

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

39<sup>th</sup> Session, FAO Headquarters,

Rome, Italy, 27 June – 1 July 2016

#### MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMISSION BY CODEX COMMITTEES

#### MATTERS FOR ACTION

##### Committee on Sugars (CCS)<sup>1</sup>

##### Report on the Draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice

1. The Circular Letter [CL 2016/15-CS](#) invited comments on the proposals and recommendations, prepared by Colombia, CCS host country, in regard to the draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice.
2. The proposals are:
  - Colombia, as host of the Committee on Sugars, recommends a physical meeting of the Committee on Sugars, taking into account that the aspects that are preventing consensus are few, but technically specific, meriting review and direct dialogue between the interested parties to achieve better understanding and real progress towards an agreement. In order to achieve this, Colombia formally requests that consideration be given to vital support from the Commission through the Codex Trust Fund or another multilateral financial mechanism to cover the incurred costs and expenses from holding a physical meeting.
  - Colombia states that at this time it is unable to offer any indication on the possibility of assuming some of the costs associated with holding the meeting. Colombia's course of action will depend on the Commission's decision on the raised proposal.
3. The recommendations were that CAC:
  - **Note** the review and proposals presented in CL 2016/15-CS;
  - **Note** that the comments submitted in response to [CL 2015/19-CS](#) highlight the continuing differences among members on the core issues relating to the name of the product, scope, chemical characteristics, labelling and methods of analysis;
  - **Note** that these differences are the very same issues that have previously impeded advancement of the standard; and
  - **Consider** the next steps in relation to this work taking into account the review and proposals presented in this document, the responses to CL 2015/19-CS and the discussion and recommendation made at CAC38 in relation to further work on this standard ([REP15/CAC](#), paragraph 48).

#### Action by CAC

4. Comments to CL 2016/15-CS from six members and one observer organization are presented in the Appendix in original language.
5. The above comments have not been examined by Colombia, CCS host country, as the deadline for submission of comments (i.e. 10 June 2016) was too close to the forthcoming sessions of the Executive Committee and the Commission.
6. The Commission **is invited to consider** the proposals and recommendations in paragraphs 2 and 3 in light of the comments submitted in CL 2016/15-CS as compiled in the Appendix to this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> CCS is working by correspondence. Paras 2-3 are an excerpt from CL 2016/15-CS.

**APPENDIX  
Original Language****DRAFT STANDARD FOR NON-CENTRIFUGED DEHYDRATED SUGAR CANE JUICE****Compilation of comments submitted in reply to CL 2016/15-CS “Request for Comments:  
Report on the draft standard for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice”**

Comments submitted by: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Japan, United States of America and CEFS

**BRAZIL**

Taking into consideration the recommendations of the aforementioned document, we would like to submit our comments for consideration during CAC39, for the debate and decision about the standard for non-centrifugal sugars.

Brazil would like to express that we have noted and would like to confirm the statement - *“that the comments submitted in response to CL 2015/19-CS highlight the continuing differences among members on the core issues relating to the name of the product, scope, chemical characteristics, labelling and methods of analysis”*.

Nonetheless, as provided at the Document: Compilation of Comments Submitted in Reply to CL 2015/19-CS “Request for comments at Step 6 on the draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice”, we would like to share our view that alternatives were provided by most of the members of the working group.

We also have noted that the differences as provided by the leading country of the electronic working group have presented the very same issues that have previously impeded advancement of the standard.

On the other hand, we would like to state that since the very beginning of the discussions (i.e., at our responses to CL 2013-9CS, CL 2014-35CS, CL2015/09 and CL2015-19) we had suggested to the WG to differentiate the various non-centrifuged sugars and/or to expand/flexible the proposed values to encompass all products under the provisions of the Standard.

In that sense, Brazil would like to express a strong disappointment for the lack of progress despite all the efforts made and all the alternatives presented.

We would like to reiterate the need to be taken an inclusiveness approach for an international Standard for Non-centrifugal sugars, adopting the same approach as in the Codex Standard for (Centrifuged) Sugars (Codex Stan 212-1999), positioning different non-centrifugal sugars in different columns/provisions.

If the approach to be considered is the continued discussion to frame all non-centrifugal sugars at the same provisions for panela, Brazil would like to recommend the finalization of the standard as it is, removing the references to non-centrifugal sugars and the list of sugars that do not comply with the proposed provisions.

Brazil also would like to be considered a Codex Standard for non-centrifugal sugars that could accommodate the different products as formerly presented and discussed.

**COLOMBIA**

Colombia, actuando en calidad de país miembro de la Comisión y no como Presidente del Comité del Codex sobre Azúcares, tiene el agrado de presentar los siguientes comentarios a las conclusiones y recomendaciones relacionadas en el apéndice de la carta circular CL 2016/15-CS, versión en español.

Ratifica su respaldo al análisis y conclusiones del informe sobre el estado del proyecto de norma, teniendo en cuenta que, según los comentarios recibidos, persiste cierta confusión sobre el producto que se desea normalizar.

Confirma su apoyo a la propuesta de celebrar una reunión presencial, sobre la base que, un diálogo directo entre las partes podría aclarar muchos aspectos y afinar los términos de un consenso, para lo cual se suma a la solicitud de recabar apoyo para el cubrimiento económico de la misma.

Con relación a las recomendaciones del Secretariado para la Comisión, desea realizar las siguientes precisiones y comentarios:

Viñeta dos: No hay diferencias sobre la composición del producto. El único componente, como se define en el proyecto de norma (en el trámite 6) es el jugo de caña de azúcar *Saccharum officinarum* L. Si existen diferencias sobre las características químicas del producto.

Viñeta dos: No hay diferencias sobre los aditivos alimentarios (estabilizantes y espesantes). El proyecto de norma (en el trámite 6), través de la carta circular CI 2015/19-CS, no tuvo comentarios sobre esta cuestión de algún estado miembro u organización observadora.

Viñeta dos: En realidad, las diferencias sobre el etiquetado son directamente dependientes, del acuerdo que se logre sobre el nombre del producto. De otra parte, existe consenso sobre que el nombre adoptado en la norma vaya seguido del nombre corriente u ordinario aceptado en el país de origen o de venta al por menor.

Viñeta cuatro: En concordancia con la recomendación formulada durante la reunión 38 de la Comisión, en relación con la labor futura sobre este proyecto de norma (Rep. 15/CAC, párr.48), en el sentido de realizar una reunión presencial en caso de no lograrse un consenso sobre su adopción definitiva, Colombia apoya esta opción, antes de la suspensión de los trabajos sobre el proyecto de norma.

## COSTA RICA

Costa Rica agradece la oportunidad para expresar sus comentarios en el trámite 6 del procedimiento ya que considera de suma importancia que se realice una norma Codex para lo que en nuestro país se conoce como "Tapa Dulce".

Asimismo, Costa Rica desea destacar que no coincide con Colombia en lo explicado en el informe respecto a los niveles bajos de azúcares reductores, porque al igual que sugieren varios países (Brasil, Japón y Costa Rica) un nivel bajo de azúcares reductores (1.5%*m/m* sugerido) sí permite alcanzar un nivel máximo de sacarosa (91% propuesto); con lo cual no contravendría el producto originalmente propuesto. De igual manera, Costa Rica sigue apoyando la posición enviada en respuesta a la CL 2015/19-CS.

En relación con la propuesta establecida en el informe, a Costa Rica le preocupa que no se observa un avance en el proyecto de norma respecto del año pasado, en el cual se ha trabajado de manera electrónica; entonces pareciera que una reunión presencial podría ser útil, pero también preocupa las posibilidades reales de los países en desarrollo para poder participar.

Dado lo anterior, Costa Rica solicita que el tema se mantenga en agenda y no se vaya a suspender hasta agotar todas las vías para lograr un consenso.

## ECUADOR

Ecuador agradece a Colombia la oportunidad de comentar el documento: "PROYECTO DE NORMA CODEX PARA EL JUGO DE CAÑA DE AZÚCAR DESHIDRATADO NO CENTRIFUGADO", sin embargo apoyamos la recomendación de Colombia de realizar una reunión presencial del Comité de Codex sobre Azúcares.

De acuerdo a lo mencionado Ecuador desea realizar las siguientes observaciones específicas:

- **Capítulo 1; Párrafo 1**

### ÁMBITO DE APLICACIÓN

Esta norma se aplica al jugo de caña de azúcar deshidratado no centrifugado, según se define en la sección 2 que está destinado al consumo directo, inclusive para fines de hostelería o para reenvasado en caso necesario, como también al producto cuando se indique que está destinado a una elaboración ulterior. Esta norma no se aplica a los productos obtenidos a partir de la reconstitución de sus componentes.

#### **Ecuador:**

No especifica las presentaciones de jugo de caña de azúcar deshidratado a las que se aplica esta normativa.

Se sugiere aumentar en el párrafo 1 lo siguiente:

Esta norma se aplica al jugo de caña de azúcar deshidratado no centrifugado, "**en sus dos presentaciones: bloque y granulado**", según se define en la sección 2 que está destinado al consumo directo, inclusive para fines de hostelería o para re-ensado en caso necesario, como también al producto cuando se indique que está destinado a una elaboración ulterior. Esta norma no se aplica a los productos obtenidos a partir de la reconstitución de sus componentes

- **Capítulo 2; Párrafo 1**

### DEFINICIÓN DEL PRODUCTO

Se entiende por "jugo de caña de azúcar deshidratado no centrifugado", al producto obtenido por la evaporación del jugo de caña de azúcar *Saccharum officinarum* L., que contiene microcristales amorfos no visibles al ojo humano, que mantiene sus elementos constitutivos como sacarosa, glucosa, fructosa y minerales.

#### **Ecuador:**

a.- No existe nombre común para el producto.

Incluir los nombres comunes para los países, como es el caso de Ecuador el nombre de “**Panela**”.

b.- No existe un término que evidencie la procedencia del jugo de caña de azúcar.

Además, Ecuador propone aumentar dentro del párrafo lo siguiente:

Se entiende por jugo de caña de azúcar deshidratado no centrifugado, al producto obtenido por la evaporación del jugo de caña de azúcar “**proveniente de cualquier variedad de la planta gramínea**” *Saccharum officinarum* L., que contiene microcristales amorfos no visibles al ojo humano, que mantiene sus elementos constitutivos como sacarosa, glucosa, fructosa y minerales.

• **Capítulo 2; Subcapítulo 3.2; Tabla Características físicas y químicas**

Requisito	COMPOSICIÓN EN BASE SECA	
	Valor	
	Mínimo	Máximo
Cenizas (% m/m)	0,9	--
Sacarosa (% m/m)	--	91
Azúcares reductores (% m/m)	4,5	--
Proteínas en % (N X 6,25)	0,2	--

- ✓ La norma no especifica los tipos de Azúcares Reductores.

**Ecuador:**

- Respecto al contenido de Cenizas se solicita proporcionar información que evidencie la procedencia del valor mínimo propuesto en la tabla.
- En cuanto a % de Proteína presente en el producto se recomienda no establecer un valor mínimo, debido a que en el proceso de elaboración se utiliza altas temperaturas las cuales desnaturalizan la mayoría de proteínas presentes en la caña de azúcar, adicionalmente este proceso permite obtener un producto inocuo ya que disminuye la carga microbiana.
- Solicitamos especificar cuáles azúcares reductores se encuentran contenidos (dentro del término azúcares reductores).

**JAPAN**

Japan appreciates Colombia's great efforts as the host of the Codex Committee on Sugar (CCS), and is pleased to provide the following comments on the Draft Codex Standards for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice.

We have gradually put focus on several issues through the discussion for the development of the standards. However, we have not reached an agreement of the standards at this time.

In addition, Japan is disappointed that our proposals have not been reflected in the current draft without any rationale.

Regarding the new proposal for a physical meeting of the CCS, Japan recognizes that it is worth holding this physical meeting if there is room to reach consensus.

However, if that is not the case, Japan would suggest discontinuation of this work that has already been mentioned in CL 2015/19-CS (para 8, same as REP15/CAC para 48).

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The United States appreciates the opportunity to comment further in response to CL 2016/15-CS, on the *Report on the Draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice*.

**General Comments:**

The United States agrees with Colombia's conclusion in the Report that there are still outstanding issues that need to be addressed in the development of this standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice, as we have previously mentioned at the 2015 Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) and in our earlier responses to the various Circular Letters (CLs) on this draft standard. Those issues are the very same issues that have previously impeded advancement of the standard. It is regrettable that neither a new proposed draft standard, nor an appendix with all of the comments received in response to the most recent CL-2015/19-CS (July 2015) were provided for consideration with this new CL.

As suggested by the CAC in 2015, Colombia has proposed having a physical meeting to help address the outstanding issues in order to reach consensus on the draft standard, however we believe that a physical meeting cannot guarantee that consensus can be reached and may not be justified. Given that Colombia is not in a position to host a physical meeting of the Committee on Sugars (CCS) and that the necessary funds for hosting such a meeting have not been secured, the United States is reluctant to support further elaboration of this draft standard. As such, the United States would not object to the option of discontinuing work on the draft standard. If however, the CAC were to agree that a physical meeting of the CCS would take place, the United States would provide the following specific comments for consideration in addition to the concerns raised in our previous responses to CLs.

### **Specific Comments:**

The United States is concerned that CL 2016/15-CS still refers to this product as juice, since it is in fact not juice, but a form of sugar. The United States believes that this product should be called "non-centrifugal cane sugar" or a variation of this term, such as "raw non-centrifugal cane sugar" or "unrefined non-centrifugal cane sugar." Please note all of the underlined sections below are hyperlinks to the relevant information.

- This product appears to be a type of cane sugar described by World Custom Organization under its [Harmonized System Nomenclature Subheading 1701.13. US Customs and Border Protection](#) also considers panela as a type of cane sugar (raw cane sugar, non-centrifugal).
- The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has recently published a "Guidance for Industry: Ingredients Declared as Evaporated Cane Juice" stating that the use of the term "juice" for sweeteners (e.g., "evaporated cane juice") is false or misleading because it suggests that the sweetener is "juice" or is made from "juice" and does not reveal that its basic nature is that of a sugar.
- The US Department of Agriculture considers panela as a type of non-centrifugal sugar.
- FAO has defined sugar, non-centrifugal as "generally derived from sugar cane through traditional methods without centrifugation" under FAOSTAT code 0163. The committee should consider the term "non-centrifugal" (rather than "non-centrifuged") as it is used by FAO for consistency.

For product definition, the United States would like to seek clarification on whether the formation of amorphous microcrystals is considered a crystallization process and whether cane juice which undergoes scum removal operations prior to evaporation is considered partially purified.

- The Codex Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999) defines "raw cane sugar" as "[p]artially purified sucrose, which is crystallised from partially purified cane juice, without further purification, but which does not preclude centrifugation or drying, and which is characterised by sucrose crystals covered with a film of cane molasses." As indicated in India's comment on CL 2013/9-CS, the production of jaggery involves some processing of sugar cane juice and scum removal operations before actual evaporation. If work on the draft standard proceeds, it should be clear on how this product is different from "raw cane sugars" or if the sugar standard needs to be revised to modify "raw cane sugars."

As for the Scope, the United States would like to seek clarification on how "consensus could be reached if the product were also considered to be intended for purposes other than direct consumption, including catering, a term commonly used in Codex standards, as well as for pre-packaging or for subsequent processing," as stated in CL2016/15-CS.

### **COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DES FABRICANTS DE SUCRE (CEFS)**

Firstly, CEFS also would like to reiterate its support for the current version of the draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice, as found in CL 2015/19-CS and which was communicated in July 2015.

Secondly, CEFS agrees with the understanding that *“even though the product originates from sugar cane, the proposal to name it as sugar, with a descriptive term related to its process, goes against the initial intention of the work proposed and approved by the Commission, which was to cover a product that is different in nature to sugar”* laid down in the report available in CL 2016/15-CS. As already mentioned before, CEFS supports a “name of the product”, a “scope” and a “product definition” which would avoid potential conflict with the definitions and provisions laid down in the Codex Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999).

In terms of next steps, we feel that the report is currently too vague to understand the proper extent of the remaining few technical issues. Therefore, CEFS would like to suggest Colombia to create an electronic working group which would work on a discussion paper clearly identifying the points preventing consensus and including proposed solutions/options based on the comments received so far. With this suggested approach, a physical meeting might not be necessary.