk assessment, information technologies and management and the design and implementation of food safety policies;

Capacity building in national Codex structures

- introductory courses on Codex to enable participants of Codex meetings to understand the functioning and main operating rules of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (e.g. Procedural Manual). This could be done through CD or online training courses.
- strengthening using technological tools allowing easy access to Codex information, in particular the CCLAC webpage.

Capacity building in consumer participation in food standards setting

- training on international strategies to foster consumer participation.

PANAMA

106. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

Capacity building in national Codex structures

- strengthening official food safety systems through the use of the risk-analysis framework including risk-assessment of food hazards;
- enhancing laboratory capacity in relation to food safety and the planning and implementation of risk-based food inspection systems;
- strengthening the safety management of food and feed (including the application of good hygienic practices, good agricultural practices, good manufacturing practices and quality assurance systems based on HACCP) by producers and processors;
- facilitating access and the provision of national scientific contributions to international risk assessments.

PARAGUAY

107. The Delegation highlighted the following aspects:

Capacity building in food control systems and national Codex structures

108. The country needed an integrated food control system to enhance its analytical capabilities. Paraguay was receiving corresponding assistance from Project TCP/RLA 3213 (Assistance for strengthening and/or designing food safety policies for countries of the region).

109. In this regard, the following needs were identified:

- establishment of accredited national reference laboratories permitting risk assessment, effective participation in Codex meetings and the generation of data at the national level to support country-level positions on issues of importance to Paraguay and the region;
- systems of detection and quantification of pesticides, heavy metals and mycotoxins;
- establishment of national and regional food inspection and control programmes focused on quality and safety aspects, taking into account Codex standards;
- training to strengthen food inspection and certification systems;
- strengthening the focal point for the communication of national positions to the CCLAC and the Codex Secretariat;
- establishing mechanisms or programmes for the traceability of plant products;
- strengthening the implementation of good agricultural practices and good manufacturing practices;
- creation and implementation of early warning systems for food safety;
- dissemination of healthy and nutritious eating habits that focus on quality of life of the population.

USE OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL (Agenda Item 6)¹⁷

110. The Committee noted the written comments submitted in response to CL 2010/18-LAC Part C and, in particular, recorded the following comments in relation to the use of Codex standards and related texts at national and regional level.

111. The Delegation of Colombia indicated that there were difficulties in the application of provisions in general standards vis-à-vis related provisions in commodity standards e.g. food additive provisions in the General Standard for Food Additives and corresponding provisions in commodity standards.

112. The FAO JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that the issue of inconsistencies between food additive provisions in the GSFA and in the commodity standards had been discussed at the Committee on Food Additives. In this regard, an electronic working group had been established to prepare proposals for the alignment of the food additive provisions of the five Codex standards for meat products with the food additive provisions of the corresponding food categories of the GSFA, including an analysis of the problems and solutions identified when carrying out this work. The discussion paper would be presented for consideration by the next session of the CCFA (2011) and the outcome of discussion on this matter could lead to broader guidance on how to deal with inconsistencies between food additive provisions in commodity standards and those in GSFA¹⁸. The Secretariat further explained that full correspondence between food additive provisions in the GSFA and in the commodity standards was only possible if there was one-to-one correspondence between the scope/definition of the commodity standard and the corresponding food category of the GSFA.

113. The Delegation of Costa Rica indicated that to strengthen the use of Codex standards, Codex should adopt a proactive policy of encouraging member countries to base their national legislation on Codex standards. The Delegation referred in particular to compliance with Maximum Residue Limits, as some Codex members applied stricter MRLs than those defined by Codex. In this regard, a pilot project of the Committee on Pesticide Residues was mentioned in which the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) would conduct an independent, parallel review together with a global joint review team and would recommend MRLs before national governments established them¹⁹. The Delegation invited CCLAC member countries to closely follow this novel approach that could facilitate the harmonization of MRLs for pesticide residues at international level.

114. The Delegation of Bolivia mentioned that the Spanish translations of Codex texts did not correspond exactly to the English version, causing leading to in the application of provisions. In addition, the lack of enforcement of Codex standards in the food regulations of countries hampered the implementation of those standards.

115. The Delegation of Mexico indicated that the use of Codex standards could be strengthened by training technical staff through participation at international forums.

¹⁷ CL 2010/18-LAC: Part C. CX/LAC 10/17/9 (Comments from Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay). Additional comments from Mexico (CRD 7), Peru (CRD 10), Haiti (CRD 11), Jamaica (CRD 12) and Chile (CRD 15).

¹⁸ ALINORM 10/33/12 paras. 151-161.

¹⁹ ALINORM 10/33/24 paras. 195-202.

NUTRITIONAL ISSUES AT NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVELS (Agenda Item 7)²⁰

116. The Committee noted the written comments submitted in response to CL 2010/18-LAC Part D and, in particular, recorded the following comments in relation to nutritional issues at national and regional levels.

117. The Delegation of Bolivia indicated that technical assistance was needed to implement a system of nutritional surveillance and food control.

118. The Delegation of Brazil considered that the impact of food labelling on the nutritional status of the population and public health should not be separated from nutritional education. It was necessary to work on a greater understanding of food labelling by consumers.

119. The Delegation of Colombia stated the need for technical assistance to implement mandatory food fortification and nutritional labelling, and to promote healthy lifestyles.

120. The Delegation of Costa Rica indicated that there is need for technical assistance to carry out studies on consumption patterns in countries of the region, since these did not have all the relevant data to take necessary actions to ensure healthy diets for their population.

121. The Delegation of Mexico requested training by FAO/WHO experts for the dissemination of health and nutrition measures that had been implemented worldwide.

122. The FAO Representative informed the Committee that FAO nutrition-related activities and technical assistance in countries of the region were available on the website of the FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean²¹ and that countries interested in such technical assistance might wish to consult the website to familiarize themselves with the information available and with procedures to receive FAO technical assistance.

123. The PAHO/WHO Representative informed the Committee of his organization's activities on nutrition in the region and invited countries to visit the webpage²² for more information in this regard. He also mentioned that PAHO/WHO had launched a pan-American alliance for food security and nutrition in the region to address, among other matters, nutrition-related problems in the region, such as obesity. Further information on this initiative can be found on the PAHO/WHO website.

PARTICIPATION IN CODEX WORK AND IN FAO/WHO ACTIVITIES ON SCIENTIFIC ADVICE (Agenda Item 8)²³

124. The Committee noted the written comments submitted in response to CL 2010/18-LAC Part E and observed that part of the information relevant to this Agenda Item had already been provided under Item 5.

125. The Committee agreed that the recommendations of the FAO/PAHO-WHO Regional Workshop on the International Process of Risk Assessment in Developing Risk-based Standards held prior to the 17th Session of CCLAC reflected the region's needs in relation to FAO/WHO activities on the provision of scientific advice. The recommendations were as follows:

126. Build capacity in risk assessment and risk management; coordinate information, institutions and managers involved in the risk analysis (RA) process; include all relevant actors in the process; develop methodology and training on data generation and collection for RA and on mechanisms for performing the assessment; raise awareness of the importance of the RA process; encourage industry to provide data and information for risk assessment; exchange successful RA experiences among countries; strengthen capacity for data analysis; foster the creation of national risk analysis units; strengthen international technical cooperation on RA; share data and practical experiences; promote and/or conduct total-intake dietary surveys and the generation of other data; disseminate information and existing databases; utilize existing reference centers; develop regional or sub-regional projects for risk assessment of priority pathogen or contaminant and food combinations; develop qualitative and quantitative protocols for risk assessment in priority pathogen or contaminant and food matrices.

127. As a general conclusion from consideration of Items 5, 6, 7 and 8, the Committee agreed that information provided in reply to CL 2010/18-LAC, including relevant CRDs, that had not been discussed in plenary, would be posted on the CCLAC webpage²⁴ for further consultation, especially information relating to the mutual exchange of information on regulatory initiatives arising from food control and food legislation and regulations. The Committee further agreed that replies to this CL for the next session of the CCLAC should be limited to the updating and identification of needs additional to the information provided to this session, which should be done in a concise and succinct manner to facilitate their discussion by the Committee.

²⁰ CL 2010/18-LAC: Part D. CX/LAC 10/17/10 (Comments from Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay). Additional comments from Mexico (CRD 7), Peru (CRD 10), Haiti (CRD 11), Jamaica (CRD 12) and Chile (CRD 15).

²¹ <http://www.rlc.fao.org>.

²² <http://new.paho.org/hq>.

²³ CL 2010/18-LAC: Part E. CX/LAC 10/17/10 (Comments from Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay). Additional comments from Mexico (CRD 7), Peru (CRD 10), Haiti (CRD 11), Jamaica (CRD 12) and Chile (CRD 15).

²⁴ <http://www.cclac.org>.

NOMINATION OF THE COORDINATOR (Agenda Item 9)²⁵

128. The Committee was invited to nominate a Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean for appointment by the 34th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in accordance with Rule IV.2 of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. As there were two candidates for the post (Costa Rica and Guatemala), the Committee proceeded with the nomination by secret ballot in accordance with Rule VIII of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. Following the result of the secret ballot the Committee nominated Costa Rica as new Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean for appointment by the 34th Session of the Commission.

129. The Committee thanked Mexico for the support given to the region during its two terms as Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean and extended its congratulations and best wishes to Costa Rica for its nomination. The Committee also thanked Guatemala for its willingness to serve as Coordinator.

ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE REGION (Agenda Item 10)²⁶

130. The Committee noted that the document had not been issued as no proposals had been presented in time for translation, distribution, and consideration by the members of the Committee.

131. The Committee agreed to maintain the Item on the Agenda of its next session and urged delegations to transmit any proposals well in advance, respecting the deadlines and thus allowing time for translation, distribution and consideration of the document by members of the region before the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 11)²⁷

132. The following matters were brought to the attention of the Committee:

DEVELOPMENT OF A GLOBAL STANDARD FOR PANELA

133. The Delegation of Colombia introduced CRD 3 containing a proposal for the development of a global standard for Panela. Several delegations supported the development of this standard since "panela" was an important trade commodity for the region and the international market. Some delegations indicated that matters relating to the identity and quality of the product should be clarified when developing the standard to avoid confusion in international trade, for example the name "panela" which could be associated with different products in other countries, similar products could be made from sugar beet rather than from sugar cane, processing methods to differentiate from raw brown sugar or related nutritional or health claims.

134. The Delegation of Mexico stated that it supported the proposed draft global standard. However. It asked that consideration be given to Mexico's proposal that the draft should carry the correct name of the product and that synonyms be avoided in the title to prevent confusion in the identification of the product.

135. The Committee agreed to support the development of a standard for this product. The Delegation of Chile said that a similar product "chancaca" made from sugar beet existed in Chile. There was a need to study the implications that a standard for panela would have on this product.

USE OF NOTE 161 IN THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES

136. The Delegation of Costa Rica introduced CRD 2 containing background information on discussion under way in the Committee on Food Additives on the use of Note 161 "Subject to national legislation of the importing country aimed, in particular, at consistency with Section 3.2 of the Preamble" in the GSFA.

137. The FAO JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that the CCFA was considering this matter in an electronic working group and invited countries of the region to participate in this work to get the best possible outcome from the group's discussion. The Secretariat also mentioned that Codex standards and related texts were voluntary in nature and that they made reference to national legislation when consensus could not be reached.

138. The Delegation of Brazil recalled that, as Codex was a reference organization for the World Trade Organization, its complete texts, including footnotes, were considered as international reference standards for commercial matters.

139. The Delegation of Uruguay asserted that, in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 3 of the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, the adoption of Codex standards for food safety was not voluntary. The exceptions set out in paragraph 3 only referred to countries that wished to apply higher levels of sanitary protection, duly based on scientific evidence.

140. Several delegations said that although Codex standards were of a voluntary nature, they were a benchmark under the WTO/SPS Agreement. They indicated that the use of such a note could undermine the Codex international harmonization process and that other cases in addition to the GSFA existed where similar notes had been proposed to finalize standards for adoption by the Commission.

²⁵ CX/LAC 10/17/12. Additional comments of Colombia (CRD 20).

²⁶ CX/LAC 10/17/13 (Not issued).

²⁷ Comments from Costa Rica (CRDs 2, 4 and 19) and Colombia (CRD 3).

141. The Committee agreed that the countries of the region should be encouraged to actively participate in the CCLAC electronic working group on the use of Note 161; that Note 161 should not be used in new provisions for food additives of the GSFA; that there should be a study of the application of Note 161 in food additive provisions already adopted, with a view to its deletion when its use had no scientific basis; and that its concern be expressed over the use of similar notes in other Codex standards and related texts.

REVISION OF THE RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

142. The Delegation of Costa Rica introduced CRD 4 containing background information on the ongoing revision of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Committee on Pesticide Residues, in particular the Periodic Review Procedure for pesticides vis-à-vis the deletion of Codex MRLs/PRs, if these were no longer supported by the industry but were still used in countries, therefore limiting the availability of pesticides for use on agricultural products of interest to the region.

143. Several delegations indicated that MRLs should not be revoked without scientific justification. They also indicated that the concerns and circumstances of developing countries were not taken into consideration. They pointed out that revocation of Codex MRLs should be based on new scientific evidence and not solely on the passage of time or lack of support of the manufacturer, provided there was no risk to health. They further noted that the requirements of the Periodic Review Procedure were inconsistent with the Risk Analysis Principles for application in the framework of Codex as regards the scientific basis for decision-making on matters related to food safety.

144. The Committee supported the position that MRLs/PRs should not be deleted without scientific basis, so that the inconsistency between the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Committee on Pesticide Residues and the General Principles of Codex and other relevant Codex texts could be resolved. This inconsistency was clearly reflected in CRD 4 available for consultation on the CCLAC webpage.

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL POSITIONS BY THE CCLAC

145. The Committee recalled that the 25th Session of the Committee on General Principles (2009) confirmed that the current terms of reference of FAO/WHO coordinating committees granted them complete freedom to issue regional opinions on all topics under discussion in Codex that were of strategic importance to the region concerned and to promote the adoption of regional positions on strategic topics.²⁸

146. The Committee therefore agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by Costa Rica and working in English and Spanish, that would prepare a discussion paper on proposed procedures for drawing up regional positions, elements that needed to be considered, the scope of regional positions, etc., for consideration at the next session of the Committee. The following countries expressed their interest in participating in this work: Argentina, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 12)

147. The Committee was informed that its next session would be held in Costa Rica in approximately two years' time. The exact date and venue would be decided by the Secretariats of Costa Rica and Codex, subject to the approval of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

²⁸ ALINORM 09/32/33, para. 103.

STATUS OF WORKS

TOPIC	STEP	ACTION BY:	REFERENCE IN DOCUMENT REP11/LAC
Codex Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Culantro Coyote	5/8	Governments 38th Session of the CCFL 33rd Session of the CAC	Para. 60 and Appendix II
Codex Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Lucuma	5/8	Governments 39th Session of the CCFL 34th Session of the CAC	Para. 67 and Appendix III
Discussion paper on the formulation of regional positions for the CCLAC	---	Electronic working group led by Costa Rica Governments 18th Session of the CCLAC	Para. 146

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Presidente:
Chairperson:

CHRISTIAN TURÉGANO ROLDÁN
Director General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
Estado de México
C.P. 53950
Tel: + 52 57 29 91 00
Fax: + 52 55 20 97 15
E-mail: christian.turegano@economia.gob.mx

Asistente del Presidente:
Assistant to the Chairperson:

INGRID MACIEL PEDROTE
Director de Normalización Internacional
Dirección General de Normas
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
Estado de México
C.P. 53950
Tel: +52 57 29 91 00
Fax: + 52 55 20 97 15
E-mail: imaciel@economia.gob.mx

ARGENTINA / ARGENTINE

Laura Ester Bernardi Bonomi
Asesora Jurídica
SENASA- Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentario
Paseo Colon 439- 2° Piso C1063ACD-
Ciudad de Bs As
Tel:+ 4342-2502 / 4121-5069
Fax:+ 4121-5069
Email: lbonomi@senasa.gov.ar

Nicolas Ezequiel Winter
Asesor Técnico
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA)
Av. Paseo Colón 367, 5to. piso, contrafrente. C1063ACD, Ciudad
Autónoma de Buenos Aires Argentina
Tel: + 5411 4121 5352
Fax: + 5411 4121 5353
E-mail: nwinter@senasa.gov.ar

Juan Andrés Arakelian
Director Técnico
Cámara de la Industria Argentina de Fertilizantes y Agroquímicos -
CIAFA -
Rivadavia 1367- 7° B- Capital Federal- Argentina
Tel: 54-11-4381-2742
Fax: 54-11-4383-1562
E-mail: andresarakelian@ciafa.org.ar

Pablo Alejandro Grosso
Director Gestión Tecnológica
Cámara de Sanidad Agropecuaria y Fertilizantes - Argentina -
CASAFE
Reconquista 661 Piso 1 "A" C1003 ABM Buenos Aires Argentina
Tel: +54-11-5779-4056
Fax: +54-11-5779-4059
E-mail: pgrosso@casafe.org

BELICE / BELIZE

Delilah Alice Cabb
Coordinator, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Enquiry Point
Belize Agricultural Health Authority, Central Farm, Cayo District.
Tel: (501) 824- 4899 or (501) 824-4872
Fax: (501) 824 - 3773
E-mail: bahasps@btl.net, DelilahCabb@gmail.com

BOLIVIA / BOLIVIE

Ana Carola Zeballos Coria
Jefe de Unidad de Vigilancia y Control de la Calidad e Inocuidad de
los Alimentos
Ministerio de Salud y Deportes- INLASA
Pasaje Rafael Zubieta N° 1889 - Lado Estado Mayor Miraflores.
Tel: (591)-2-2226670 / (591)-70539335
Fax: (591) -2 -2228254
Email: carolazeballos@yahoo.es

BRASIL / BRAZIL / BRÉSIL

Claudio Meluzzi Mendes
Third-Secretary
Ministry of External Relations- Division of Agriculture and
Commodities
Esplanada dos Ministérios - Bloco H- 70170-900 - Brasília - DF
Tel: + 55 61 3411 8927
Fax: + 55 61 3411 8918
E-mail: claudio.mendes@itamaraty.gov.br

Arlindo Bonifácio
Fiscal Federal Agrícola
Ministério de Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento
Esplanada dos ministérios, Bloco D. Anexo A, Sala 327- 70.043 -
900 - Brasília/DF- Brasil
Tel: 5561 3218 - 2808
Fax: 55 61 3225 - 5341
Email: arlindo.bonifacio@agricultura.gov.br

Antonia Maria Aquino

Manager of Special Food Products
Brazilian National Health Surveillance Agency- ANVISA
SIA Trechos 5 Area Especial 57
Tel: 55 61 3462 5327
Fax: 55 61 3462-6514
Email: antonia.maria@anvisa.gov.br

Diana Carmem Almeida Nunes de Oliveira

Safety Food Manager
National Healthy Surveillance Agency
SIA - Techo 05 - Brasilia- Distrito Federal
Tel: 55 (61) 34625684
Fax: 55 (61)3462 6514
Email: diana.oliveira@anvisa.gov.br

André Luis Santos

Coordinator Brazilian Codex Alimentarius Committee
INMETRO- National Institute of Metrology, Standardization and Industrial Quality
Rua da Estrela, 67 - 2º andar- Rio Comprido - CEP: 20251-900 - Rio de Janeiro.
Tel: +55 21 32161087
Email: alsantos@inmetro.gov.br

Rogério Pereira Da Silva

Coordinador de Assuntos del Codex Alimentarius
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Abastecimiento
Esplanada dos Ministérios - Bloco "D", Edifício Sede, Sala 349 (SRI) CEP: 70.043-900 Brasilia- DF/Brasil.
Tel: + 55 61 3218-2968
Fax: + 55 61 3225-4738
Email: rogerio.silva@agricultura.gov.br

Ana Carolina Miranda Lamy

Fiscal Federal Agrícola
Coordinación de Plaguicidas
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Abastecimiento (Brasil)
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D - Anexo A, sala 327 - 70.043-900 – Brasília / DF- Brasil
Tel: + 55 61 3218-2808
Fax: + 55 61 3225-5341
Email: ana.lamy@agricultura.gov.br

CHILE / CHILI**Claudia Carbonell Piccardo**

Jefe Subdepartamento de Asuntos Sanitarios y Fitosanitarios
Dirección General de Relaciones Económicas Internacionales (DIRECON)
Teatinos 180, Piso 11, Santiago centro Santiago Chile
Tel: 56 2 8275447
Fax: 56 2 3809494
E-mail: ccarbonell@direcon.cl

Maria Viviana Aranda Alonso

Presidente
International Life Sciences Institute,
ILSI SUR-ANDINO
Perez Valenzuela 1098 of 101 Providencia- Santiago
Tel: 56- 2- 2649420
Fax: 56- 2- 2649420
E-mail: aranda.vivi@gmail.com

Jaime Cornejo Catalán

Asesor en Inocuidad de los Alimentos
Ministerio de Salud Chile
Enrique MAC IVER 459, Piso 8º
Tel: 56 2 5740 614
Email: JCORNEJO@MINSAL.CL

Enedina Lucas Viñuela

Coordinadora Subcomité de Aditivos y Contaminantes Alimentarios
Instituto de Salud Pública de Chile
Avenida Marathón N°1000 Santiago de Chile
Tel: 56-2-5755478
Email: elucas@ispch.cl

COLOMBIA / COLOMBIE**Javier Muñoz Ibarra**

Asesor
Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Turismo
Calle 28 N° 13 A 15 Bogotá, Colombia
Tel: 571-6067676 ext.1205
Fax: 571- 6064777
E-mail: jmunoz@mincomercio.gov.co

Elvin Leonel Rincón Cárdenas

Profesional Dirección de Regulación
Ministerio de Comercio Industria y Turismo
Calle 28 N° 13A - 15 Bogota - Colombia
Tel: 571-6067676 ext. 2133
Fax: 571 -6064777
Email: erincon@mincomercio.gov.co

Claudia Patricia Moreno Barrera

Profesional especializado
Ministerio de la Protección Social, Dirección General de Salud Pública
Carrera 13 No 32 -76
Tel: 3305000 ext. 1263
Fax: 3305050 ext. 1280
Email: cmorenob@minproteccionsocial.gov.co

Laura Judith Otálora Cortés

Regulatory Sc. Manager for Andean Pact, Central America and Caribbean Region
Mead Johnson Nutrition
CII 76 N° 11-17 Piso 3 Bogotá – Colombia
Tel: 571 - 3190 830
Fax: 571 - 3190 857
Email: laura.otalora@mjn.com

Diana Ximena Correa Lizarazo

Coordinador Unidad de Evaluación de Riesgo para la Inocuidad de los Alimentos UERIA
Instituto Nacional de Salud
Av. Calle 26 No. 51 -20.
Tel: 2 20 77 00 ext.1333
Fax:
E-mail: dcorrea@ins.gov.co

COSTA RICA**Isabel Cristina Araya Badilla**

Directora / Punto de Contacto del Codex en Costa Rica
Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio
San José, Costa Rica, Los Colegios, Moravia del antiguo colegio Lincoln 200 m oeste, 100 m sur y 200 m oeste, continuo a la Sinfónica Nacional.
Tel: (506) 2236-2538
Fax: (506) 2297-1439/2235-8192
E-mail: iaraya@meic.go.cr

Gina Monteverde Castro

Supervisora Fitosanitaria
Departamento de Exportaciones
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 2260-6721
Fax: (506) 2260-672
E-mail: gmonteverde@sfe.go.cr

Tatiana Cruz Ramírez

Coordinadora del Departamento del Codex
Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio
San José, Costa Rica, Los Colegios de Moravia, del antiguo colegio
Lincoln 200 m oeste, 100 m sur y 200 m oeste, contiguo a la
Sinfónica Nacional.
Tel: (506) 2235-2700 Ext. 263
Fax: (506) 2297-1439 / 2235-8192
E-mail: tcruz@meic.go.cr

Roger Ruiz Zapata

Jefe Laboratorio de Residuos de Plaguicidas
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado
Tel: (506) 2260-4925
Fax: (506) 2260-4925
E-mail: rruiz@sfe.go.cr

Marlene Vallejo Bustos

Asuntos Regulatorios
Mead Johnson Nutrition
Tel: 52 (55) 1103 - 9605
E-mail: marlene.vallejo@mjn.com

CUBA**Jorge Félix Medina Pérez**

Secretario Comité Nac. del Codex y Comité de Higiene de los
alimentos. Coord. del Grupo de alimentos
Oficina Nacional de Normalización (NC)
Calle E esq 13 No 261 Vedado Ciudad Habana.
Tel: 5 37 830 0022 / 5 37 830 0732
Fax: 5 37 836 8048
E-mail: jfelix@ncnorma.cu / nc@ncnorma.cu

Gilberto O'Farril Delis

Especialista en la Dirección de Regulaciones Técnicas y Calidad
Ministerio de Comercio Exterior y la Inversión Extranjera
Infanta No 16 Vedado Ciudad Habana
Tel: 537 8300364
Fax: 5 37 8380454
E-mail: gilberto.ofarril@mincex.cu
cc: nc@ncnorma.cu (gabriel.lihens@mincex.cu)

GUATEMALA**Antonio Ferraté de la Riva**

Jefe del Área de Inocuidad de los Alimentos y Punto Focal del
Codex Alimentarius Guatemala
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación
7a. avenida 12-90 zona 13. Edificio UNR
Tel: 24137455 / 24137466
Fax: 502 - 24137454
E-mail: antonio.ferrate@yahoo.com
codexguatemala@yahoo.com

HAITÍ / HAITI / HAÏTI**Vély Blaise**

Chef Service Quarantaine
Ministère de l'Agriculture, Ressources Naturelles et du
Développement Rural
Ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie 8, Rue Légitime Port-au-
Prince, Haiti -HT 6112
Tel: (509) 3473-4898 / 3724-0520
E-mail: dcqpc_mci@yahoo.fr blaisev2003@yahoo.fr
codexhaiti_mci@yahoo.fr

Marguerite V. Ostagne

Responsable de la Section Bactériologique / Responsable Projet
Contrôle Qualité de l'Eau
LVCQAT, MARNDR
Ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie 8, Rue Légitime Port-au-
Prince, Haiti -HT 6112
Tel: (509) 3473-4898 / 3724-0520
E-mail: dcqpc_mci@yahoo.fr dorothyvmv79@yahoo.fr
codexhaiti_mci@yahoo.fr

HONDURAS**Yolandina Lambur Valle**

Punto de Contacto Codex Honduras
Secretaría de Agricultura y Ganadería
Boulevard Miraflores, ave la FAO
Tel: 232- 6213 / 239-72-70
Fax: 231-07-86
E-mail: yolylambur@yahoo.es

JAMAICA / JAMAÏQUE**Orine Henry Blair**

Director, Regulatory Division
Bureau of Standards Jamaica
6 Winchester Roar, Kingston 10
Tel: 1 876 3832961 / 6191131
Fax: 1 876 929 - 4736
E-mail: oblair@bsj.org.jm

MEXICO / MÉXICO / MEXIQUE**Michelle Vizueth Chávez**

Jefe de Departamento para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes Naucalpan de Juárez CP. 53950
Estado de México, México.
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 ext. 43220
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: codexmex@economia.gob.mx

José Alberto Rangel Cordero

Gerente de Dictamen de Productos y Servicios de Uso y Publicidad
Comisión Federal para la Protección contra Riesgos Sanitarios
(COFEPRIS) Secretaría de Salud
Monterrey 33 piso 3 Col. Roma Del. Cuauhtémoc c.p.06700 México
D.F.
Tel: 01(55) 50 80 52 00 ext. 1169
Fax: 01 (55) 55 14 14 07
E-mail: arangel@cofepris.gob.mx

Gabriela Alejandra Jiménez Rodríguez

Jefa de Departamento de Agrocultivos Industriales
 Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura/SAGARPA
 Municipio Libre 377 Piso 2 ala B, Colonia Santa Cruz Atoyac,
 Delegación Benito Juárez, C.P. 03310 México, D.F.
 Tel: 387110 00 ext. 28313
 Fax: 38 71 10 00 ext. 33359
 E-mail: gjimenez.dgvd@saqarpa.gob.mx

Ana Rosa Castro Ramos

Investigador Titular "C"
 National Fishery Institute (INAPESCA)
 Pitagóras 1320 Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac C.P. 03310 México D.F.
 Tel: (55)38 71 9546
 E-mail: castro_998anarosa@yahoo.com.mx

María Elena Álvarez Jiménez

Jefa de Departamento de Marcas Colectivas
 Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura Secretaría de
 Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación.
 Municipio Libre 377 piso 2 ala B, Col. Santa Cruz, Atoyac, C.P.
 03310 Del. Benito Juárez, México, D.F. Del. Benito Juárez
 Tel: 3871 10 00 ext. 28314
 Fax: 38 71 10 00 ext. 33359
 E-mail: malvarez.sa@saqarpa.gob.mx

Erika Iliana Quevedo Chan

Regulatory Affairs
 Consejo Mexicano de la Industria de Productos de Consumo
 Ejército Nacional 904 B, 10th floor, Palmas Polanco, 11560, México
 City.
 Tel: (525)52 6296133 / (525) 53 3332577
 Fax: (525) 55 3959939
 E-mail: equavedo@conmexico.com.mx

Delia Altamirano Gutiérrez

Directora de Asuntos Regulatorios
 Pepsico Internacional México
 Bosque de Duraznos # 67 Col. Bosques de las Lomas CP.11700
 México D.F.
 Tel: 01 55 28 82 47 46
 Fax: 01 55 25 82 39 43
 E-mail: delia.altamirano@pepsico.com

Beatriz Haydeé Pelayo Consuegra

Asuntos Regulatorios- Representante FIL-IDF México
 Federación Internacional de Lechería FIL-IDF México
 Pedro Santacilia No.260, Col. Iztlaccihualt, Del. Benito Juárez,
 México D.F. C.P. 03520
 Tel: 52(55) 50001484
 Fax: 52 (55) 5601 0903
 E-mail: bhpelayo@prodigy.net.mx
delfinbhpc@yahoo.com

Xochitl Morales Macedo

Gerente Regional de Asuntos Regulatorios Latinoamérica
 Mead Johnson Nutricionales de México, S de R.L. de C.V.
 Avenida Revolución No. 1267 Colonia Tlacopac.
 Tel: 11039604
 Fax: 5651-2092
 E-mail: xochitl.morales@mjn.com

Sandra Herrero Cagigas

Regulatory Affairs Representative
 HECA
 Avenida Paseo de la Reforma 42, Dep. A, P1, Colonia Centro,
 México D.F. C.P. 06040, México
 Tel: + 52 (55) 5752-0043
 Fax: + 52 (55) 5752-0043
 E-mail: sandra.herrero@att.net.mx

Mildred Euridice Villanueva Martínez

Asesor Consejo Mexicano de la Carne A.C.
 Consejo Mexicano de la Carne, A.C.
 Av. de las fuentes 41-A 603, piso 6 Col. Lomas de Tecamachalco,
 Naucalpan, Edo. de México, C.P. 53950
 Tel: (55) 10192487
 Fax: 52947995
 E-mail: mwillanu@sigma-alimentos.com

Macarena Hernández Márquez

Coordinadora General
 Consejo Mexicano de la Carne, A.C.
 Av. de las fuentes 41-A 603, piso 6 Col. Lomas de Tecamachalco,
 Naucalpan, Edo. de México, C.P. 53950
 Tel: (55) 55890941
 Fax: (55) 52947995
 E-mail: coordinacion@comecarne.org

Elvia Aguilar Esperanza

Asuntos Regulatorios
 Concamin
 Rúben Darío 115. Col. Bosque de Chapultepec, México, D.F. C.P.
 11580
 Tel: 52 (55) 52622129
 E-mail: elaquilar@la.ko.com

Claudia C. Jáquez Huacuja

Regulatory Affairs
 Abbott Laboratories de México S. A de C.V
 Calzada de Tlalpan No.3092 col. Ex Hacienda Coapa. Deleg.
 Coyoacán. 04980, México, D.F.
 Tel: 58097500 ext.7150
 E-mail: claudia.jaquez@abbott.com

Dulce Ma. Márquez Mejía

Regulatory Affairs
 Abbott Laboratories de México S. A de C.V
 Calzada de Tlalpan No.3092 col. Ex Hacienda Coapa. Deleg.
 Coyoacán. 04980, México, D.F.
 Tel: 58097500 ext.7991
 E-mail: dulce.marquez@abbott.com

Jennifer Daniel Chavero

Gerente de Asuntos Regulatorios / VP Normalización Industria
 Láctea
 DANISCO / CANACINTRA
 Poniente 122 No. 627 Col Industrial Vallejo CP 02300. México D.F.
 Tel: +52 55 50784400
 E-mail: jennifer.daniel@danisco.com

NICARAGUA**Salvador Efraín Guerrero Gutiérrez**

Dirección de Normalización y Metrología/ Punto Focal del Codex –
Nicaragua

Ministerio de Fomento, Industria y Comercio

km 3 1/2 carretera masaya, contiguo al Hotel Metrocentro Frente
donde estuvo ubicado el CHAMAN

Tel: 2267 4551 Ext. 1258

Fax: 2267 4551 Ext. 1228

E-mail: codex@mific.gob.ni; salvadorg@mific.gob.nr

PANAMÁ / PANAMA**Carmela Castillo**

Jefa del Departamento de Evaluaciones Sanitarias y Fitosanitarias
Autoridad Panameña de Seguridad de Alimentos

Vía Ricardo J. Alfaro Edificio Sun Tower Local No.70

Tel: (507) 522-0003

Fax: (507) 522-0014

E-mail: ccastillo@aupsa.gob.pa

Jose Luis Coloma

Jefe de la Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Internacional

Autoridad Panameña de Seguridad de Alimentos

Vía Ricardo J. Alfaro Edificio Sun Tower Local No.70, Panamá.

Tel: (507) 522 0005

Fax: (507) 522-0014

E-mail: jlcoloma@aupsa.gob.pa

PARAGUAY**Roque Leguizamón**

Asesor Técnico de la Unidad de Comercio Internacional e
Integración

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería - MAG

Yegros y 25 de Mayo.

Tel: 595 21 450 466, 595 21 645547

Fax: 595 21 455 466

E-mail: roquefirm@yahoo.com

José Eduardo Giménez Duarte

Jefe Dpto. Inocuidad de Productos Vegetales, SENAYE

Humaitá 145

Tel: (59521) 441549

Fax: (59521) 441549

E-mail: josegd78@hotmail.com

Trini Jiménez

Coordinador Sub-Comité Aditivos

Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Normalización y Metrología

Av. Artigas 3873

Tel: 290-160

E-mail: trini_vj@hotmail.com

PERÚ / PERU / PÉROU**Cesar Augusto Ortega Jiménez**

Secretario Técnico del Comité Nacional del Codex

Dirección General de Salud Ambiental- DIGESA (Ministerio Salud)

Calle Las Amapolas N° 350 Urb. San Eugenio Lince Lima 14

Tel: 51-991537276

Fax: 51-4428353 ext. 126

E-mail: cortega@digesa.minsa.gob.pe

**REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA / DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE****Modesto Buenaventura Pérez Blanco**

Coordinador Normas Alimenticias

Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social (MSP)

Ave. Héctor H. Hernández Esq. Ave. Tiradentes, Ensanche la Fe,
Santo Domingo, D.N.

Tel: 809-541-0382

Fax: 809-547-2946

E-mail: codexsespas@yahoo.com

mbperezb@yahoo.com

SURINAME**Gladys Lieveld**

Head of Food Inspection

Bureau of Public Health, Ministry Health, Suriname

Rode Kruislaan 22.

Tel: (597) 497978 Ext.115

Fax: (597)473923 / (597) 477109

E-mail: gladyslieveld@gmail.com

**TRINIDAD Y TOBAGO / TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO****Cheryl Scott-Alvarez**

Chief Chemist and Director of Food and Drugs

Chemistry Food and Drugs Division

92 Frederick Street Port of Spain.

Tel: 18686857010 (m) 18686232476 (o)

Fax: 18686232477

E-mail: rcalvarez2004@yahoo.co.uk

URUGUAY**Leonardo Ramon Veiga Sanchez**

Director de la Division Defensa Comercial y Salvaguardias

Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Minería

Sarandí 690 D2° Entrepiso- Montevideo- URUGUAY

Tel: 2916 2411 ext. 333

Fax: 2916 3651

E-mail: leonardo.veiga@dni.miem.gob.uy

Pedro Gabriel Friedrich Iglesias

Jefe departamento de Evaluación de la Conformidad

Laboratorio Tecnológico del Uruguay

Avda Italia 6201

Tel: 598 26013724 ext. 1117

Fax: 598 26013724 ext. 1280

E-mail: pfriedri@latu.org.uy

**PAÍSES OBSERVADORES
OBSERVER COUNTRIES****ANGOLA****Maria Antónia Sanazenge**

Chefe de Divisão /Química Especializada

Ministério da Saúde

Rma Amilear Cabral

Tel: 244 923 65 36 95 / 244 914 43 90 60

Fax: 244 222 32 37 24

E-mail: sanazenge@hotmail.com

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

Kenneth Lowery

International Issues Analyst
US Codex Office
1400 Independence Avenue, Room 4861,
Washington, DC 20250 USA
Tel: +1 202 690 4042
Fax: +1 202 720 3157
E-mail: Kenneth.Lowery@fsis.usda.gov

Edmundo Garcia

Assistant Regional Director for Latin America
US Food & Drug Administration
Unit 3440 Box 428, APO, AA 34020
Tel: 202-409-0394
E-mail: Edmundo.Garcia@fda.hhs.gov

Raúl Guerrero

International Regulatory Strategies
793 N. Ontare Road. Santa Bárbara California 93105
Tel: 805-898-1830
Fax: 805-898-1830
Email: guerrero_raul_j@yahoo.com

**CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMMISSION
PRESIDENT DE LA COMMISSION
PRESIDENTE DE LA COMISIÓN**

Karen Hulebak

Chair, Codex Alimentarius Commission
c/o USDA, 1400 Independence Ave., SW,
Room 412A
Whitten Bldg., Washington, DC 20250-3700
Tel: (202) 690-5074
Fax: 202 -690-2980
E-mail: karen.hulebak@fsis.usda.gov

**OBSERVADORES
OBSERVATEURS
OBSERVERS**

**INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACIÓN PARA LA
AGRICULTURA (IICA)
INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON
AGRICULTURA**

Ricardo Molins

Gerente- Programa de Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad de
Alimentos IICA
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura IICA
Apdo 55-2200 Coronado, San José, Costa Rica
Tel: 506- 22160185
Fax: 506 22 16 0221
E-mail: ricardo.molins@iica.int

Eric Bolaños Ledezma

Especialista de SAIA
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura- IICA
Apdo 55-2200 Coronado, San José, Costa Rica
Tel: 506 22160418
Fax: 506 22 16 0221
E-mail: erick.bolanos@iica.int

**ASOCIACION DE FABRICANTES DE MEDICAMENTOS DE
LIBRE ACCESO, A.C. (AFAMELA)**

Lisé Reyes Vermot

Regulatory Affaire Manager
AFAMELA
Yautepec No. 12, Col. Condesa, México D.F. CP 06140
Tel: (5255) 5286 5297
Fax: (5255) 5553 2909
Email: lreyes@afamela.org

**INTERNATIONAL LIFE SCIENCES INSTITUTE
(ILSI)**

Lourdes del Carmen Paniagua Mendoza

Gerente de Asuntos Regulatorios
Sensient Flavors México
Prolongación Concepción Beistegui No. 501 Col. Girasoles Celaya,
Guanajuato, C.P. 38020
Tel.: 9140 6175
Email: lourdes.paniagua@sensient-tech.com

ASOCIACIÓN LATINOAMERICANA DE AVICULTURA (ALA)

J. Isidro Molfese

Observador por ALA al Codex
ALA - Asociación Latinoamericana de Avicultura
Arce 441-1426 Buenos Aires, República de Argentina.
Tel.: 54 11 4774- 4770
Email: molfese@ciudad.com.ar

Miguel Márquez

Coordinador Comité Técnico- Científico CTC de ALA
Asociación Latinoamericana de Avicultura
Azahares No. 242 Rancho Contento. Zapopan, Jalisco. México
45222
Tel.: (52.33) 3682-1483
Email: miguelmarquez42@hotmail.com

**SECRETARIADO CONJUNTO FAO/OMS
JOINT FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT**

Gracia Teresa Brisco López

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 570 52700
Fax: +39 06 570 54593
E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

Tom Heilandt

Senior Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 06 570 54384
Fax: +39 06 570 54593
Email: tom.heilandt@fao.org

FAO JECFA

Annika Wennberg

Senior officer, FAO JECFA Secretary
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: + 390657053283
Fax: + 390657054593
Email: annika.wennberg@fao.org

**OPS / OMS
PAHO / WHO**

Genaro Wilfredo García

Asesor Regional Inocuidad de Alimentos (OPS/OMS)
Centro Panamericano de Fiebre Aftosa (PANAFTOSA)
Av. Presidente Kennedy, 7778- Sao Bento- Duque de Caxias; RJ -
Brasil-Cep: 25040-000
Tel: 0055-(21)-3661-9039
Fax: 0055 (21) 3661 9027
Email: garcia@paho.org
FAO

Maya Piñero, Ph.D

Coordinadora Sanidad e Inocuidad Agroalimentaria
Oficial Principal de Inocuidad y Calidad de los
Alimentos
Oficina Regional de la FAO para América Latina y el
Caribe
Avda. Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura
Casilla 10095, Santiago, Chile
Tel: 562 923 2100
Directo 562 923 2208
E-mail: maya.pineiro@fao.org

**SECRETARÍA TÉCNICA
TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT**

Jorge Antonio López Zárate

Subdirector para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius y otros
Organismos
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950, Estado de México.
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: jorge.lopezz@economia.gob.mx

Jesús Figueroa Gamboa

Subdirector para la Atención de la ISO e IEC
Dirección General de Normas Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
C.P. 53950, Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9300, Ext. 43217
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: jesus.figueroa@economia.gob.mx

Emeterio Mosso Zempoalteca

Jefe de departamento para la atención de la ISO
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
C.P. 53950, Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9300, ext. 43219
Fax: 5520 9715
Email: iso-mex@economia.gob.mx

**SOPORTE TÉCNICO
TECHNICAL SUPPORT**

Yessika Nayelli Melgar Rivera

Asistente para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
Dirección General de Normas Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes Naucalpan de Juárez CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 ext. 43220
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: codexmex1@economia.gob.mx

Isabel Suárez Ochoa

Asistente para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6 Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de
Juárez C.P. 53950, Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100, Ext. 43220
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: codexmex2@economia.gob.mx

Jorge Alberto Tiburcio Palma

Asistente para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
C.P. 53950, Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100, Ext. 43220
Fax: 5520 9715

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX REGIONAL STANDARD FOR CULANTRO COYOTE¹

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties and/or commercial types of culantro coyote grown from *Eryngium foetidum L.*, of the *Apiaceae* family, to be supplied in bundles² of fresh leaves or any other equivalent presentation to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Culantro coyote for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, bundles of culantro coyote must:

- be sound, and free of leaves affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make them unfit for consumption;
- be clean, and practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- be practically free of pests, and damage caused by them, affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- be free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- be free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures.

In addition, they must have a fresh appearance and have their natural colouring.

2.1.1 The development and condition of culantro coyote must be such as to enable it:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Culantro coyote is classified into the three classes defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Bundles in this class must be of superior quality, and characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

2.2.2 Class I³

Bundles in this class must be of good quality, and characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- presence of white, and/or brown and yellow blemishes, that do not exceed 5% of the total leaves in the bundle;
- presence of broken leaves that do not exceed 10% of the total leaves in the bundle;
- presence of split leaves that do not exceed 10% of the total leaves in the bundle.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes bundles which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the rambutans retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

¹ International names for *Eryngium foetidum L.* include: Culantro, culantrón, culantro coyote, culantro extranjero, culantro real, alcapate, escorzonera, samat, xamat, cilantro cimarrón, recaó, culantro culebra, cilantro ancho, jia yuan gian, koulant, chadwon, spiritweed, false coriander, long coriander, stinkweed, fitweed.

² Bundle: Number of leaves that can be held in the hand.

³ Broken leaves: leaves whose central vein has suffered breakage from physical damage without losing any parts adjacent to the point of breakage.
Split leaves: leaves in which part of the blade area is missing.

- presence of white, and/or brown and yellow blemishes, that do not exceed 15% of the total leaves in the bundle;
- presence of broken leaves that do not exceed 20% of the total leaves in the bundle;
- presence of split leaves that do not exceed 20% of the total leaves in the bundle.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the number of bundles per kilogram. The size specifications are as follows:

Size specifications for bundles of leaves

Size code	Weight per bundle (grams)	Number of bundles per Kg
1	> 200	< 5
2	150 - 200	5 - 7
3	100 - 149	8 - 10
4	50 - 99	11 - 20
5	< 50	> 20

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent, by number or weight of bundles, not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent, by number or weight of bundles, not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent, by number or weight of bundles, satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes and forms of presentation, 10% by number or weight of bundles corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only bundles of the same origin, variety and/or commercial type, quality, size, and colour. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

The bundles must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new⁴, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

The bundles shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of culantro coyote. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

5.3 PRESENTATION

The bundles may be presented in one of the following forms:

5.3.1 Individually

In this case, each bundle will be packed in a separate bag.

5.3.2 In bunches

In this case, several bundles will be placed in each bag, according to their size.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce "Culantro Coyote", or its name in the country of marketing, and may be labelled as to name of the variety and/or commercial type, specifying the form of presentation (individual or in bunches).

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)⁵.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce "Culantro Coyote", or its name in the country of marketing, if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety and/or commercial type (optional).

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Net weight.

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

⁴ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

⁵ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

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

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX REGIONAL STANDARD FOR LUCUMA

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to the fruit of commercial varieties of lucuma grown from the *Pouteria lucuma* (R. y P.) species, of the *Sapotaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Lucuma for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the lucuma must be:

- whole, and preferably with its stalk which must always be attached to the calyx; the stalk should not exceed 5 mm and should be cleanly cut;
- sound, produce affected by rotting, mould, or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free of pests, and damage caused by them, affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures;
- free of physical damage including deep bruising, cuts, abrasions etc. Superficial natural cracking due to ripening is acceptable at the time of commerce;
- free of sunburns.

In addition, the lucuma must be fresh in appearance and characteristic of the variety in shape and external colour.

2.1.1 The lucuma must have been carefully picked, and have reached an appropriate physiological degree of development and ripeness, in accordance with the characteristics of the variety and/or commercial type, the time of picking, and the area in which it is grown.

The development and condition of the lucuma must be such as to enable it:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Lucuma is classified into the three classes defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Lucuma in this class must be of superior quality. The produce must be characteristic of the variety in shape, development and colouring, allowing for the district in which it is grown. It must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.¹

The maximum number of seeds in this class is 2, the firmness of 'silk' lucuma is soft while that of 'stick' lucuma is semi-hard.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the pulp of the produce

2.2.2 Class I

Lucuma in this class must be of good quality. The produce must be characteristic of the variety in shape, development and colouring, allowing for the district in which they are grown. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- slight defects in shape not corresponding to the variety, slight skin defects not exceeding 1 cm² in total for all sizes of lucuma.

The maximum number of seeds in this class is 3, the firmness of 'silk' lucuma is soft while that of 'stick' lucuma is semi-hard.

¹ Slight defects: cracking, scratches from branch movement due to the wind, superficial marking due to treatments or pests that do not cause degenerative damage affecting the pulp of the fruit.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the pulp of the produce.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes lucuma which does not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfies the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the lucuma retains its essential characteristics as regards quality, keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape not corresponding to the variety, slight skin defects not exceeding 2 cm² in total for all sizes of lucuma.

The maximum number of seeds in this class is 3, the firmness of 'silk' lucuma is semi-hard while that of 'stick' lucuma is hard.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the weight of the fruit. Lucumas are graded according to the following table.

Table 1
Size specifications for lucuma²

Size code	Average unit weight (g)	Weight range (g)
A	-	Under 55
B	90	50 – 130
C	160	120 – 200
D	230	190 - 270
E	300	260 – 340
F	-	Over 330

Table 2
Size classes for lucuma

	Classes		
	Extra	I	II
Diameter of equatorial section (cm)	From 6 to 9	Over 9, or more than or equal to 4 and less than 6	Less than 4
Weight (g)	120 to 300	Over 300, or more than or equal to 50 and less than 120	Less than 50

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent, by number or weight, of lucuma, not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent, by number or weight of lucuma, not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

² The specified ranges include size tolerance of ± 10% weight of fruit contained in each package.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent, by number or weight of lucuma, satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting, or any other deterioration, rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10% by number or weight of lucuma, corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only lucuma of the same origin, variety, quality, size, and appreciably of the same degree of ripeness and development. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

The lucuma must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new³, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

The lucuma shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the lucuma. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce, and may be labelled as to name of the variety.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)⁴.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce "Lucuma" if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety (optional).

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (size code or maximum and minimum diameter in millimetres);
- Net weight;
- Lot number.

³ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

⁴ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

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

ANNEX

1. DESCRIPTION

Lucuma is a native fruit of the Andean part of Peru, where it exists in numerous biotypes, many of them wild. The fruit is a berry or drupe that is round, ovoid, conical, flattened or with a spinning-top shape, approximately 4 to 9 cm in diameter and with a characteristic odour and colour. It is generally asymmetrical with a pointed apex that is usually surrounded with a brown to light green areola. The exocarp or skin is very thin and delicate, hairless and somewhat scaly. The mesocarp or pulp is of variable thickness, floury to mealy in texture, and soft to hard in firmness. The seed is round and flattish, 2 to 4 cm in diameter and covered with a thick light or dark brown epispem. It has an opaque whitish hilum and is covered with a thin light yellow endocarp.

The following definitions apply for this Standard:

- 1.1 Biotype: group of individuals whose phenotypes correspond to the same genotype (heritage).
- 1.2 Areola: small, more or less circular, ridge, depression or mark that appears in certain organs or the wall of certain cells.
- 1.3 Silk lucuma: lucuma with a soft or semi-hard firmness of pulp. See Table 1.
- 1.4 Stick lucuma: lucuma with a hard firmness of pulp. See Table 1.

Table 1 – State of pulp firmness

Firmness		State of firmness
In Kg-f	In N	
0 to 6	0 to 60	Soft
Over 6 and under 11	Over 60 and under 110	Semi-hard
More than or equal to 11	More than or equal to 110	Hard

NOTE: 1 kg-f = 9.80665 N (\approx 10 N)