CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

World Health Organization

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

Agenda Item 10 **CX/CAC 18/41/11 Add.3**

June 2018

Original language only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

41th Session, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, 2 - 6 July 2018

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES

MATTERS FOR ACTION

Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods: Organic Aquaculture

1. CCEXEC71 discussed the recommendation of CCFL43 to consider that the work on the revision of the *Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods*: Organic Aquaculture be undertaken by another relevant technical subsidiary body or be discontinued. Noting that the work was behind schedule, CCEXEC considered the following options: to extend the timeline for completion; or to find a different platform for the work; or to discontinue the work

2. CCEXEC noted that CCFL had made every effort to progress work, but the highly technical issues that remained were too complex for CCFL to resolve; that there were varying opinions or interpretations of what entailed organic aquaculture; and that assigning this work to another subsidiary body would not necessarily lead to a solution of the technical issues.

3. CCEXEC further noted that the original work on organically produced foods had started at a time when there was very little international guidance on the production, processing, labelling and marketing of such foods, but that since then, there had been many developments internationally and that consideration should be given to whether such further work was needed in Codex.

4. In conclusion, CCEXEC supported the recommendation to discontinue the work on the revision of *Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods*: Organic Aquaculture.[1]

5. CAC39[2] considered the recommendation of the CCEXEC to discontinue the work.

6. After discussion, the Chairperson noted the interest to continue the work, but that there were also those in favour of discontinuation, and noted the intervention of FAO[3], and proposed that the Commission postpone the decision on discontinuation awaiting a proposal by interested members on how and where to take this work forward. This would be considered by CAC41 in 2018.

7. The Commission agreed to consider this matter at CAC41 and that this item would not be on the agenda of CCFL.

8. The Commission **is invited to take a decision** on the revision of the *Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods*: Organic Aquaculture.

[1] REP16/EXEC, paras 31-35
[2] REP16/CAC, paras 191-196
[3] REP16/CAC, para 194

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
ENDORSEMENT AND/OR REVISION OF MAXIMUM LEVELS FOR FOOD ADDITIVES AND PROCESSING AIDS IN CODEX STANDARDS[4]

1. The 40th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC41) (2017) adopted[5] the draft Regional Standard for Doogh at Step 5/8 and noted that publication of the Regional Standard would be pending the endorsement of the labeling (see CX/CAC 18//41/11) and food additive provisions.

2. The 50th Session of the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA50) (2018) considered food-additive provisions forwarded by CCNE9 for the Regional Standard for Doogh. The following was noted:

- all except two of the food-additives provisions were identical to those in the *Standard for Fermented Milks* (CXS 243-2003) i.e. nisin and magnesium dihydrogen diphosphate;
- there were transcription errors in the draft Regional Standard for Doogh, including in table 4.1 between heat-treated doogh and unheated doogh;
- the footnote (a) to the table in section 4.1, referring to national legislation, was not appropriate; and
- no justification was provided for the deviation from the requirements of the Procedural Manual, Section II: Elaboration of Codex texts, Relations between commodity committees and General Subject Committees (pp. 50-51 and 57-58), as to why the GSFA was not referenced in this commodity standard.

Conclusion

3. The Committee agreed:

(i) not to endorse the food-additive provisions in the draft Regional Standard for Doogh; and

(ii) to request that CCNE

a) consider whether a general reference to the GSFA was possible in place of food-additive provisions in the draft Regional Standard and if not to provide a justification;

b) assess the detailed comments provided in CRD31; and

c) reconsider reference to footnote (a) in the Table of Section 4.1.

4. The Commission **is invited to note** the above information.

4 REP18/FA, paras. 31-33
5 REP17/CAC, paras. 16, 63