CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION





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

Agenda Item 2

CX/FL 16/43/2-Add.1

April 2016

Organization

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

Forty-third Session Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 9 – 13 May 2016

MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CAC AND OTHER CODEX SUBSIDIARY BODIES MATTERS FOR ACTION

Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS22)¹
PROPOSED NEW CODEX WORK ON FOOD INTEGRITY/FOOD AUTHENTICITY AS EMERGING ISSUES

- 1. CCFICS considered a proposal for new work on food integrity/food authenticity as emerging issue and agreed to request guidance from CCFL on issues relating to labelling in relation to food integrity/authenticity. A full extract of the discussion in CCFICS is in the Appendix attached.
- 2. The Committee **is invited to consider** the request from CCFICS.

Committee on Food Additives (CCFA48)²

REVISION OF SECTION 4.2.3.4 OF THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PREPACKAGED FOODS (CODEX STAN 1-1985)

Background

- 3. CCFA47 supported new work to address the inconsistent terminology related to flavourings; and agreed to limit the scope of the new work to the revision of Section 4.1 c and 5.1 c of the *General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold As such* (CODEX STAN 107-1981), so that these provisions are consistent with the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008).
- 4. CCFA47 also agreed to first complete work on <u>CODEX STAN 107-1981</u> before other committees could be informed to consider revising texts under their responsibility (or before CCFA would consider revising texts developed by inactive committees).

Request from CCFA

- 5. CCFA48 completed the revisions of sections 4.1 c and 5.1 c, of <u>CODEX STAN 107-1981</u> and agreed to recommend to CCFL to consider the revision of Section 4.2.3.4 of the *General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods* (<u>CODEX STAN 1-1985</u>) taking into account the revision of Section 4.1.c and 5.1.c of <u>CODEX STAN 107-1981</u>.
- 6. The Committee **is invited to consider** the recommendation from CCFA.

¹ <u>REP16/FICS</u>, Paras 66 - 70

² REP16/FA, Paras 148 and 151

CX/FL 16/43/2-Add.1 2

APPENDIX

PROPOSED NEW CODEX WORK ON FOOD INTEGRITY/FOOD AUTHENTICITY AS EMERGING ISSUES

1. The Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced the paper (<u>CRD 8</u>). He described how increasingly difficult it is for consumers to assess the authenticity of food today, and that with the rise of food fraud there is a need for developing methodologies and possibly Codex guidelines to help authorities address this matter.

Discussion

- 2. The Committee discussed the matter and noted that the issue of food integrity/authenticity was a very difficult problem to tackle, but which nevertheless may require more attention from Codex. Many delegations expressed their support for new work to be carried out in this area, as they had experienced various forms of food fraud, where the analytical methods for detection of the fraud by food authorities were either missing or not widely available.
- 3. Aside from the more technical aspects of the issue, the Committee also recognized the need for an analysis of CCFICS texts to see whether there were any gaps in the ways food integrity/authenticity was covered in them.

Conclusion

- 4. The Committee invited the Islamic Republic of Iran to develop a discussion paper on this topic, with assistance from the Netherlands and Canada. The paper could identify where possible new work in the area of food integrity and authenticity could relate to (and possibly supplement) current CCFICS texts. The Australian secretariat could provide assistance in regard to process and procedure.
- 5. The Committee agreed to seek guidance from CCFL on issues relating to labelling, CCMAS on issues regarding methods of analysis and sampling in relation to food integrity/authenticity, and from CAC to verify if this issue would be covered by the mandate of CCFICS.