



**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](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

**Agenda Item 2 (a)**

**CX/EXEC 14/69/2**

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION  
Sixty-ninth Session  
WHO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland  
8-11 July 2014**

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

**BACKGROUND**

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. This document should be read in conjunction with CX/CAC 14/37/3 - Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 8 of the Procedure (including those submitted at Step 5 with a recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7 and at Step 5 of the Accelerated Procedure) and CX/CAC 14/37/5 - Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 5.

PART I - DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 8, 5/8 or 5 Accelerated<sup>1</sup>

Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (21 <sup>st</sup> Session, 26-30 August 2013)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Risk Management Recommendations (RMRs) for chloramphenicol, malachite green, carbadox, furazolidone, nitrofurantoin, chlorpromazine, stilbenes and olaquinox (Proposed Draft)	N10-2012	2015	5/8	1.1	JECFA	CCRVD21 (2013) finalised work on eight of the twelve veterinary drugs for which it had proposed to develop RMRs. The remaining four RMRs (for dimetridazole, ipronidazole, metronidazole and ronidazole) were retained at Step 4 and included in the Priority List of JECFA for updating the toxicological and exposure assessment.
Performance Characteristics for Multi-Residues Methods (MRMs) for Veterinary Drugs (Appendix C of CAC-GL 71-2009) (Proposed Draft)	N01-2011	2013/2014	5/8	1.1	-	Date of submission to the Commission for adoption depended on the schedule of CCRVD21 (2013), which was held in August 2013.
<p><u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u></p> <p><b>Risk Management Recommendations (RMRs)</b>  The CCRVD21 (2013) is forwarding for adoption proposed draft Risk Management Recommendations (RMRs) for chloramphenicol, malachite green, carbadox, furazolidone, nitrofurantoin, chlorpromazine, stilbenes and olaquinox for adoption at Step 5/8. The CCRVD20 (2012) forwarded a project document to the CAC35 (2013) for approval of new work on the development of risk management recommendations (RMRs) for veterinary drugs for which no ADI and/or MRL has been recommended by JECFA due to specific human health concerns. After substantial work and consensus building, the Committee is forwarding these RMRs for adoption. In the opinion of the Chair, these proposed draft RMRs represent a strong consensus across the Committee. This result, in large part, is due to outstanding work of a Physical Working Group led by the European Union.</p> <p><b>Performance Characteristics for Multi-Residues Methods (MRMs) for Veterinary Drugs</b>  The Committee is forwarding draft Performance Characteristics for Multi-Residues Methods (MRMs) for Veterinary Drugs (Appendix C of CAC-GL 71-2009), for adoption at Step 5/8.</p>						

<sup>1</sup> “**Job Identification Number**”: Job Identification Number, or the year when new work was approved, or the year when work actually started, as applicable.

“**Target Year**”: 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.

“**Output Codes**”: the following codes are used: 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.

**Explanatory Notes**: includes specific issues only for relevant provisions and the status of endorsement when applicable. There are no comments when no specific problems exist as regards the criteria mentioned in the Critical Review or other related issues.

Committee on Food Hygiene (45 <sup>th</sup> Session, 11-15 November 2013)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Guidelines for the Control of <i>Trichinella</i> spp. in Meat of Suidae (Proposed Draft)	N07-2011	2013	5/8	1.1	FAO/WHO	See Chair's note
Guidelines for the Control of <i>Taenia saginata</i> in Meat of Domestic Cattle (Proposed Draft)	N07-2011	2013	5/8	1.1	FAO/WHO	
Code of Hygienic Practice for Spices and Dried Aromatic Herbs (CAC/RCP 42-1995) (Proposed Draft Revision)	N01-2012	2015	5/8	1.1	FAO/WHO	
The Definitions of the Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Assessment (CAC/GL 30-1999) (Amendment)	-	-	-	1.1	-	This work entailed the alignment of definitions with those in the Procedural Manual and further amendment for consistency with more up to date related Codex texts. Proposals were made to CCGP28 (2014) to amend definitions of hazard characterization and risk estimate in Procedural Manual.

Comments by the Chairperson/host country:

#### **Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Control of *Trichinella* spp. in meat of Suidae**

This work was co-lead by the Delegation of the European Union and the Delegation from New Zealand. We had a physical working group immediately preceding the meeting during which most of the outstanding concerns were addressed. The results of the PWG were presented in plenary. Two outstanding items remained unresolved. One was the availability of the report from the FAO/WHO expert consultation (which was a footnote reference in the proposed text). The representative from FAO shared a draft and indicated that the final report would soon be available at the FAO website. The second outstanding item, was the technical interpretation and application of the statistical sampling concept.

After much discussion in plenary, and expecting that that the two outstanding issues would be resolved in the interim between the committee meeting in November and the CAC37 (2014), the Committee with reservations from most Latin American Delegations decided to forward the text for adoption at Step 5/8.

In support of a request by the Chair, the Delegation from the United States of America, facilitated a videoconference in February between one of the two workgroup leads and the representatives from countries that had filed reservations during the session. The action item was to address the practical application of the sampling approach. After the conference, the participating countries were still not completely satisfied with the discussion.

In addition, even after that videoconference, the report of the expert consultation was still not available for the in-country experts to consider and evaluate.

It is the opinion of the Chair, that a more appropriate approach would have been to suggest submission for adoption by the Commission at Step 5, rather than 5/8, and allowing for the unresolved issues to be addressed. The Chair apologizes to the Commission for this misjudgement and takes responsibility for this decision. The Committee has already requested advice from FAO in order to continue working on the examples of parasites and, in particular, to further extend the work already done on illustrating the levels of public health protection that can be achieved when establishing a negligible risk compartment; to develop examples to assist competent authorities in deciding on options for ongoing verification of a negligible risk compartment ("maintenance") and for judging the equivalence of different options; and ensure a strong focus on communicating a risk-based approach to control of *Trichinella* spp. in pigs. The Representative of FAO, on behalf of FAO and WHO, welcomed the request for additional work to elaborate the maintenance section of the report and to provide information to make it a user-friendly document.

We expect the document will be referred back to the CCFH46 (2014) where, after thorough discussion, it may be considered again for suggested adoption with full committee consensus.

#### **Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Control of *Taenia saginata* in meat of domestic cattle**

The Committee, lead by the Delegation of New Zealand, reviewed the draft guidelines and with minor amendments advanced the document for adoption.

Committee on Food Hygiene (45 <sup>th</sup> Session, 11-15 November 2013)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
<b>Proposed Draft Revision of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Spices and Dried Aromatic Herbs</b>						
The Delegation of the United States of America introduced the report of the EWG, highlighting the key points taken into account in the redrafting of the Code and further drew the attention of the Committee to the points on which the EWG could not reach agreement (see paragraph 13 of CX/FH 13/45/13). The Committee agreed to base its discussion on a redrafted conference room document and considered the proposed draft Code section by section. After plenary discussion, the Committee agreed to offer the code for adoption at Step 5/8.						

Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (33 <sup>rd</sup> Session, 17-21 February 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Performance Criteria for Methods for the Determination of Marine Biotoxins (Section I-8.6) in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (Draft)	See Explanatory note	2014	8	1.1 1.2	FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Marine Biotoxins (2004)	Initially draft List of Methods for the Determination of Biotoxins retained for further consideration when the <i>Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs</i> was adopted in 2008. The work was finalized taking into account the requests from CCMAS34 (2013). In addition to performance criteria, CCFFP33 (2014) also included a section on biological and functional methods to determine PSP. CCMAS35 (2014) endorsed with amendment.
Standard for Fresh and Quick Frozen Raw Scallop Products (Draft)	2001	2014	8	1.1 1.2	-	CCFA46 (2014) endorsed the food additive provisions. CCFL42 (2014) to endorse the food labelling provisions. The standard can be adopted subject to the endorsement of the food labelling provisions.
Food Additive Provisions in Standards for Fish and Fishery Products (Revision)	ongoing	-	-	1.1 1.2	-	This work is alignment with the GSFA. CCFA46 (2014) endorsed the food additive provisions.

Comments by the Chairperson/host country:

**Draft Performance Criteria for Methods for the Determination of Marine Biotoxins (Section I-8.6) in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs**

The methods section is part of the *Standard for Raw and Live Bivalve Molluscs*, adopted at the CAC31 (2008). The CCFFP30 (2009) agreed to develop performance criteria and that further consideration is needed to decide whether specific methods would be included in the Standard or not. CCFFP33 (2014) agreed to forward the draft Performance criteria to Step 8 for adoption and to forward it to CCMAS for endorsement. CCMAS35 (2014) endorsed with amendments the proposed provisions.

**Draft Standard for Fresh and Quick Frozen Raw Scallop Products**

CCFFP33 (2014) agreed to forward the draft Standard to Step 8 for adoption. Provisions on FA and FL to be sent to relevant committees for endorsement. CCFA46 (2014) endorsed the food additive provisions.

**Food Additive Provisions in Standards for Fish and Fishery Products**

As regards the provisions, which required further consideration, the Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group, working in English and chaired by the European Union,

Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (33 <sup>rd</sup> Session, 17-21 February 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
to continue with the review of food additive provisions to correct inconsistencies/inaccuracies in the standards for fish and fishery products. We expect the Committee to finish this work at the next session in 2015. Future revisions or amendments to be considered by the committee at a later stage (see recommendation in CX/EXEC 14/69/3)						

Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (18 <sup>th</sup> Session, 24-28 February 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Standard for Passion Fruit (Draft)	N17-2011	2014	8	1.2	-	Scope expanded to cover species of passion fruits most traded internationally. Notes on food additives, methods of analysis and labelling also apply to durian and okra. No provisions for food additives and methods of analysis. CCFL42 (2015) to endorse the food labelling provisions. The standard can be adopted subject to the endorsement of the food labelling provisions
Standard for Durian (Proposed Draft)	N06-2011	2015	5/8	1.2	-	
Standard for Okra (Proposed Draft)	N02-2013	2016	5/8	1.2	-	
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u>						
<u>Comments by the Codex Secretariat:</u> The Committee has completed work on quality standards for fresh fruits and vegetables within or before the target year for completion of work. With no pending work on standards and related texts, the next CCFFV will consider ware potatoes, garlic, aubergines and kiwifruit as part of its new work schedule for the next two sessions (see CX/EXEC 14/69/4).						

Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (35 <sup>th</sup> Session, 3-7 March 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Methods of Analysis and Sampling in Codex Standards (Draft and Proposed Draft)	Ongoing	-	-	1.4	-	For adoption in existing Codex Standards or CODEX STAN 234-1999.
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u> As usual, the CCMAS discussed the methods of analysis and sampling that were forwarded to the meeting, and several methods were endorsed, in the following commodity categories. - -Milk and Milk Products - -Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses						

Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (35 <sup>th</sup> Session, 3-7 March 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
- Fish and Fishery Products						

Committee on Food Additives (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 17-21 March 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Food Additive Provisions of the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) (Draft and Proposed Draft)	ongoing	-	8 and 5/8	1.1	JECFA	See Chair's note.
Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Dietary Exposure to Food Additive (Proposed Draft Revision of CAC/GL 3-1989)	N08-2013	2016	5/8	1.1	FAO/WHO	See Chair's note.
The International Numbering System for Food Additives (CAC/GL 36-1989) (Amendment)	ongoing	-	5/8	1.1	-	
Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives (Proposed Draft)	ongoing	-	5/8	1.1	77 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (2013)	
Notes of the GSFA (Amendment)	-	-	-	1.1	-	Amendments are of editorial nature and aim at improving the clarity and harmonising the language of the notes of the GSFA.
Provisions for Aluminium-containing Food Additives in Selected Standards (Revision)	-	-	-	1.1	JECFA	These provisions were inadvertently not submitted by CCFA45 (2013) for adoption by CAC36 (2013).
Food Additive Sections of Standards for Meat Products (Revision)	-	-	-	1.1	-	The CCFA undertook this work following the request of CAC32 (2009) to update relevant sections of the five meat standards, developed in the early '80s. The revised food additive sections contain a general reference to the GSFA, consistent with the provision concerning the <i>Format for Codex Commodity Standards</i> (Codex Procedural Manual).
Food Additives Provisions of Food Category 08.0 "Meat and meat products, including poultry" and Its Sub-categories of the GSFA (Revision)	-	-	-	1.1	-	See Chair's note.
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u>						
The 46 <sup>th</sup> CCFA has made significant progress which includes:						
- GFSA: the major task of CCFA, 542 provisions were submitted to the Commission for adoption at Step 8 and Step 5/8. It is for the first time that the number of adopted GFSA provisions exceeds the number of provisions in the Step process.						

Committee on Food Additives (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 17-21 March 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Completed the revision of the 5 meat standards (food additive section) assigned by the Commission and also aligned with GFSA. It is the first case that food commodity standards are aligned with GFSA using the decision tree approach developed by CCFA.</li> <li>- After several years of no consensus on the Note 161 issue, it was agreed to establish an EWG to request information on the effect of the application of the following Note: "For use only in energy-reduced food or food with no added sugars as defined in CAC/GL 23-1997" to provisions for sweeteners in GFSA. The information collected will be used to determine if the application of this Note to replace Note 161 on a general basis for provisions for sweeteners in specific food categories is appropriate, or if alternative Notes can be developed to address concerns for the provisions for sweeteners in specific food categories when the replacement with this Note is not appropriate.</li> <li>- The proposed draft Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Dietary Exposure to Food Additive (revision of CAC/GL 3-1989) is submitted to the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8. These Guidelines would be a useful tool for the member states, in particular developing countries, to screen and decide national priorities in regulatory control of food additives.</li> </ul>						

Committee on Contaminants in Foods (8 <sup>th</sup> Session, 31 March – 4 April 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Maximum Levels for Lead in Infant Formula and Formula for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants and for Follow up Formula (Proposed Draft)	N04-2012	2015	5/8	1.1	73 <sup>rd</sup> JECFA (2010)	This is part of the ongoing review of MLs for lead in the <i>General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed</i> . The ML applies to the product "as consumed".
Maximum Levels for Inorganic Arsenic in Polished Rice (Proposed Draft)	N12-2011	2013	5/8	1.1	72 <sup>nd</sup> JECFA (2009)	Analysis for total arsenic as screening method followed-up by specific testing if the concentration of total arsenic is above the ML. Methods are in accordance with country practices. The ML for inorganic arsenic in husked rice will be further considered at the CCCF9 (2015) (see CX/EXEC 14/69/3).
Maximum Levels for Fumonisin in Maize and Maize Products and Associated Sampling Plans (Proposed Draft)	N10-2009	2012	5/8	1.1	74 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (2011)	The CCCF3 (2009) agreed on new work on MLs/SPs for fumonisins in maize and maize products based on the findings the 64 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (2001). The CCCF4 (2010) suspended work awaiting the outcome of the JECFA additional evaluation. The CCCF6 (2012) resumed discussion following the outcome of the 74 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (2011). The MLs accommodates the need of certain regions for stricter MLs to ensure consumers' health protection due to high consumption of maize and maize products while ensuring food security worldwide.

Committee on Contaminants in Foods (8 <sup>th</sup> Session, 31 March – 4 April 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
						CCMAS 36 (2015) to endorse the sampling plans. The sampling plan can be adopted subject to the endorsement of CCMAS. .
Annex for the Prevention and Reduction of Aflatoxins and Ochratoxin A Contamination in Sorghum (Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Mycotoxin Contamination in Cereals –CAC/RCP 51-2003) (Proposed Draft)	N05-2012	2014	5/8	1.1	-	
Code of Practice for Weed Control to Prevent and Reduce Pyrrolizidine Alkaloid Contamination in Food and Feed (Proposed Draft)	N03-2012	2015	5/8	1.1	-	
Editorial Amendments to the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed	-	-	-	1.1	-	Editorial amendments follow the decision of the Committee to introduce definitions of product and portion to which the ML applies as the template for the Schedule of the GSCTFF as opposed to use of code numbering from the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> which may not always fit the purposes of MLs for contaminants and toxins.
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u>						

Committee on Pesticide Residues (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 5-10 May 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Maximum residue limits for pesticides (proposed draft and draft)	-	-	8 and 5/8	1.1	JMPR ongoing	
Inclusion of kumquats in the MRLs for “citrus fruits” and “lemons and limes”.	-	-	-	1.1		Consequential amendment following the revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> as per the fruit commodity groups.
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u>						
<b>Draft and proposed draft maximum residue limits for pesticides</b>						
Because of different extrapolation policies used by the JMPR and in the EU, the clarification of 2013 JMPR couldn't convince the Delegations of EU and Norway to change their position of reservation raised since CCPR45 (2013) on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL of Clothianidin in/on Root and tuber vegetables.						
The EU clearly stated that EU will adopt CXLs as EU MRL if there are no discrepancies in assessment policy and methodology between Codex and EU, There are increasing reservations made by EU (Norway holds the same position as EU). It is a perennial problem, that how the Codex scientific consultation bodies harmonize their approaches with what members use. There are significant inconsistencies in approaches used for assessment, data selection, uncertainty policy, and acceptable level of risk.						
The same phenomenon exists as mention above. EU keeps its reservations mainly because of discrepancies between EU and JMPR in assessment policy, approaches used,						

Committee on Pesticide Residues (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 5-10 May 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
<p>toxicological and metabolism evaluation, residue definition, etc. .</p> <p>Other problems to mention are different positions held by members caused by data quality, MRL Grouping, revocation of exists CXLs during the periodic re-evaluation processes lacking in predefined data, etc..</p> <p>Development of elaboration of Codex MRLs is now facing two main challenges. First of all, the increasing need for more CXLs for ensuring consumer health and protecting fair international trade in food, especially for developing countries. Second, the requirements for refining the risk assessment processes to ensure its credibility and power of convincing the stakeholders. To meet these challenges, capacity building for the members as well as the scientific consultation of Codex are urgently recommended. A top-down systemic analysis of the uncertainty-based risk assessment is suggested for better resolution to the issue raised. The member's involvement in the risk assessment process of scientific consultation of Codex could be a way out. This is but yet no clear roadmap to be following.</p> <p><b>Revised Group MRLs for Citrus Fruits and Lemons and Limes That Apply to Kumquats</b></p> <p>There are some questions that remain unsolved relating to the grouping policy and dietary assessment criterion. This is a decision made according to the majority of the attending delegations. The scientific consultation body and some members are asked to obey the rule, but observations could be still necessary. Refinement and case-by-case handling to meet the minimum requirement of dietary exposure assessment, especially short term dietary exposure assessment, would be expected, as no rules could fit for all purposes.</p>						

#### STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS HELD AT STEP 8 BY THE COMMISSION

Draft Standard/ Related Text	Timeframe	Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
Draft MRLs for bovine somatotropin (bST)	ongoing	8	1.1	JECFA meetings in including 78 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (2013)	The 35 <sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission agreed to request JECFA to re-evaluate bST and to continue holding the draft MRLs for bST at Step 8, pending JECFA re-evaluation and CCRVDF recommendations.

## PART II - DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 5

Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (35 <sup>th</sup> Session, 4-8 November 2013)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
General Principles for the Addition of Essential Nutrients to Foods (CAC/GL 9-1987) (Proposed Draft Revision)	N02-2010	2013 /2014	5	1.3	-	
Comments by the Chairperson/host country:						

Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (33 <sup>rd</sup> Session, 17-21 February 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Code of Practice for Processing of Fish Sauce (Proposed Draft)	N03-2013	2016	5	1.1 1.2	-	
Comments by the Chairperson/host country: <b>Proposed Draft Code of Practice for Processing of Fish Sauce</b> EWG prior to the CCFFP33 (2014) lead by Thailand and Vietnam prepared a draft to facilitate progress. Written comments at Step 3 were received and incorporated into a CRD, which was used as basis for the discussion. Good progress was made in plenary, and the Committee agreed to forward the Proposed Draft Code to the CAC37 (2014) for adoption at Step 5. We expect this work to be finished at our next session in 2015.						

Committee on Pesticide Residues (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 5-10 May 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
<i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> – selected vegetable commodity groups (pulses) (proposed draft Revision)	N11-2004 N09-2006	2012	5	1.1	-	This is part of the ongoing revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> currently applying to vegetable commodity groups. Several vegetable commodity groups are now retained at Step 7 awaiting the completion of the revision of the vegetable commodity groups in by 2016 or before. The approach to the revision of the Classification as per the vegetable commodity groups follows the approach taken for the revision of the fruit commodity groups namely commodity groups should not be adopted at Step 8 until the revision for the whole group has been completed in order to avoid problems with the transfer of commodities from one group to

Committee on Pesticide Residues (46 <sup>th</sup> Session, 5-10 May 2014)	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
						the other when finalising the whole group for final adoption by CAC.
<u>Comments by the Chairperson/host country:</u>						