



**Agenda Item 2a**

**CX/EXEC 11/65/2-Add.1  
ENGLISH ONLY**

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

**Sixty-fifth Session**

**WHO Headquarters, Geneva, 28 June – 1 July 2011**

**CRITICAL REVIEW FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS  
DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS SUBMITTED  
TO THE COMMISSION FOR ADOPTION**

- 1) In accordance with the Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Part 2. Critical Review, the texts submitted to the Commission for consideration for adoption should be examined:
  - for consistency with the mandate of Codex, the decisions of the Commission, and existing Codex texts,
  - to ensure that the requirements of the endorsement procedure have been fulfilled, where appropriate,
  - for format and presentation, and
  - for linguistic consistency.
- 2) The format included in the Strategic Plan 2008-2013 is used in the presentation of the critical review. The Job Identification Number provides information on standards and related texts that were approved as new work from 2004 onwards. As the Committee needs to know the date when new work was initiated for all standards and related texts under elaboration, the first column in the Table indicates either the Identification Number, or the year when new work was approved, or the year when work actually started, as applicable. The target year is the year by which the text is to be adopted at Step 8, as agreed by the Commission on the basis of the project document (from 2004 onwards), or the date specified by the Committee, where applicable.
- 3) The output codes are specified in Part 2 of the Strategic Plan: 1.1: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food safety; 1.2: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality; 1.3: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food labelling and nutrition; 1.4: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food inspection and certification, and methods of sampling and analysis. The draft standards and related texts submitted for adoption are listed in the following Tables with notes to draw the attention of the Executive Committee and the Commission to specific issues. The notes include the status of endorsement when applicable and only for relevant provisions.
- 4) There are no comments when no specific problems exist as regards the criteria mentioned in the Critical Review or other related issues. The comments from Chairpersons or host countries are included in the Tables. Comments received after the finalisation of the present document will be presented as room documents.
- 5) This document should be read in conjunction with **CX/CAC 11/34/3**, **CX/CAC 11/34/3-Add.1** and **CX/CAC 11/34/3-Add.3** - List of Draft Standards and Related Texts Submitted to the Commission for Adoption and **CX/CAC 11/34/4** List of Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts submitted at Step 5.

## PART I - DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 8

Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (25 <sup>th</sup> Session, 25 – 29 October 2010)	Timeframe		Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed Draft Standard for Canned Bamboo Shoots (revision of CODEX STAN 241-2003)	N01-2009	2013	5/8	1.2		CCMAS: endorsed with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Methods of analysis for cadmium and lead should be removed from the Standard as there are no maximum levels for lead and cadmium for canned vegetables/foods in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods.</li> <li>– Methods of analysis for mineral impurities should be removed as there are no such provisions in the Standard.</li> <li>– The method for tin should be removed as it is still under consideration in CCPFV and CCMAS</li> </ul>

Comments by the Chairperson/host country of the Committee:

**Desiccated Coconut** (see also CX/EXEC 11/65/2)

1. The CCPFV agreed to revise the name for this standard from “Grated Desiccated Coconut” to “Desiccated Coconut” as a more appropriate name in light of current technologies.
2. The 39<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFL endorsed the food labeling provisions with the deletion of “or Reduced Oil Desiccated Coconut” in Section 9.1.1 “Name of Product.” The CCFL noted that this term could be understood as a nutrient content claim or modification of a standardized name and therefore could mislead consumers. As a result, the product name is “Desiccated Coconut.” This development is being reviewed with respect to its impact on the standard and there is an interest to seek agreement that the standard can be adopted, as endorsed by the CCFL.
3. The CCFA endorsed the food additive provisions recommended by the CCPFV during CCFA’s 43<sup>th</sup> session. This included:
  - (a) Permitting antioxidants and preservatives used in accordance with Tables 1 and 2 of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives for Food Category 04.1.2.2 – Dried Fruits.
  - (b) Permitting the antioxidant INS No. 330 Citric Acid at a maximum level in accordance with GMP.
  - (c) Adding a new Note to the provision for sulfites in food category 04.1.2.2 in the GSFA: "Only sulfites can be used as preservatives and antioxidants in the products covered by the *Standard for Desiccated Coconut* (CODEX STAN 177-1991)."

(d) Amending Note 135 to read “Except for use in dried apricots at 2000 mg/kg, bleached raisins at 1500 mg/kg, desiccated coconut at 200 mg/kg and reduced oil desiccated coconut at 50 mg/kg.” (The original text of Note 135 was: “Except for use in dried apricots at 2000 mg/kg, bleached raisins at 1500 mg/kg, and desiccated coconut at 50 mg/kg.”)

4. The CCPFV agreed to establish a Food Additives Working Group co-chaired by the EU and USA to continue to review provisions for food additives under the functional classes of preservatives and antioxidants in Table 3 of the GSFA for possible inclusion or continued non-inclusion in the Desiccated Coconut standard. This approach was seen as an appropriate way forward regarding the differing views on how the provisions of the GSFA can be considered in light of this product and standard.

#### **Certain Canned Mushrooms**

1. This Certain Mushrooms Annex was originally a stand-alone Codex standard. It has now been converted to an Annex for inclusion in the Codex Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables. As such, the Annex contains information unique to this item (canned mushrooms) and relies on the body of the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables for general provisions.

2. The 39<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFL endorsed the food labeling provisions recommended by the CCPFV.

3. The CCFA endorsed the food additive provisions recommended by the CCPFV during CCFA’s 43<sup>th</sup> session. This included:

(a) Permitting thickeners, emulsifiers and stabilizers used in accordance with Table 3 of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives for Food Category 04.2.2.4, for use in canned mushrooms in sauce only.

(b) Permitting the colour INS No. 150d Caramel IV – Sulfite Ammonia Process at a maximum level of 50,000 mg/kg in canned mushrooms in sauce. This colour is the only caramel colour allowed in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables. The CCPFV reached a compromise agreement which permitted only this colour and only for canned mushrooms in sauce. (Note that the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables includes three other food additive colours. They are Tartrazine, Brilliant Blue FCF, and Fast Green FCF.) This resulted in a departure from the general approach that any provision in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables is applicable to all of the products described in the Annexes. (In this case, the Annex established a restriction for canned mushrooms for three of the colours that the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables permits.) The Delegations of Brazil, EU, Norway, and Switzerland expressed a reservation regarding use of colours in canned mushrooms other than mushrooms packed in sauce as allowed in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables; however, the intent of the Certain Mushrooms Annex is to disallow use of the three other colours, and to only allow use of Caramel IV in mushrooms in sauce, so the reservations were addressing a situation which is not present when the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables and the Certain Mushroom Annex are considered together. Note that, during the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the CCFA, the Delegation of the EU expressed concern about use of Caramel IV in canned mushrooms in regular packs (brine, water). This concern can be considered resolved since the Certain Mushrooms Annex only permits Caramel IV in mushrooms with sauce. Note that, to provide clarification on this point, it may be helpful to consider adding a footnote to Section 4.2 in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables that states, with respect to the products covered by the Certain Mushrooms Annex, only INS No. 150d Caramel IV – Sulfite Ammonia Process is allowed, and only in canned mushrooms in sauce.

(c) Permitting the flavor enhancer, INS No. 621 Monosodium Glutamate at a maximum level in accordance with GMP. This is the same allowance as in the existing Codex Standard for Canned Mushrooms. Note that during the 25<sup>th</sup> session of the CCPFV, various delegations had differing opinions on whether Monosodium Glutamate (MSG) should be allowed. Since agreement was not reached on this specific matter, the Committee agreed to invoke a procedural step it had agreed to use in such cases, i.e., when agreement could not be reached on new text, the Committee would agree to accept the existing text. The Committee applied this approach and agreed to include the provision for permitting MSG. Note, however, that the Delegation of the EU expressed a reservation to allowing MSG, since, in its view MSG was not technically justified as a flavour enhancer for canned mushrooms in simple or natural packing media. Additionally, during

the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the CCFA, the Delegation of the EU expressed concern about use of MSG in canned mushrooms in regular packs (brine, water). This may continue to be a concern of the EU; however, the CCPFV agreed to allow MSG under the Committee's agreed-upon procedure, since it was previously allowed and agreement to change this allowance was not reached.

#### **Canned Bamboo Shoots**

1. The CCPFV agreed to maintain this standard as a stand-alone standard instead of converting it to an Annex to the Codex Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables. This was because Canned Bamboo Shoots may be packed in media with fermentation and this type of media and process is not included in the Codex Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables.
2. The 39<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFL endorsed the food labeling provisions recommended by the CCPFV.
3. The CCFA endorsed the food additive provisions recommended by the CCPFV during CCFA's 43<sup>th</sup> session. This included:
  - (a) Acidity regulators used in accordance with Table 3 of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives; and
  - (b) INS No. 334, Tartaric acid, at a maximum level of 1300 mg/kg.