

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 2

CX/PFV 10/25/2
July 2010

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

25th Session
Bali, Indonesia,
25 – 29 October 2010

MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND CODEX COMMITTEES

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

1. Draft standards adopted at Step 8

1. The 32nd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (July 2009) adopted the *Draft Standards for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* and *Certain Canned Vegetables*.

2. The following paragraphs are extracted from the report of the Commission and provide additional information on comments made and decisions taken on the adoption of these items:

1.1 *Jams, Jellies and Marmalades*

3. The Delegation of India requested the inclusion of a footnote to the scope of the Standard to exclude certain products widely traded in that country, e.g. “murabba”, which might not fit into the definition of jams as presented in the Standard. It was noted that the scope of the Standard did not include jam-like products that were traditionally produced in certain countries and therefore there was no possibility of confusion between these products.

4. The Commission agreed to delete the reference to “fruit spread” from the scope of the Standard as an editorial amendment since this product was not covered by the Standard.

5. The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Executive Committee to delete the reference to “veterinary drugs” from the section on contaminants as not relevant to products of plant origin. The Commission also agreed that the provisions for sampling plans in the annexes of the Standard would not be included pending clarification from the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to the Committee on Methods and Analysis and Sampling on which provisions in the Standard they apply to. It was noted that this would not affect the implementation of the Standard as provisions for lot acceptance already recommended that countries apply appropriate sampling plans. The Commission acknowledged that the amendment to the section on contaminants and the removal of the annexes on sampling plans also applied to the Standard for *Certain Canned Vegetables*.

6. The Commission adopted the *draft Standard for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* with the above amendments.

7. The Commission noted that this Standard would supersede individual *Standards for Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies (CODEX STAN 79-1981)* and *Citrus Marmalade (CODEX STAN 80-1981)*.¹

1.2 *Certain Canned Vegetables (general provisions); Packing Media (for inclusion in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables); Annexes specific to certain canned vegetables (for inclusion in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables)*

8. The Commission adopted the *Draft Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables*. The Commission also adopted the *Proposed Draft Section 3.1.3 on Packing Media* and the *Proposed Draft Annexes Specific to Certain Canned Vegetables* for inclusion in the *Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables*.

¹ ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras. 49-53, App. III.

9. The Commission further noted that this Standard would supersede individual Standards for *Canned Asparagus* (CODEX STAN 56-1981), *Canned Carrots* (CODEX STAN 116-1981), *Canned Green Peas* (CODEX STAN 58-1981), *Canned Green Beans and Wax Beans* (CODEX STAN 16-1981), *Canned Mature Processed Peas* (CODEX STAN 81-1981), *Canned Palmito* (CODEX STAN 144-1985) and *Canned Sweet Corn* (CODEX STAN 18-1981).²

2. **Proposals for the elaboration of new standards and related texts**

10. The 32nd Session of the Commission approved the revision of the Standards for *Grated Desiccated Coconut*, *Table Olives*, *Canned Mushrooms* and *Canned Bamboo Shoots* as new work for the Committee.³

3. **Amendments to Codex standards and related texts**

3.1 ***Amendments to adopted standards: Reference to sampling plans for pre-packaged foods in Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables***

11. The 32nd Session of the Commission noted that in view of the revocation of CODEX STAN 233-1969 and its replacement by the *General Guidelines on Sampling*, by which subsidiary bodies of the Commission should develop appropriate sampling plans for the product(s) being standardized, the reference to lot acceptance provisions in a number of Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables should be aligned with the wording used in the latest standards revised by the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables which referred to the “*appropriate sampling plan with an AQL of 6.5*” and therefore agreed to proceed with this replacement in the relevant standards for processed fruits and vegetables.⁴

3.2 ***Amendments to the Section on Contaminants of certain commodity standards: Reference to “veterinary drugs” in Codex standards for commodities of plant origin***

12. The 32nd Session of the Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Executive Committee to remove the reference to “veterinary drugs” in the contaminants section of the standards for processed fruits and vegetables as standards for products of plant origin should not make reference to veterinary drugs. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat would replace the provisions for contaminants (including pesticides) with the standardized provision as set out in the Procedural Manual for consistency throughout Codex standards and to refer the matter to the committee concerned when specific technical issues arose that required more than editorial changes to the section on contaminants.⁵

3.3 ***Revision of certain maximum levels for contaminants for canned fruits and vegetables in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed***

Executive Committee

13. The 62nd Session of the Executive Committee (June 2009) noted that due to the development of general standards for groups of processed fruits and vegetables, several individual standards had been revoked following the adoption of more horizontal standards for canned fruits and vegetables. The horizontal standards included only the general statement on contaminants specified in the Procedural Manual, while the individual standards included maximum levels for certain contaminants (lead and tin) that were also listed in the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed*. In view of the technical nature of the issue, the Executive Committee recommended that the Commission refer the review of maximum levels for contaminants in processed fruits and vegetables to the Committee on Contaminants in Foods.⁶

Committee on Contaminants in Foods

14. The 4th Session of the Committee on Contaminants in Foods (April 2010) noted that the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables had elaborated several general standards for groups of canned fruits and vegetables thereby replacing individual standards for canned fruits and vegetable which were revoked by the Commission on adoption of the general standards. It was further noted that the scope of these general standards had also been expanded to include other commodities for which individual standards had not previously existed. These general standards contained the general statement on contaminants from the Procedural Manual.

15. At the same time, several maximum levels for tin and lead for canned fruits and vegetables from the revoked standards were listed in the *General Standard for Contaminants in Toxins in Food and Feed*. The Committee therefore considered whether the levels for tin and lead applied to the more general standards with particular regard to whether these levels could also be extended to those commodities now included in these general standards for which levels had not previously been established.

² ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras. 54-55, App. III.

³ ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 114, App. IV.

⁴ ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 106.

⁵ ALINORM 09/32/3, paras. 70-72 and ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 112.

⁶ ALINORM 09/32/3, paras. 15-17.

16. As the General Standard provided for a *ML for tin in canned foods (excluding beverages) at 250 mg/kg*, the Committee agreed to apply this ML to the general standards for canned fruits and vegetables and to replace product name in the General Standard (i.e. *canned apricots, canned peaches, canned plums*, etc.) by the group name in the general standards (i.e. *canned stone fruits*) and to insert the corresponding references associated general standards for canned fruits and vegetables (i.e. *CODEX STAN 242-2003*). In the case of the ML for lead, the Committee noted that lead would be evaluated by the 73rd meeting of Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) in June 2010 and agreed to not take action until JECFA had completed its evaluation.⁷

Codex Alimentarius Commission

17. The 33rd Session of the Commission (July 2010) adopted *Maximum Level for Tin in Canned Food (excluding beverages) at 250 mg/kg* to various general standards for canned fruits and vegetables in the *Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed*.⁸

4. Methods of analysis and sampling for certain standards for canned fruits and vegetables

18. The 30th Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (March 2009) considered methods of analysis and sampling in a number of Codex standards for canned fruits and vegetables and made the following comments and decisions:

4.1 Jams, Jellies and Marmalades

19. The Committee agreed to revoke the methods for calcium and mineral impurities as no provisions existed in the Standard.⁹

4.2 Aqueous Coconut Products

20. The Committee deleted the Bligh-Dyer and AOAC 983.23 methods for total fats because they used chloroform as a solvent.

21. The Committee considered the information provided by the Delegation of Thailand on the validation studies carried out on ISO 1211:1999 for total fats and ISO 6731:1989 for total solids in coconut milk and agreed to endorse both methods as Type I. The AOAC 963.15 method for total fats was therefore deleted as only one Type I method could be retained.¹⁰

5. Food additive and related provisions in Codex commodity standards

22. The 42nd Session of the Committee on Food Additives (March 2009) endorsed with some editorial amendments the majority of food additive provisions forwarded by the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.¹¹

5.1 Jams, Jellies and Marmalades

23. The Committee endorsed the provision for grape skin extract (INS 163(ii)) at a maximum level of 500 mg/kg as opposed to at GMP level as it had a numerical Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI). The level of 500 mg/kg for the four carotenoids was endorsed to be used singly or in combination and the Section on Flavourings was endorsed with the inclusion of a reference to the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings*.¹²

5.2 Certain Canned Vegetables

24. The Committee did not endorse caramel III (INS 150c) proposed at the level of good manufacturing practices (GMP) noting that it had a numerical ADI. The level for caramel IV (INS 150d) was changed from GMP to the numerical level of 50,000 mg/kg agreed for food category 04.2.2 of the *General Standards Food Additives*.¹³

5.3 Other Matters for CCPFV

25. The Committee considered the request of the 24th Session of the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to associate certain new functional classes with certain food additives in the *Class Names and the International Numbering System for Food Additives*. In this regard, the Committee did not agree to assign a new "preservative" technological purpose to ascorbic acid (INS 300), due to the fact that ascorbic acid did not prevent the growth of microorganisms but acts mainly as a colour preserving/retention agent in jams, jellies and marmalade.¹⁴

⁷ ALINORM 10/33/41, paras. 18-21, App. II.

⁸ ALINORM 10/33/REP, App. III.

⁹ ALINORM 09/32/23, para. 72, App. IV.

¹⁰ ALINORM 09/32/23, paras. 74-75, App. IV.

¹¹ ALINORM 09/32/12, para. 33, App. III.

¹² ALINORM 09/32/12, paras. 36-45.

¹³ ALINORM 09/32/12, paras. 46-47.

¹⁴ ALINORM 09/32/12, para. 118.

5.4 *Food additives, flavourings and processing aids in Codex commodity standards*

Food additives

26. The 63rd Session of the Executive Committee (December 2009) encouraged all committees to comply with the provisions of *Section II of the Procedural Manual - Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* and agreed that the Secretariat should provide guidance to committees in this respect. The Committee was informed of the work in progress in several committees to update the provisions on additives and to ensure consistency between the *General Standard for Food Additives* and provisions in individual standards.¹⁵

Processing Aids

27. The 33rd Session of the Commission (July 2010) adopted the *Draft Guidelines on Substances used as Processing Aids* and revoked the *Inventory of Processing Aids (IPA) (CAC/MISC 3)*. In this regard, the Committee on Food Additives agreed to develop a database on information on processing aids. The structure and content of this database, including criteria for the entry and update of the database, will be considered at the next session of CCFA (March 2011).¹⁶

Flavourings

28. The 33rd Session of the Commission (July 2010) adopted the revision of the *Section on Format for Codex commodity standards (Food Additives)* in *Section II of the Procedural Manual* to include a reference to the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings*.¹⁷

¹⁵ ALINORM 10/33/3, para. 11.

¹⁶ ALINORM 10/33/12, paras. 106-126.

¹⁷ ALINORM 10/33/12, para. 15 and ALINORM 10/33/REP para. 11 and App. II.

MATTERS FOR ACTION

1. Review of the Codex committee structure and mandates of Codex committees and task forces: Allocation of fruit and vegetable juices and related products to the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables

29. When considering the review of Codex committee structure and mandates of Codex committees and task forces, the 32nd Session of the Commission concluded that the issue of merging committees had generated very little interest. It was further concluded that merging of committees might not be the most appropriate way to deal with improving the efficiency of Codex work, but that the entire Codex work processes needed to be addressed. The Commission agreed to discontinue discussion on the merging or dissolving of committees until there was a need to do so in the future. In this framework, it was noted that it would be appropriate to consider revising the terms of reference of the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables in order to include fruit and vegetable juices, since these commodities were also processed foods. The Commission therefore agreed to request the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to review its terms of reference to consider the inclusion of fruit and vegetable juices.¹⁸

30. The Terms of Reference of Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables comprises the development of worldwide standards for all types of processed fruits and vegetables, excluding fruit and vegetable juices and related products.

31. The *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices was dissolved by the 28th Session of the Commission (July 2005) after completion of its work on the revision and consolidation of the existing Codex standards and related texts for fruit and vegetables juices and related products including methods of analysis¹⁹. The *General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars* represents the revision and updating of all individual standards for fruit juices and nectars and related texts into one horizontal standard covering a wider range of fruit juices and nectars currently marketed on international trade.

32. The Committee is invited to consider whether its Terms of Reference should include fruit and vegetables juices and related products taking into account the dissolution of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit and Vegetable Juices and the finalization of the *General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars* and within the framework of the discussion of the Commission on the review of the Codex committee structure and mandates of Codex committees and task forces.

2. Methods of analysis and sampling in certain Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables

2.1 Application of sampling plans (AQL = 6.5) to lot acceptance in Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables

33. The 30th Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling noted that there was no indication of the purpose of the sampling plans in the *Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables* and in the *Standard for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* and asked the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to clarify to which provisions in the standards the sampling plans applied.²⁰

34. In adopting both standards, the 32nd Session of the Commission agreed that the provisions for sampling plans in the annexes of the *Standard for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* and *Certain Canned Vegetables* would not be included pending clarification from the CCPFV to CCMAS on which provisions in the Standard they apply to. It was noted that this would not affect the implementation of the Standard as provisions for lot acceptance already recommended that countries apply appropriate sampling plans.²¹

35. It is noted that provisions for lot acceptance applying sampling plans with an AQL of 6.5 usually refer to those provisions listed under the quality criteria, e.g. colour, flavour, odour, texture, size, etc., and under minimum fill. Lot acceptance for minimum drained weight should be deemed to be complied with when the average drained weight of all containers examined is not less than the minimum required, provided that there is no unreasonable shortage in individual containers. Specific sampling plans for lot acceptance for minimum drained weight (AQL = 2.5) will be considered by the Committee under Agenda Item 6.

36. The Committee is invited to clarify whether provisions for lot acceptance (sampling plans with an AQL of 6.5) in the Standard for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades and in the Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables apply to provisions falling under quality criteria (Section 3.3 jams, jellies and marmalades and Section 3.2 canned vegetables) and minimum fill (Section 7.1 jams, jellies and marmalades and Sections 7.1.1-7.1.3 canned vegetables) of these Standards.

¹⁸ ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras. 223-228.

¹⁹ ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 244.

²⁰ ALINORM 09/32/23, para. 76, App. IV

²¹ ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 52, App. III.

2.2 *Methods of analysis for certain canned fruits and vegetables*

37. The 30th Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling agreed to seek clarification from the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables as to whether the ISO 762:1982 method currently listed for canned palmito should be retained, and endorsed the AOAC 971.33 method as Type I. All other methods were endorsed or revoked as proposed by the CCPFV.²²

38. The 28th Session of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (March 2007) temporarily endorsed the ISO/UNIUN method for the determination of drained weight for crushed style tomatoes in the *Standard for Preserved Tomatoes* pending confirmation of the correct ISO reference. The 24th Session of the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (October 2008) could not identify the correct ISO reference and requested the CCMAS to delete this method and to endorse AOAC 968.30 as a method for “crushed style” preserved tomato only, with the following footnote: “Use a No. 14 screen instead of ‘7/16’ or No. 8”. The Committee agreed to endorse the method as Type I and requested clarification from the CCPFV as to the change in the size of the sieve, as compared with the original AOAC method.²³

39. The Committee is invited to provide clarification to the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling in relation to the above matters.

3. **Development of specific decision making and priority setting criteria for development (including revision and amendments) of Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables**

40. The 24th Session of the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (October 2008) considered the request from the Codex Alimentarius Commission in regard to various activities of the *Codex Strategic Plan 2008-2013* relevant to the programme of work of the Committee including *Activity 3.3 (Develop committee-specific decision-making and priority-setting criteria)*. The Committee considered this Activity in the framework of the priority list for standardization of processed fruits and vegetables and agreed not to develop any additional specific criteria for the setting of work priorities recognizing that the *Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities* of the Procedural Manual were sufficient for setting priorities for the future work of the Committee.²⁴

41. The 63rd Session of the Executive Committee (July 2010) agreed to advise the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to reconsider developing committee specific decision making and priority setting criteria, as specified in the *Codex Strategic Plan Goal 3 (Activity 3.3)*, including the need for revision or amendment of existing standards.²⁵

42. The Committee is invited to reconsider the need to develop specific decision making and priority setting criteria taking into account its previous decision in this regard and the outcome of the discussion under Agenda Item 8.

²² ALINORM 09/32/23, para. 73, App. IV.

²³ ALINORM 10/33/23, paras. 79-80.

²⁴ ALINORM 09/32/27, para. 112.

²⁵ ALINORM 10/33/3, para. 9.