

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

E



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

REP17/LAC

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Fortieth Session

CICG, Geneva, Switzerland

17 – 22 July 2017

REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Viña del Mar, Chile

21 – 25 November 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Status of Work.....	page ii
List of Acronyms	page iii
Report of the Twentieth Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean	page 1

Paragraphs

Introduction	1
Opening of the Session	2 - 5
Adoption of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1)	6
Keynote Address on the Evaluation of Food Safety Systems (Agenda Item 2)	8 - 14
Food Safety and Quality Situation in the Countries of the Region (Agenda Item 3a)	
Prioritization of the Needs of the Region and Possible Approaches to Address them (Agenda Item 3b)	15 - 32
Use of Codex Standards in the Region: Relevance of Existing Regional Standards and Need for New Standards (Agenda Item 4)	33 - 46
Matters Arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex Committees (Agenda Item 5)	47 - 48
Codex Work Relevant to the Region (Agenda Item 6)	49 - 110
Monitoring of the Implementation of the Codex Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan for CCLAC 2013-2019 Status of Implementation) (Agenda Item 7)	111 - 120
Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Yacon (Agenda Item 8)	121 - 123
Nomination of the Coordinator (Agenda Item 9)	124
Other Business (Agenda Item 10)	125 - 142
Date and Place of Next Session (Agenda Item 11)	143

Appendices

Appendix I	List of Participants	page 16
Appendix II	Keynote Address by Dr Hugo Fragoso Sanchez, Director General for Food Safety and Quality, SENASICA, Mexico	page 26
Appendix III	Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Yacon	page 28

SUMMARY AND STATUS OF WORK

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step	Para.
Members/ CCEXEC73 CAC40	Comments/ Adoption	Proposed draft regional standard for yacon	N11-2013	5/8	123, App.III
CCFA49 / CCFL44	Endorsement	Relevant sections for the proposed draft regional standard for yacon			
CAC40	Appointment	Recommended that Chile be re-appointed as Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean			124
CCEXEC73	Information	Reaffirmed that the criteria for the establishment of work priorities as laid down in the Procedural Manual are sufficient to prioritize its work			48
CAC Chair and vice Chairs	Information	Provided inputs and comments on the preparation of the new Strategic Plan			115 - 120
CCLAC Coordinator CCLAC21	Information	Report on the status of monitoring of the Strategic Plan for CCLAC 2013-2019			111 - 114
FAO/WHO Members	Information	Noted that the analysis of critical and emerging issues was very preliminary; noted that prioritisation of issues should be considered within the framework of Codex mandate; and agreed to invite countries that had not replied to the questionnaire to provide their inputs.			20
		Expressed general support for the usefulness of the on line platform for information sharing on food safety control systems platform and made suggestions and comments for the further review and development.			32
FAO/WHO Members	Information	Noted the analysis of the survey on the use of Codex standards and made comments and suggestions for the future development.			46
FAO/WHO Members	Information	Discussed Codex issues of relevant interest to the region, including: Cross-cutting topics for the region and proposed draft standards and discussions seeking regional support			49 - 110
FAO/WHO Members	Information	Considered information on: a proposal for the development of a standard for yam; status of work on the standards for quinoa and for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice; possible changes of the status of CCPFV; and work on biofortification.			125 -142

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACHIPIA	Chilean Agency for Food Quality and Safety
AMR	Antimicrobial Resistance
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CCCF	Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods
CCCPL	Codex Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes
CCEXEC	Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission
CCFA	Codex Committee on Food Additives
CCFH	Codex Committee on Food Hygiene
CCFICS	Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems
CCFL	Codex Committee on Food Labelling
CCFO	Codex Committee on Fats and Oils
CCGP	Codex Committee on General Principles
CCLAC	FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean
CCNFSDU	Codex Committee on Nutrition and Food for Special Dietary Uses
CCPFV	Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables
CCPR	Codex Committee on Pesticides Residues
CCRVDF	Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods
CCS	Codex Committee on Sugars
CL	Circular Letter
CRD	Conference Room Document
CTF	Codex Trust Fund
EU	European Union
EWG	Electronic Working Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEMS/Food	Global Environment Monitoring System
GSCTFF	General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed
GSFA	General Standard for Food Additives
GSLPF	General Standard for Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
INFOSAN	International Network of Food Safety Authorities
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
ML	Maximum Level
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PWG	Physical Working Group
RCCs	FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees
RILAA	Red Interamericana de Laboratorios de Analisis de Alimentos / Inter-American Network of Food Analysis Laboratories (INFAL)
SENASICA	Servicio Nacional de Sanidad, Inocuidad y Calidad AgroalimentariaAs
SG	Strategic Goal
TFAMR	Ad hoc Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Antimicrobial Resistance
UNSDG	United Nation Sustainable Development Goal
WG	Working Group
WHO	World Health Organization
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary (WTO Agreement)
TBT	Technical Barrier to Trade (WTO Agreement)

INTRODUCTION

1. The FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean (CCLAC) held its Twentieth Session in Viña del Mar, Chile, from 21 to 25 November 2016 at the kind invitation of the Government of Chile. Dr Michel Leporati Néron, Executive Secretary of Chilean Agency for Food Quality and Safety (ACHIPIA), Ministry of Agriculture, chaired the session, which was attended by delegates from 30 Member countries, three Member countries outside the Region and seven international organizations. The list of participants is reproduced in Appendix I.

OPENING

2. The Chair welcomed the delegates and gave his opening remarks.
3. The Vice-Minister of Agriculture, Chile, Dr Claudio Ternicier, welcomed the participants and opened the session. In his address, the Vice-Minister confirmed the commitment of Chile as regional coordinator to strengthen the work of Codex in the region through coordination and communication as well as facilitation of participation of countries in coordination with FAO and IICA. He recalled the importance of the double mandate of Codex and the responsibility of countries to strengthen their national food control systems to ensure food quality and safety. He mentioned the immense challenges involved in feeding the entire population of the country as well of the region and world. Food safety and quality were a tremendous added value while it should be ensured that agricultural production is sustainable.
4. The Minister of Health, Chile, Dr Carmen Castillo also welcomed the participants. The Minister said that Codex is one of the most important organisations to ensure safe food and fair trade practice. She noted that since Codex standards are developed by consensus, consumers can have confidence that food is safe and of good quality. She mentioned the longstanding commitment of Chile to Codex (since 1969) and that as coordinator Chile would ensure that Codex responds to regional interests and to bring about positive experiences to give countries the tools to make interventions as necessary to ensure protection of the population against communicable and non-communicable diseases and overall improve food safety and health.
5. Ms Eve Crowley, FAO Deputy Regional Representative for Latin America and the Caribbean and FAO Representative in Chile; Dr Marcos Monteverde, Specialist, Food Safety and Surveillance, PAHO; Ms Awilo Ochieng Pernet, Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Mr Tom Heilandt, Secretary of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, also addressed the meeting.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)¹

6. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the session with the following additions:
 - a) Under Item 6:
 - Front of pack labelling (Costa Rica)
 - Maximum limits for cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products (Ecuador)
 - b) Under Item 10:
 - Proposal for the development of a standard for yam (Costa Rica)
 - Information on work on the standard for quinoa (Bolivia and Peru)
 - Information on work on the standard for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice (Colombia)
 - Time management of CAC39 to debate issues, e.g. processed cheese
 - Possible change of the status of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruit and Vegetables (Brazil)
 - Information on work on biofortification in the region (IFPRI)
7. The Committee agreed to consider Items 3a and 3b together.

¹ CX/LAC 16/20/1

KEYNOTE ADDRESS ON THE EVALUATION OF FOOD SAFETY SYSTEMS (Agenda Item 2)²

8. The Representative of FAO, on behalf of FAO and WHO, introduced the item and referred to the ongoing process of revitalization being undertaken across all RCCs. The Representative noted that the inclusion of a keynote address, as well as the discussion on critical and emerging issues, online platform to share information on food control systems and the use of Codex standards, were key activities within this process that aimed at stimulating discussion and sharing information on matters of interest to the region. The Representative further noted that the revitalization process also aimed at strengthening the role of RCCs as a regional forum to discuss food quality and safety issues relevant to the region.
9. Dr Hugo Fragoso Sanchez, Director General for Food Safety and Quality, SENASICA, Mexico, delivered the keynote address on the evaluation of food safety system (Appendix II). His presentation was followed by a general discussion facilitated by the Representatives of FAO and WHO.
10. Key points made by delegations in relation to keynote address can be summarized as follows:
 - The development of economic and social indicators of easy use would be useful to assist national competent authorities to estimate the costs of food safety and quality issues in terms of market access and public health expenditures.
 - Integrated food safety systems to address plant health, animal health and human health would ensure public health. Evaluation of food safety systems is useful to identify aspects of the system that need improvements. Risk communication by national competent authorities should ensure that misleading information does not reach the public domain.
 - Cooperation among countries of the region having more integrated and mature food safety systems would be useful to assist those countries developing their systems or improving national coordination amongst relevant agencies having competence on food safety.
 - An essential point for the evaluation of food safety systems is the need to generate and collect information and data that should inform the continuous improvement of the system. Challenges do exist due to the fragmented systems in place in many countries, which hamper information sharing and thus there is a need for improved internal coordination. Implementation and use of relevant documents and tools developed by FAO, WHO and Codex (CCFICS) will help to ensure good functioning of national food safety systems.
 - Countries of the region should actively participate in the work of CCFICS on documents related to food safety systems to ensure they fit the purpose and do not become overly prescriptive nor of mandatory nature.
 - Information and data sharing should be done across institutions and countries to ensure prompt reaction and proper legal frameworks to enforce technical regulations.
 - Information was shared on the steps taken to improve national coordination amongst different stakeholders on food safety issues. In this regard, it was mentioned that the International Health Regulation (2005) called upon countries to put in place a rapid alert system on food safety emergencies such as outbreaks to share such information amongst member countries.
 - There is a need for better use of regional networks (e.g. RILAA, PULSENET) for data and information sharing, in addition to steps taken to improve national coordination amongst different stakeholders on food quality and safety issues.
 - Recognized the role of FAO, WHO and other organizations in providing assistance to countries of the region to strengthen their food safety systems and requested the organizations to continue to support countries not only at technical level but also to raise the food safety agenda at the political level.
 - Expressed the need for appropriate legislation and policies based on evidence and information.
11. In the context of measuring and evaluating food control systems, the Representative of FAO updated the Committee on the current status of the development of the FAO/WHO Food Control Assessment Tool. This self-assessment tool would provide a framework for assessing core elements of national food control systems against specific competencies and indicators. Countries were advised that the testing of the tool was ongoing in selected countries. Regarding the ongoing work in CCFICS, the Committee was advised that FAO participates at the sessions in order to exchange information on the food control assessment tool and other relevant FAO work.

² CX/LAC 16/20/2

12. The Representative of WHO clarified the different purposes and legal bases of the International Health Regulations (2005) and INFOSAN, including the voluntary nature and accompanying benefits of the latter mechanism. The Representative also highlighted that the countries could use disease burden data to mainstream food safety in the political agenda and informed the Committee that a country tool for estimating national foodborne diseases burden would be made available by mid 2017. Quantification in monetary terms of national investment in food safety per inhabitant or per food production value could also serve as useful indicators to raise awareness of decision makers. The Representative also stressed that good collaboration between different government branches was the key for building effective food safety systems with or without the establishment of a single agency.
13. The Chair highlighted the need for integrated food safety systems where relevant institutions coordinate their respective activities in a collaborative way. This is a complex exercise that it is difficult to execute in practice. There is therefore a paradox between the recognition of the need for integrated food safety systems and the implementation of such systems. Implementing integrated systems is of utmost importance for food safety to ensure public health as opposed to non-food safety issues where there could be different levels of engagement of the public and private sector as they are more related to consumer preferences and market trends. It is therefore important to implement the documents and tools available from FAO, WHO, Codex and IICA for a better coordination and integration of the relevant stakeholders.
14. The Chair closed the item by thanking Dr Fragoso for his keynote address and the Committee for the lively discussion.

FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY SITUATION IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE REGION (Agenda Item 3.1)³

PRIORITIZATION OF THE NEEDS OF THE REGION AND POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO ADDRESS THEM (Agenda Item 3.2)⁴

15. The Representative of FAO, on behalf of FAO and WHO, recalled the request by CAC38 to FAO/WHO with the Codex Secretariat to develop a set of questions on issues and priorities in countries and prepare an analysis of the information collected to provide a global overview of commonalities and differences on critical and emerging issues.

Discussion

16. Delegations generally agreed with the top six critical and emerging food safety and quality issues identified in CX/LAC 16/20/3, namely: regulatory landscape; antimicrobial resistance (AMR); contaminants/residues/additives; new technologies; climate change and capacity development. However, delegations noted that the analysis was not representative of the LAC region as it only reflected the responses of 12 countries, (approximately 30% of the membership).
17. The following additional critical and emerging issues were mentioned: increase of obesity among children and adults; MRLs for minor crops; impact of EU regulations on endocrine disruptors; capacity development needs of countries; lack of participation by all relevant stakeholders; need for strengthening collaboration among food laboratories, e.g. laboratory networking; contribution of the food sector to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), e.g. reduction of poverty and hunger, good health and wellbeing, decent work and economic growth, responsible consumption and production; changes in food habits and urbanisation; risk communication, i.e. how risk managers should appropriately communicate food safety risk to the public; viruses in food; water contamination as it affects the safety of food; food fraud; distribution of food through new channels such as internet sale of food.
18. Delegations also mentioned that it was important: to set priorities at national and regional level; to catalogue national food safety legislation in order to allow for its analysis and comparison with that of other countries and with Codex standards; to have information on the status of food safety systems in the countries of the region, including related capacity development needs, in order to prioritise interventions; to know the status of implementation of food legislation at country level; to develop national food safety policies, to regularly review and update national legislations and to analyse the impact of food safety legislation; to strengthen regional coordination and collaboration; to avoid fragmentation at the national level in the implementation of food legislation; to increase involvement of private sector; to have strong inter-sectorial collaboration, i.e. One Health approach; to develop MRLs for more pesticides; to have more FAO and WHO work to assist countries to produce data for exposure assessment of chemicals; to establish Codex guidelines for the prevention of non-communicable diseases.

³ CX/LAC 16/20/3; CX/LAC 16/20/3 Add.1; Comments of Chile (CRD3; CRD4); Brazil (CRD6); El Salvador (CRD7); Dominican Republic (CRD8); Ecuador (CRD12)

⁴ CX/LAC 16/20/4

19. With regard to the prioritisation of the issues identified (critical and emerging), it was noted that prioritisation of issues should be considered within the framework of Codex mandate as laid down in the Procedural Manual.

Conclusion

20. The Committee:
- Noted that the analysis of critical and emerging issues in CX/LAC 16/20/3 was very preliminary as it was based on the replies of a limited number of CCLAC countries;
 - Noted that prioritisation of issues should be considered within the framework of Codex mandate as laid down in the Procedural Manual;
 - Agreed to invite countries that had not replied to the questionnaire to provide their inputs, so that FAO and WHO could prepare a more representative and complete analysis in the short-term for distribution in the region in the course of 2017, and for consideration at the next Session of CCLAC.

Online platform for information sharing on food safety control systems

21. The Representative of FAO, on behalf of FAO and WHO, introduced the background paper (CX/LAC 16/20/3 Add.1) and explained that the primary use and purpose of the platform was to facilitate information exchange between member countries on food control and food safety issues replacing the former CL on the same topic with the goal to be more sustainable. Country information collected could also be used by FAO and WHO when implementing capacity development activities and identification of additional needs. The Representative highlighted that the platform's success depends on member countries actively uploading and updating the information on the platform.
22. The Representative drew the attention of the Committee to two areas of information in the platform: (i) food law and regulations where it is planned to fill in the information from existing sources in FAO LEX to facilitate the work, which countries would subsequently check and update as necessary; and (ii) part F, which includes a series of questions the information provided for which would be handled confidentially.
23. The Representative recalled that the prototype platform had been launched in May 2016 and up to now only 11 CCLAC countries had provided information in the platform with data and therefore, encouraged countries to upload their information to enhance the usefulness and sustainability of the platform.
24. Delegations were asked to provide comments and feedback on the prototype platform (Annex to CX/LAC 16/20/3 Add.1), in particular: (i) whether the platform was useful and fit for purpose; (ii) ease of sharing information; (iii) suitability of existing questions and on the need to include additional questions; and (iv) suggestions for other improvements.

Discussion

25. Delegations generally considered the prototype platform suitable to share information and they also agreed with the management of the platform.
26. It was mentioned that a lot of information on food safety and the information are spread in different systems. The platform could help to make access to the information easier.
27. With regards to additions/clarifications to existing questions the following suggestions were made:
- Add to Q.1: How does the competent authority fulfil its functions and competencies; information on the principal contact point of the competent authority as well as the actions that are being carried out as to comply with such competencies; Indicate what are the standards for import and export and examine if relevant documents could be attached.
 - Add to Q.2: Is the INFOSAN contact point active in the country and does it adequately reply to requests from the network. What is the INFOSAN focal point
 - Add to Q.3: Add a new question on what are the control mechanisms implemented to ensure application of the laws and regulations
 - Add to Q.8: Person in charge
 - Clarify Q.11: As the question has the objective to evaluate national capacity which is also the goal of the previous questions there should be objective criteria and comparative parameters for each component.

28. With regards to additional questions the following suggestions were made:
- What are relevant projects and programs to improve food safety in the country that could be made available in a repository through links;
 - What actions have countries taken to implement food safety policy;
 - Has the country implemented Codex standards in whose development the country has participated;
 - How are Codex standards applied in the food control system;
 - What is the status of development of legislation;
29. The following general improvements were proposed and questions asked:
- Start a complementary project to consider and manage sanitary information generated by the national food control system and determine any cross-linkages to food borne diseases and contamination.
 - Include additional information to allow an in depth analysis of the efficiency of implementation and enforcement of regulations.
 - There should be more analysis of the information provided by countries.
 - Could the platform be exported in order to provide access to the information in the platform and could documents be attached to include information from different ministries?
30. The Representative of FAO thanked the Committee for the interesting feedback, which would be taken into account when further developing the platform. The Representative also advised the Committee that as the platform was global, decisions on new questions to be included would take account of feedback from all RCCs and would be informed by the feasibility to provide and share the information and ensure reliability of information (e.g. contact points). The Representative further noted that the platform had a specific purpose and would not replace all information collection activities required at country level.
31. The Representative of WHO reminded the Committee that the online system, in contrast to the discontinued Circular Letter-based system, allowed countries to update data on a continuous basis. The Representative confirmed that the intent of Q.11 was to collect data that could produce analytical statistics to monitor the progress in countries' capacity building over time and understand countries' areas of strengths or weaknesses and that data would be handled by FAO and WHO in such a manner that would not reveal the identity of respondent countries. Further adjustments could be made to Q.11 to keep consistency with the WHO's IHR country self-assessment tool which was under finalization in order to avoid asking too many different questions to countries. The question on the INFOSAN emergency contact point was included in the questionnaire to detect any inconsistency or errors with the INFOSAN contact database and make sure that the correct contact address be maintained.

Conclusion

32. In wrapping up the discussion the Chair noted that:
- There was general support for the usefulness of the platform and its format;
 - FAO and WHO had taken note of the various points suggested during the discussion for further review and development of the platform.

USE OF CODEX STANDARDS IN THE REGION: RELEVANCE OF EXISTING REGIONAL STANDARDS AND NEED FOR NEW STANDARDS (Agenda Item 4)⁵

33. The Secretariat recalled that this item was on the agenda of the six RCCs and that an online electronic survey, jointly developed with FAO and WHO, had been used to enhance data collection on the use of Codex standards from members.
34. The Secretariat further explained that the survey had focused on specific standards, widely known and representative for their respective categories, i.e. (i) numerical standards (MRLs of pesticides in food and feed); (ii) general subject standards (General Standards for Food Additives (GSFA), for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF) and for Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (GSLPF); and (iii) General Principles of Food Hygiene.

⁵ CX/LAC 16/20/5; Comments of Chile (CRD3); Comments of Nicaragua (CRD5); El Salvador (CRD7); Dominican Republic (CRD8); Ecuador (CRD12)

35. The Chair congratulated CCLAC members for the response rate (67%), which demonstrated the high level of interest for Codex in the region.
36. The Secretariat introduced the analysis of the survey results, as presented in CX/LAC 16/20/5, inviting delegations to note the outcome of the analysis and provide inputs on specific aspects of the survey.

Discussion

Format and approach

37. Delegations expressed their satisfaction with the format and approach of the survey which had been easy to use.

Use of the results

38. Delegations were of the opinion that because of the high response rate, the survey was a good reflection of how Codex was applied in the region and the results of the survey and the analysis should be published on the Codex website. It was also noted that the information on use of Codex standards was consistent with the WTO provisions on transparency.
39. With regards to the publication of the results it was suggested: to allow countries to update the information regularly; to invite countries that did not complete the survey to access it and insert data; and to mention the name of countries who had provided specific information.
40. Delegations further suggested: to analyse the reasons for not using Codex standards as it was important information for market access; to provide information on the way countries were using Codex texts. It was mentioned that it could be useful to develop guidance on how countries could use Codex standards for their national legislation and that it was of utmost importance for the countries of the region to make available the results of the applications of the standards from all regions as well as an interregional comparative analysis of the results in order to determine the level of the harmonisation of the standards.
41. The Representative of WHO welcomed the survey as a tool to measure use and impact of Codex activities, which should be part of any program. He said that the good response rate could justify the usefulness of Codex and help to mobilise resources. He suggested that it could be of interest to have an inter-regional comparison and think about how to consolidate data from different regions. This information could be presented to CCEXEC and CAC as well as the WTO SPS and TBT committees in 2017.
42. The Codex Secretariat said that an agenda item on the revitalisation process had been included in the agenda of CCEXEC73 and a relevant analysis would be prepared by the Codex Secretariat in cooperation with FAO and WHO. It was important to have a global view of the use of Codex standards which could also stimulate more harmonisation between countries.

Scope of next survey

43. Delegations suggested the following Codex texts for the scope of the next survey: commodity standards as they were an important part of Codex work; *Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems* (CAC/GL 82-2013); MRLs for veterinary drugs, and texts on AMR and biological hazards.
44. It was also suggested to include questions on: the reasons for partial or no adoption of a Codex text and difficulties to collect relevant documents; the competent authorities responsible for the implementation of the standards and the tools necessary for their implementation; and the use made of relevant tools and manuals developed by FAO and WHO.
45. While the response rate had been very good, it should be examined why 33% did not reply and how these could be motivated to reply in the future. It was noted that the inclusion of complex or too many questions might negatively affect the response rate.

Conclusion

46. The Committee noted that the comments and suggestions made would guide the Codex Secretariat in the future development of the survey.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COORDINATING COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 5)⁶

47. The Committee considered the information provided in documents CX/LAC 16/20/6 and CX/LAC 16/20/6 Add.1, noting that several matters were presented either for information or discussion under relevant items.

⁶ CX/LAC 16/20/6, CX/LAC 16/20/6 Add.1; Comments of Dominican Republic (CRD8)

Monitoring of Standard Development

48. The Committee noted that due to the limited workload on standards development it did not need to develop a specific approach to manage its workload. The Committee reaffirmed that the criteria for the establishment of work priorities as laid down in the Procedural Manual were sufficient to prioritize its work.

CODEX WORK RELEVANT TO THE REGION (Agenda Item 6)⁷

49. Chile, as CCLAC Coordinator introduced the item presented document and provided an analysis of the replies to a questionnaire requesting CCLAC Members to submit issues of regional interest being discussed in Codex to be considered at the current session. The Coordinator explained that suggestions received had been divided into two categories: (i) Cross-cutting topics for the region; and (ii) Proposed Draft Standards and discussions seeking regional support.
50. The Committee was invited to discuss the topics identified noting that the list was not in a priority order.

a) Cross-cutting topics for the region

Codex work on antimicrobial resistance

51. Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Dominican Republic raised the issue recognising that AMR is a serious threat for public health and requires urgent action by Codex. They also noted the importance of the activities undertaken by FAO, WHO and OIE on AMR, the relation of the topic with the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the importance to apply the “One health approach” when dealing with AMR.
52. Delegations commented that Codex work on AMR should focus on the entire production chain (and not only on primary production); that it is important to avoid duplication with the work of OIE; and that countries need FAO and WHO technical support to enhance their capacity to implement Codex guidance.
53. Delegations expressed concerns as to the difficulties to participate in the work of the PWG on AMR (London, United Kingdom, 29 November - 1 December 2016) and of the TFAMR and requested that work on AMR be carried out by electronic means to allow wider participation of countries, especially developing countries.
54. The Representative of FAO stated that FAO’s action plan for AMR promotes a complete chain approach from primary production onwards, and advised that a regional FAO project to build capacities on AMR will commence in early 2017.
55. With regard to the PWG on AMR, Brazil noted that it was important to guarantee wide participation, without limiting the number of participants, in line with the *Guidelines on Physical Working Group*⁸.

Operations of the Codex electronic and physical working groups

56. Brazil and Dominican Republic raised the issue of lack of participation of developing countries in PWGs and EWGs. They recalled that both, the WTO SPS Agreement and the Codex Strategic Plan (Strategic Goal 3) refer to the need to ensure participation of developing countries. They noted that preference should be given to use EWGs over PWGs and to ensure full language coverage to allow equal participation of developing countries in Codex work. Brazil reiterated the view that EWGs would have had a greater participation of developing countries than PWGs. The Delegation stated that they intended to bring this matter to the attention of the SPS Committee.
57. The Committee recalled that CCLAC19 had already discussed the issue (REP15/LAC 130-135).
58. In addition, it was mentioned that a number of committees had suspended physical meetings and continued their work by correspondence for which proper guidance was missing in the Procedural Manual but for which translation into the official Codex languages should also be ensured.
59. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that within the ongoing review of Codex work management the first topic that had been chosen was EWGs and presently a survey to assess the efficiency of EWG was under preparation. The results of the review would be distributed for comments to members and observers in April 2017. In addition, the Secretariat mentioned that CCEXEC72 had formed a sub-committee led by vice-Chair Yayoi Tsujiyama to examine the questions related to committees working by correspondence.
60. The Chair mentioned that it was important to raise the concern of languages when a new EWG is created while being mindful of resource implications. There were many positive examples now of EWG functioning in several languages but it was necessary to find alternative ways if costs did not allow for translation.

⁷ CX/LAC 16/20/7 Rev; Comments of Costa Rica and Uruguay (CRD1); Chile (CRD4); Nicaragua (CRD5); El Salvador (CRD7); Dominican Republic (CRD8); Dominica (CRD9); Peru (CRD10); Ecuador (CRD11)

⁸ Procedural Manual

FAO/WHO Trust Fund for Participation in Codex

61. Bolivia raised the issue noting that following the establishment of the CTF2 no countries of the region had accessed the funds for projects in the application round in 2016. The Delegation encouraged countries to work together to submit robust proposals (national or regional projects).
62. In addition a delegation noted that it was not clear how to access the funds, how the projects were approved, and whether funding availability limited the number of approved projects. The Delegation stressed the importance of accessing the funds to enhance participation of countries in Codex work and joining forces to present robust project proposals to the next round of application.
63. The Chair informed the Committee that CTF2 had established an Advisory Group where Regional Coordinators participated to be informed about the activities of the CTF2 but also to provide inputs and views of the regions as to the shortcomings identified and ways to improve the operation of CTF2. He stressed the value of CTF2 to assist countries to strengthen and build capacity in Codex structures to allow sustainable and effective participation in Codex work.
64. The Administrator of CTF2 drew the attention of the Committee to the side event where information on the operation of the CTF2 would be provided including eligibility criteria and assessment of the project proposals to access the funds.

Scientific and technical capacity building through exchanges among countries of the region

65. Cuba raised the issue and noted that enhancing the interchange of information among countries of the region e.g. through workshops, training courses, could assist countries to deal with issues of common interest to the region in a coordinated manner and to strengthen their scientific and technical capacity.
66. Delegations noted that IICA had developed a tool to facilitate the interchange of information among countries (e.g. scientific data, experts). IICA was implementing a programme to assist countries to better understand the issues related to food safety and to strengthen their technical and scientific capacity to effectively participate in Codex activities. Delegations also highlighted the importance of South-South cooperation in this regard.
67. The Representative of FAO supported the importance of exchanging scientific and technical information as part of building effective food control systems. The Representative referred to the ongoing work and support from FAO to countries, including improved use of risk analysis, data generation, collection and use of evidence as a basis for evidence informed decision making, and improving understanding of FAO/WHO scientific advice processes e.g. JECFA. She further noted that the modality of South-South cooperation was important and used within ongoing capacity development activities and projects.

Seeking consensus on topics relevant to the region

68. Cuba raised the issue of the need to find consensus in standards development and gave as example two projects that presently had issues in finding consensus and were so at risk of being suspended (e.g. processed cheese, non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice). A regional consensus would facilitate worldwide consensus building.
69. It was also mentioned that at CAC39 unfortunately there had not been enough time to discuss these two issues to attempt to find a consensus due to bad management of time.
70. Colombia making reference to their experience as Chair of CCS noted that one problem was that there was often a lot of enthusiasm and participation at the beginning of a new project, which diminished at later stages when issues around certain provisions arose (e.g. product identity).

Private standards of importance for the region

71. Cuba raised the question of how to keep a more integrated follow up on the issue of private standards. The existence of private schemes was mentioned that did not allow for example the use of certain pesticides even when Codex MRLs are available.
72. Delegations recalled the following:
 - This issue was mentioned as a key concern in the keynote address. It seemed that Mexico had made some progress in promoting the dialogue with the private sector which might be interesting to follow up in more detail.
 - The issue had been discussed for years without conclusion on a definition of “private standards” in the SPS Committee. The Commission had also discussed the matter and had contacted relevant private standard setters eligible to become observer organisations and invited them to participate in the Codex work.

73. The Committee also recalled that a regional position on private standards had been developed in 2012 (REP13/LAC, para 170) and has been reaffirmed in 2014 (REP15/LAC, paras 163-168) and that one of the conclusions was the need for countries to provide concrete information on issues with private standards.
74. The Chair noted that this was a complex issue and invited Mexico to provide more information on any agreement reached with private standard setters.

Regular review of Codex management

75. Brazil raised the issue regarding CAC39 decision to discontinue the discussion on the ToR of the internal Secretariat-led review of Codex Work Management and Functioning of the Executive Committee and to request the Codex Secretariat to regularly review Codex work management as part of the monitoring of the Codex Strategic Plan. In this context the Commission noted that "FAO and WHO had a prerogative to conduct an evaluation of the Codex programme whenever they consider it necessary and appropriate". Brazil did not support some of the recommendations discussed at CAC39, e.g. changing voting procedures, replacing CCEXEC with an executive board, etc., as this might jeopardise the functioning of Codex. The Delegation proposed that countries should monitor any discussion on this matter.
76. The Codex Secretariat clarified that the recommendations mentioned by Brazil, included in a document considered by CCGP29 (2015), were no longer under discussion in Codex. The Secretariat further explained that CAC39's decision allowed the Secretariat to review a selected topic in the context of the ongoing review of Codex work (see "Operation of Codex electronic and physical working groups") while reporting every year to the CAC on the monitoring of the Codex Strategic Plan. The Secretariat confirmed the prerogative of FAO and WHO to carry out an independent external evaluation of Codex if they considered it necessary.
77. A delegation commented that the ongoing review of Codex work would provide valuable information on Codex activities to members and further suggested to assess the rate of adoption of Codex text in order to make recommendations aimed at improving the efficiency of Codex work.

Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)

78. El Salvador raised the issue of consistency of the risk analysis texts across relevant committees and recalled that this matter had been considered by CCGP30 (2016). In particular, the Delegation highlighted the need to examine the consistency between the *Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR* (i.e. periodic review procedure for the re-evaluation of pesticides and subsequent revocation of MRLs for pesticides) in relation to relevant provisions in the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius* and in similar texts developed by other Codex committees responsible for assessing risks to chemicals (e.g. CCFA, CCRVDF, etc.).
79. El Salvador further noted that this matter had also been considered at CAC39 (2016) where several countries of the region had proposed that the legal departments of FAO and WHO provide a legal analysis of the consistency between the risk analysis principles applied by CCPR and other relevant Codex committees for consideration by CCGP. The Delegation reiterated the view that CCGP had not yet completed work on the review of the consistency of the risk analysis texts and so the matter should remain on the agenda of CCGP.
80. The Chair recalled the Committee that the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR had already been adopted by CAC and that CCGP had by now concluded consideration of the matter. He acknowledged that in both CCGP and CAC the decision had been taken with the reservation of several countries of the region.
81. In addition, the Chair informed the Committee that Chile, with the assistance of FAO, was carrying out a study to assess the impact of the application of the periodic review procedure on the availability of pesticides / MRLs and the consequences on the production and the economy of countries of the region. The outcome of this study could further support the concerns of the region and provide robust argument to request the reopening of the discussion in CAC, CCGP and/or CCPR.
82. Several delegations supported El Salvador and agreed to request CAC40 (2017) to put the matter back to CCGP for consideration. They acknowledged that any further support coming from the outcome of the study carried by Chile would be useful to accompany this request.
83. The Committee therefore agreed to request CAC40 to task CCGP to reconsider the matter of consistency of risk analysis principles on the basis of information that could be provided on this matter..

Relationship of Codex with parent organizations FAO and WHO

84. Costa Rica proposed to have a regional position with regards to the ongoing discussion in CCEXEC on the relation of Codex and relevant FAO and WHO strategies and policies. The proposed position was based on the mandate of CAC and the existing Codex procedures in the Procedural Manual.

85. Delegations debated whether a regional position could be taken to reaffirm that Codex Alimentarius Commission is a member driven organisation, which may take into account relevant FAO and WHO strategies and policies in accordance with its mandate.
86. The Representative of WHO welcomed delegations' interest and attention in this subject, which would be discussed at the forthcoming sessions of the Executive Committee and the Commission. In his view it was important to establish interactive links between the Commission and the Governing Bodies of WHO, in order that Codex work become more visible within these bodies having a significant influence on the degree of the support provided by WHO to Codex and related programmes. With regard to certain terms, such as "independence", "sovereignty" and "autonomy", mentioned by some delegations to qualify the relations between the joint FAO/WHO food standard programme and its parent organizations, the Representative noted that these terms, which did not appear in any text in the Procedural Manual, should be used with caution as they could have particular legal implications.
87. The Representative of FAO recognized the value of consultation and information exchange when there is parallel work ongoing by FAO and Codex on food safety and quality issues. She recalled that there are examples of where this is occurring, e.g. Codex work on food labelling and date marking and the revision of the General Principles of Food Hygiene with potential benefits. The Representative acknowledged the inter-governmental nature of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the need for decisions in Codex to be decided by Codex members according to Codex rules and processes for standards development.
88. The Committee agreed that the Codex Alimentarius Commission considers the policies and guidelines of FAO and WHO, which may be relevant to the work of Codex, respecting the autonomy of the Commission, reflected in its mandate and Procedural Manual, and that it is therefore the CAC, with the agreement of its Members, that defines how it will address and take into account such policies.

CCLAC webpage

89. The Dominican Republic raised the issue of the CCLAC website and made reference to the position reached at CCLAC19 (REP15/LAC, para 124). They reiterated the importance of a regional website and reported issues with the Codex website which was at times not available. They also noted that it had never been agreed that the CCLAC webpage should be integrated into the FAO page.
90. The Codex Secretariat invited delegations to report any issues with the performance of the Codex website to the Codex Secretariat. In addition, the Secretariat explained that the move of the Codex website into the FAO domain had been a FAO internal decision outside the competence of the Codex Secretariat but should have no implications as to the accessibility of the website.
91. With regard to the regional websites the Codex Secretariat noted that the proposal to integrate them into the Codex website had been made because of the experience with difficulties when moving the website from one to the next Coordinator. There had been delays in the publishing of the new websites but their issuing was imminent. Once published, any suggestions for improvements would be welcome.

b) Codex work which need support of the region

Proposed draft MLs for cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products

92. Ecuador informed the Committee on the latest developments of the work of the CCCF/EWG led by Ecuador on the establishment of MLs for cadmium in chocolate and cocoa-derived products. In view of the interest of several Codex members and observers to participate in this work the deadline for the registration to the EWG and submission of relevant data and information to GEMS/Food had been extended up to early December 2016. The Delegation highlighted the need to identify the country of origin of the samples (geographical origin) in order to develop the different contamination profiles which will better support the ML proposals.
93. The Delegation encouraged countries of the region, particularly cocoa-producing countries, to submit relevant data and information to GEMS/Food in reply to CL 2016/22-CF and to actively participate in the work of the EWG and if possible in the consideration of this matter at the next session of CCCF which will be held in Brazil in April 2017. This will allow the establishment of worldwide representative MLs that will ensure consumers' health and fair trade practices.
94. The Delegation further acknowledged the support of IICA in providing technical assistance to Ecuador and other producing countries to develop data. The output of this work would further feed into the work being carried by Ecuador within Codex.
95. The Committee stressed the importance of this work for the region and encouraged countries to submit relevant data and information.

96. Several delegations expressed their interest and commitment in submitting data and information to GEMS/Food as well as to Ecuador as Chair of the EWG and to actively participate in this work within Codex.

Draft Standard for fish oils

97. Chile explained their concern on the scientific validity of the chemical method used in the draft standard for fish oils to define the source of named fish oils as explained in CRD4. In their view the fatty acid range for anchovy (*Engraulis ringens*) oil would overlap with those of other species making it more difficult to identify the product. Chile requested CCLAC members to evaluate the information in CRD4 to determine if it is possible to support the proposal at the next session of CCFO (February 2017).
98. Peru while supporting the approach used in the draft standard and explained that no official data had been provided to define the fatty acid profile by Chile and Peru who were the only producers of anchovy oil. The Delegation explained that they had generated data to define the fatty acid profile for the anchovy oil which will be considered at the next session of CCFO. In their view it was necessary to provide additional official data to allow CCFO to refine the fatty acid profile for anchovy oil.
99. The Committee further noted that CCFO24 had established a PWG, meeting immediately prior to CCFO25, to consider the replies to the CL 2015/5-FO Part B, point 4 (deadline 1 December 2016) requesting additional information on the fatty acid profiles of anchovy and krill oils.
100. The Chair urged Chile and Peru to provide the data before the next session of CCFO in and to respond timely to the CL so that data could be taken into account when defining the fatty acid profile for anchovy oil.

Initiative to report on the status and documented tests from National Registries of compounds listed in tables 2A and 2B from the priorities of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)

101. Chile informed the Committee that in order to improve the administration and management of the CCPR's priority lists and schedules, CCPR48 (2016) had requested members to provide information and evidence of the existence of national registrations for the products in the tables 2A and 2B to prevent MRLs from being revoked due to lack of use or trade.
102. The Delegation recalled that this was a matter of concern for countries of the region (see "Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) above) and therefore encouraged countries to provide information on the national registration of pesticides as listed in the aforesaid tables to the Chair of the CCPR/EWG on Priorities or in reply to a CL that will be circulated by the Codex Secretariat in due course for consideration by CCPR49 (2017).

Front of pack labelling

103. Colombia and Costa Rica introduced the issue of front of pack labelling which was a measure adopted by an increasing number of countries to raise consumer awareness about foods high in certain nutrients (e.g. sugar, fat, energy, sodium) to help them make healthy choices. While it was unlikely that total harmonisation of these schemes could be achieved, the delegation said that it would be useful if these measures were based on the same principles in order not to create barriers to trade.
104. The Committee recalled that the last session of the CCFL had established an EWG led by Costa Rica to develop an inventory of schemes used for front of pack labelling in order to have a basis for discussion on guidelines or principles for countries wishing to establish such schemes.
105. Costa Rica updated the Committee on the work of the EWG and said that 43 countries had registered including 13 from the CCLAC region. The delegation said that the EWG was working in English and Spanish and encouraged CCLAC countries to participate in it.
106. The Committee noted that this was an important endeavour and while it might not be possible achieve harmonisation because of different cultures and issues there could be some elements in common and the experience made in different countries could be useful for others to develop measures that have a real impact on the population.

Use of clean water, drinking water and other types of water in the *General Principles of Food Hygiene*

107. El Salvador recalled that CCFH had considered the issue of clean water and explained that it was important that Codex provides clear criteria that would allow differentiating the quality characteristics of the various types of water used along the food chain, e.g. water used in primary production, water in contact with food, etc.
108. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that CCFH48 (November 2016) had continued discussion on this matter and agreed to request FAO/WHO to provide guidance for those scenarios where the use of clean water was indicated in Codex texts in particular, irrigation water, clean seawater, and on the safe re-use of processing water.

109. The Representative of FAO acknowledged CCFH request to FAO and WHO for scientific advice on water quality and safety and advised that work is ongoing to respond to the request, within available resources.
110. The Chair underscored the importance for the countries of the region to have clear definition for potable and clean water. The Chair also invited FAO and WHO to provide the results of scientific advice as soon as they were available.

MONITORING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODEX STRATEGIC PLAN (Agenda Item 7)⁹

Strategic Plan for CCLAC 2014-2019 – Status of Implementation

111. Chile, as Regional Coordinator, introduced the item and underlined how communication among members and observers is important to achieve active participation and capacity development in the region. The regional Coordinator recalled the workshop organized in September 2016 in Santiago where relevant aspects for CCLAC had been analysed in the view of strengthening the position of the region and provided information on future activities.
112. The Chair noted the challenges of physical participation due to financial constraints and to substantiate with transparent and scientific data the proposals and position of the countries of the region. The Chair stressed the need for developing a permanent dialogue within and outside the region with different stakeholders, including members, observers and scientific institutions.

Discussion

113. Delegations commented as follows:
 - Noted the importance of the CCLAC Strategic Plan to define work and priority for the region and guide future actions.
 - Noted that participation in regional activities was rather difficult due to time and budget constraints, but members and observers needed to be proactive.
 - Recalled the importance to gather and get access to scientific data and information and to generate and exchange of information among countries, e.g. through twinning programme.
 - Noted that the report focused on the management of the CCLAC strategic Plan rather than on the activities needed to reach the strategic objectives.

Conclusion

114. The Committee noted:
 - The importance for CCLAC to continue to implement the Strategic Plan for CCLAC 2014-2019;
 - The implementation of the Strategic Plan was the responsibility of all members of the region;
 - The report on the implementation of the CCLAC Strategic Plan should identify gaps and information on activities to be prioritised.

Preparation of the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025

115. The Secretariat introduced the matter and recalled that CCEXEC71: (i) had considered a document prepared by the Secretariat (CX/EXEC 16/71/6), which recommended a process and timeline for developing a new Strategic Plan for the period 2020-25; and (ii) had recommended to CAC39 to request the Secretariat to start the process of developing the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025 and that the current Strategic Plan 2014-2019 should be the starting point for the new plan.¹⁰
116. The first step for the preparation of the new Strategic Plan was the provision of suggestions from the RCCs on possible goals and objectives for consideration by the CAC Chair and vice-Chairs, which had been tasked to prepare a first draft Strategic Plan (without a detailed implementation plan) for circulation for comments and consideration by CCEXEC in 2017. RCCs would be requested to provide comments on the reviewed complete draft (including implementation plan) during the 2018-2019 round of meetings.

Discussion

117. The Chair emphasized the importance of the Strategic Plan and called members to examine carefully the goals and objectives to ensure the new Strategic Plan better served the RCCs.

⁹ CX/LAC 16/20/8

¹⁰ REP16/EXEC, para. 71

118. Delegations recalled the importance for the next Strategic Plan to be in line with the United Nations SDGs and generally agreed on the importance and relevance of the four Goals. They also noted the importance of the collaboration with other organisations and to take into account the different factors that might impact on consumers health and fair practice in the food trade, according to the mandate of Codex as laid down in the Procedural Manual.
119. With regard to the Objectives, delegations said that they needed more time to consider and provide comments and that the Regional Coordinator could facilitate this discussion. In this regard, the Codex Secretariat explained that members would have an opportunity to provide individual comments on the first draft Strategic Plan before its consideration by CCEXEC73.

Conclusion

120. The Committee agreed that:
- The four Goals of the Strategic Plan 2014-2019 were still valid and relevant.
 - Discussion would continue to further develop comments on the Strategic Plan, before the distribution of its first draft in 2017.
 - The process of developing the new Strategic Plan should be participatory, be discussed in the RCCs and be elaborated in conformity with the mandate of Codex as laid down in the Procedural Manual.

PROPOSED DRAFT REGIONAL STANDARD FOR YACON (Agenda Item 8)¹¹

121. Peru and Belize, respectively as Chair and co-Chair of the EWG on the proposed draft regional standard for yacon, introduced item and indicated that the standard represented the consensus reached by the members of the EWG.

Discussion

122. The Committee considered the standard section by section, noted comments and made the following decisions:

The Committee:

- 1. Scope: noted that the provisions in the section are common to the standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as described in the *Layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables*. Therefore it agreed to leave the section unchanged and noted the reservation of Argentina for the reasons explained in CX/LAC 16/20/9 Add.1.
- 2. Definition of produce: agreed that the standard also covered commercial types; this decision was reflected in relevant sections of the standard.
- 3.1 Minimum requirements: replaced “scalding” by “cracking” as more appropriate.
- 3.1.1 Minimum maturity requirements: retained the second option with some amendments to improve the clarity of the requirement.
- 3.2.3 Category II: agreed to refer to “quality defect” to make it clear that the defects are related to those described for this category.

Conclusion

123. The Committee:
- Noted that all outstanding issues had been addressed.
 - Forwarded the proposed draft regional standard for yacon to CAC40 for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix III).
 - Noted that food additives and labelling provisions would be endorsed by CCFA and CCFL, respectively.

¹¹ CX/LAC 16/20/10; Comments of Argentina (CX/LAC 16/20/10 Add.1); Ecuador (CRD12)

NOMINATION OF THE COORDINATOR (Agenda Item 9)¹²

124. On the proposal of Dominican Republic, the Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to CAC40 that Chile be reappointed for a second term as Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean. Chile thanked all CCLAC members for their support and accepted the nomination.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 10)**Relations between FAO and WHO policies, strategies and guidelines and Codex work¹³**

125. The Committee noted that this matter had been already dealt with under Item 6.

Proposal for the development of a standard for yam¹⁴

126. Costa Rica informed the Committee of their intention to submit a proposal for new work for the development of a standard for yam to CCFFV20 (2017). The Delegation noted that the scope of the new work included yams grown in different regions of the world; that data of production, consumption and trade justified the development of a worldwide standard.

127. The Committee supported the development of a worldwide standard for yam as new work in CCFFV.

Information on work on the standard for quinoa

128. Bolivia as co-host with the United States of America of the EWG on quinoa informed the Committee of the status of work on the development of the standard for quinoa. The Delegation invited countries of the region to support this work on this standard and its adoption by CAC.

129. In reply to a request on the next steps in the development of the standard, which is being elaborated by correspondence, the Secretariat explained that following the submission of the report of the EWG to the Codex Secretariat the standard will be circulated for comments at Step 3. The standard along with the comments submitted will be reviewed by the United States of America (host country of CCCPL), who will prepare a document for consideration by CAC.

Information on work on the standard for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice

130. Colombia, as host country of CCS, provided background information on the development of the standard and the difficulties to progress this work due to the different views of countries on the scope and the definition of the product. In this regard, the Delegation referred to the decision of CAC39 which requested CCS, working by correspondence, to clarify the scope of the standard and to provide evidence of the international support for the defined scope. CCS would subsequently report on the findings to CAC40 in order to determine how to proceed further with this work, e.g. discontinuation, finalisation as a worldwide or regional standard.¹⁵

131. The Delegation requested countries of the region to support the finalisation of the standard as a worldwide standard, consistent with the decision of CAC34 (2011) when approving the new work.

132. The Chair invited countries to provide comments in reply to CL 2016/45-CS and thus demonstrate their support for the development of the standard.

Time management of CAC39 to debate issues, e.g. processed cheese

133. The Committee noted that this matter had been already dealt with under Item 6.

Possible change of the status of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruit and Vegetables

134. Brazil explained that the last session of CCPFV (September 2016) had considered the possibility to adjourn sine die if no proposals for new work would be presented at CCEXEC73 in July 2017 for consideration under the Critical Review. Based on the outcome of the Critical Review, CAC40 would decide if the quantity and quality of the proposals for new work would support a physical meeting of CCPFV. In order to submit proposal for new work, the Codex Secretariat will issue a CL requesting proposals for new work within the mandate of CCPFV for consideration by CCEXEC and decision by CAC.

135. Brazil encouraged countries of the region interested in the standardization of processed fruits and vegetables such as juices, canned products, dry and dehydrated products, to make proposals for new work in reply to the CL to keep CCPFV active as this was the only committee addressing processed fruits and vegetables within the Codex system.

¹² CX/LAC 16/20/10

¹³ CX/LAC 16/20/11

¹⁴ CRD2

¹⁵ REP16/CAC, paras 200-203

136. Delegations noted that the work of CCPFV was important for the region as processing of fruits and vegetables provided added value to the production and export of agriculture commodities. These delegations further noted that work on the review of standards has not yet been completed by CCPFV and, therefore encouraged countries interested in the review of the existing standards or in proposing the development of new standards to submit proposals for new work in reply to the CL. They also expressed their support for keeping CCPFV active and requested the support of the United States of America for keeping the Committee active.
137. The Codex Secretariat noted that the next survey on the use of Codex standards might include commodity standards, which would provide information on the relevance of the work on commodity committees.
138. The Chair noted the support of countries to keep CCPFV active and the request to the United States of America (host country of CCPFV) to continue to support the work of CCPFV. The Chair also encouraged countries to provide proposals for new work in reply to CL.

Information on work on biofortification in the region

139. The Observer from IFPRI explained that work on the definition of biofortification at CCNFSDU was currently at Step 3, following the approval of new work by CAC39. To demonstrate the importance of biofortification in the LAC region, the Observer explained that comments had been submitted already by 16 members, of which almost 60% were from LAC region, namely Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and Paraguay.
140. The Observer encouraged others to support and contribute through either written submissions or interventions at CCNFSDU (December 2016), which was urgently needed so that related biofortified food labelling and standards could be further pursued.
141. Panama provided additional information on activities on biofortification carried out in the region.
142. Delegations highlighted the importance of biofortification, supported the ongoing work on this matter in CCNFSDU and encouraged countries to participate in this work.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 11)

143. The Committee was informed that its 21st Session would be held in approximately two years' time and that more detailed arrangements would be communicated to members following the appointment of the Coordinator by CAC40.

APPENDIX I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

CHAIRPERSON – PRÉSIDENTE – PRESIDENTA

Dr Michel Leporati Nerón
Secretario Ejecutivo
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad Alimentaria, ACHIPIA
Ministerio de Agricultura
Nueva York 17, piso 4
Santiago
Chile
Tel: +56 2 27979900
Email: michel.leporati@achipia.gob.cl

CHAIR'S ASSISTANT – ASSISTANT DU PRÉSIDENT – ASISTENTE DEL PRESIDENTE

Mr Diego Varela
Punto de Contacto del Codex
Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad Alimentaria, ACHIPIA
Ministerio de Agricultura
Nueva York 17, piso 4
Santiago
Chile
Tel: +56 2 27979900
Email: diego.varela@achipia.gob.cl

**MEMBER COUNTRIES – PAYS MEMBRES –
PAÍSES MIEMBROS**

**ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA –
ANTIGUA-ET-BARBUDA –
ANTIGUA Y BARBUDA**

Ms Sharon Martin
Deputy Chief Health Inspector (Ag.)
Central Board of Health
Ministry of Health and the Environment
All Saints Road
St. John's
Email: taytay4689@hotmail.com

Mrs Solange Baptiste
Manager, Information Services
Antigua and Barbuda Bureau of Standards
(National Codex Contact Point)
Old Parham Road P O Box 1550
St. John's
Antigua and Barbuda
Tel: +1 268 5624011
Email: solange.baptiste@ab.gov.ag

ARGENTINA - ARGENTINE

Ms Mariana Parodi
Ministerio de Agroindustria
Paseo Colón 982 (C1063ACW)
CABA - Buenos Aires
Argentina
Email: marianparodi@gmail.com

BAHAMAS

Ms Rachel Williams
Senior Microbiologist
Marine Resources
Ministry of Agriculture
PO Box 3028
Nassau
Bahamas
Tel: 242 361 3985
Email: rachelwilliams@bahamas.gov.bs

BARBADOS - BARBADE

Mrs Cheryl Lewis
Technical Officer
Specifications Development, Quality Control &
Certification
Barbados National Standards Institution
"Flodden" Culloden Road
St. Michael
Barbados
Tel: +1 246 426 3870
Email: office@bnsi.com.bb

BELIZE - BELICE

Mrs Delilah Cabb-Ayala
Coordinator
Sanitary and Phytosanitary Enquiry Point
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
Central Farm, Cayo District, Belize
Belice
Tel: (501) 824-4899; (501) 824-4872
Email: bahasps@btl.net

Mr Kenrick Witty
 Plant Health Officer
 Plant Health Department
 Belize Agricultural Health Authority
 Central Farm, Cayo District Belize,
 Central América
 Belice
 Tel: +1 (501) 824-4899; 824-4873
 Email: kenrick.witty@baha.org.bz

**BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF) –
 BOLIVIE (ÉTAT PLURINATIONAL DE) –
 BOLIVIA (ESTADO PLURINACIONAL DE)**

Mr Lilis Ivan Ticlla Iñiguez
 Técnico en Quinoa
 Centro Internacional de la Quinoa
 Ministerio de Desarrollo Rural y Tierras
 La Paz
 Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
 Tel: 78783151
 Email: solyluna1407@hotmail.com

Mr Marco Antonio Saravia
 Vocal del Comité Nacional del Codex Alimentarius
 Comité Nacional del Codex Alimentarius
 CONFEAGRO Confederación Agropecuaria del
 Oriente
 La Paz
 Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
 Tel: 71522338
 Email: tomatito_bolivia@yahoo.com

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL

Mr André Luis Santos
 Coordinator of the Brazilian Codex Committee
 INMETRO
 Rua Santa Alexandria, 416 - 9ª andar -
 Rio Comprido - RJ
 Rio de Janeiro
 Brazil
 Tel: + 55 21 2563-5543
 Email: alsantos@inmetro.gov.br

Dr Guilherme Antonio Costa Junior
 Vice-Chairperson, Codex Alimentarius
 Commission
 Food Safety Adviser
 Secretary of International Relations (SRI)
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 (MAPA)
 Esplanada dos Ministerios Bl.D
 Brasília
 Brazil
 Tel: + 55 61 981344714
 Email: guilherme.costa@agricultura.gov.br

Mrs Antonia Maria De Aquino
 Manager of Special Products
 Nacional Health Surveillance Agency – Anvisa/MS
 SIA Trecho 5 – Area Especial 57 – Bloco D – 2º
 andar – CEP: 71205-050
 Brasília
 Brazil
 Tel: + 55 61 3462 5329
 Email: antoniamaria@anvisa.gov.br

Mr Rogério Silva
 Coordinator for Codex Alimentarius Matters
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Edifício Sede
 Sala 349
 Brasília
 Brazil
 Tel: +55 61 3218-3475
 Email: rogerio.silva@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Eduardo Yassue Nascimento Silva
 ABIA – Brazilian Association of Food Industries
 Av. Brigadeiro Faria Lima, 1478 – 11ª andar
 São Paulo
 Brazil
 Tel: 55 (21) 971-500-112
 Email: enascimentosilva@coca-cola.com

CHILE - CHILI

Ms Roxana Vera Muñoz
 Coordinadora Unidad de Acuerdos
 Internacionales
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
 División de Asuntos Internacionales
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Bulnes 140, piso 5.
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: 56 2 23451167
 Email: roxana.vera@sag.gob.cl

Mr Gonzalo Aranda
 Asesor Técnico
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
 División Asuntos Internacionales
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Bulnes 140, piso 5
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: 56 223451549
 Email: gonzalo.aranda@sag.gob.cl

Mr Fernando Catalán
 Asesor
 Departamento Regulatorio
 Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
 Teatinos 180, piso 11
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: 56 228275426
 Email: fcatalan@direcon.gob.cl

Mrs Paulina Chavez
Asesor Técnico
Departamento de Nutrición y Alimentos
Ministerio de Salud
Monjitas 565, piso 10
Santiago
Chile
Tel: 56 22574 0000
Email: pchavez@minsal.cl

Ms Claudia Espinoza
Asesora Técnica
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Paseo Bulnes 140, piso 5
Santiago
Chile
Tel: +56 223451214
Email: claudia.espinoza@sag.gob.cl

Mr Claudio Núñez Contardo
Asesor Técnico
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
División Asuntos Internacionales
Ministerio de Agricultura
Bulnes 140, piso 5
Santiago
Chile
Tel: +56 223451183
Email: c.nunez@sag.gob.cl

Ms Carla Saavedra
Especialista en Asuntos Científicos y Regulatorios
Nestlé
Las Condes 11287, Las Condes
Santiago
Chile
Tel: 56 223384734
Email: carla.saavedra@cl.nestle.com

COLOMBIA - COLOMBIE

Eng. Javier Muñoz Ibarra
Asesor MinCIT
Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Turismo
Bogotá
Colombia
Tel: Teléfono: 6067676, ext. 1205
Email: jmunoz@mincit.gov.co

COSTA RICA

Ms Isabel Cristina Araya Badilla
Directora
Dirección Calidad
Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio
San José
Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 2291-1936
Email: iaraya@meic.go.cr

Mrs Tatiana Cruz Ramírez
Chief of Codex Department of Costa Rica
Ministry of Economy, Industry and Commerce
San José, Matarredonda
San José
Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 2549-1495
Email: tcruz@meic.go.cr

Mr Jorge Arturo Jara
I Vicepresidente de CACIA
Miembro Comité Nacional del Codex Costa Rica
Cámara Costarricense de la Industria Alimentaria
(CACIA)
San José
Costa Rica
Email: jajara@coca-cola.com

CUBA

Mr Osvaldo Vladimir Puñales Sosa
Funcionario Especialista en Higiene,
Epidemiología y Nutrición
Jefe de programa de Prevención y Control de las
Enfermedades Transmitidas por los Alimentos
Dirección Nacional de Salud Ambiental
Ministerio de Salud Pública
Infanta y Benjumeda, Centro Habana
La Habana
Cuba
Tel: 53-7 8330276
Email: ovps@infomed.sld.cu

DOMINICA - DOMINIQUE

Ms Clara Charles
Senior Environmental Health Officer
Environmental Health Department
Ministry of Health & Environment
133 Bath Road
Roseau
Dominica
Tel: 17672663465
Email: charlesc.mt2@gmail.com

Ms Mara Abraham
Programme Manager
National Standards Development Programme
Dominica Bureau of Standards
Stockfarm P.O. Box 1015
Roseau
Dominica
Tel: 7674481685
Email: Codex@dominicastandards.org

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC –
DOMINICAINE, RÉPUBLIQUE –
DOMINICANA, REPÚBLICA**

Mr Modesto Buenaventura Pérez Blanco
Coordinador Normas Alimenticias
Dirección General Medicamentos, Alimentos y
Productos Sanitarios (DIGEMAPS)
Ministerio De Salud Pública Y Asistencia Social
(MSP)
Av. Tiradentes Esq. Av. Héctor H. Hernández
Ens. La Fé
Santo Domingo
Dominican Republic
Tel: 8095410382
Email: codex.pccdor@msp.gob.do

ECUADOR - ÉQUATEUR

Mr Rommel Aníbal Betancourt Herrera
Coordinador General de Inocuidad de Alimentos
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Acuacultura
y Pesca - MAGAP
Avenida Eloy Alfaro y Amazonas
Quito
Ecuador
Tel: +593 22567232
Email: rommel.betancourt@agrocalidad.gob.ec

Mr Israel Vaca Jiménez
Director de Inocuidad de Alimentos
Agencia Ecuatoriana de Aseguramiento de la
Calidad del Agro - AGROCALIDAD
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Acuacultura
y Pesca - MAGAP
Av. Amazonas y Av. Eloy Alfaro
Quito
Ecuador
Tel: +593 22567232
Email: israel.vaca@agrocalidad.gob.ec

Ms Ana Elizabeth Cox Vasconez
Subsecretaria del Sistema de la Calidad de la
Productividad
Ministerio de Industrias y Productividad
Yáñez Pinzón N26-12 entre Av. Colón y La Niña
Edif. Rigel – 4to Piso
Quito
Ecuador
Tel: (593-2) 3948760 Ext. 2255
Email: acox@mipro.gob.ec

EL SALVADOR

Ms Claudia Alfaro García
Researcher Teacher
Member of CONACODEX El Salvador
Department of Process Engineering and
Environmental Science
Universidad Centroamericana:
"José Simeón Cañas"
Bulevar Los Próceres
San Salvador
El Salvador
Tel: 22106695
Email: calfaro@uca.edu.sv

GRENADA - GRENADE - GRANADA

Dr Bowen Louison
Chief Veterinary Officer
Veterinary Division
Ministry of Agriculture
C/o Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and
the Environment Ministerial Complex Botanical
Garden St. George's Grenada
St. George's
Grenada
Tel: 1-473-407-2908
Email: bowen.louison88@gmail.com

GUATEMALA

Dr Nelson Ruano
Director
Dirección de Inocuidad
7a Avenida 12-90 zona 13, Edificio Monca Blanca
PBX: 2413-7000 extensión 7454
Guatemala
Email: nruano@maga.gob.gt

GUYANA

Mr Robert Anthony Ross
Guyana Manufacturers and Services Association
Guyana
Email: ross@sterlingguyana.com

HAITI - HAÏTI - HAITÍ

Mrs Marie Roberta Jean-Baptiste
Directeur
Ouest
Ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie d'Haïti
Parcs Industriels Métropolitain (SONAPI) Blvd.
Toussaint Louverture, Port-au-Prince, Haïti
Port-au-Prince
Haïti
Tel: +50934546588
Email: jeanbaptiste_mr@yahoo.fr

JAMAICA - JAMAÏQUE

Ms Orine Henry
Director of Regulatory Division
Bureau of Standards Jamaica
Jamaica
Tel: 876-383-2961
Email: ohenry@bsj.org.jm

Mr Collin Cooper
Environmental Health Specialist
Environmental Health Unit
Ministry of Health
24-26 Grenada Crescent Kingston
Jamaica
Email: collin.cooper96@gmail.com

MEXICO - MEXIQUE - MÉXICO

Mr Raúl Gerardo Portillo Aldrett
Director de Asuntos Científicos y Regulatorios y
Presidente de la Rama 17
Asuntos Científicos y Regulatorios
Cámara Nacional de la Industria de
Transformación (CANACINTRA)
MEXICO, DF
México
Tel: +52 55 52 62 23 86
Email: rportillo@coca-cola.com

Mr Emmanuel Hernández Galván
Jefe de Departamento
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6, Col. Lomas
de Tecamachalco, Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan
de Juárez
México
Email: emmanuel.hernandez@economia.gob.mx

Mr Emmanuel Vargas Salas
Enlace de Alto Nivel de Responsabilidad
Dirección Ejecutiva de Operación Internacional
Comisión Federal para la Protección contra
Riesgos Sanitarios
Monterrey #33 Piso 2, Col. Roma Delegación
Cuauhtémoc
México Distrito Federal
México
Tel: 5080-5200 ext. 1141 y 1146
Email: evargas@cofepris.gob.mx

Ms Bertha Iliana Giner Chávez
Consultora de Asuntos Regulatorios y
Corporativos Investigación y Desarrollo
Enriqueciendo la Vida
ELANCO
México
Tel: +52 871 193 5249
Email: giner_bertha@elanco.com

NICARAGUA

Ms Miriam Carolina Canda Toledo
Punto de Contacto del Codex
Dirección de Normalización y Metrología
Ministerio de Fomento, Industria y Comercio
Km 6, carretera a Masaya
Managua
Nicaragua
Tel: +505 2489300
Email: codex@mific.gob.ni

PANAMA - PANAMÁ

Ms Mayela Ortega
Coordinadora del Punto de Contacto
Dirección General de Normas y Tecnología
Industrial
Ministerio de Comercio e Industrias
Ave. Ricardo J. Alfaro, Edificio Plaza Edison
3er Piso, Panamá
Panamá
Tel: (507) 560-0600 ext. 2389
Email: mortega@mici.gob.pa

Mr Marco Pino
Asesor
Despacho de Asesores
Autoridad Panameña de Seguridad de Alimentos
Vía Ricardo J. Alfaro, Edificio Sun Tower, 2do.
Piso,
Panamá
Panamá
Tel: (507) 522-0000
Email: mpino@aupsa.gob.pa

Mrs Elizabeth Harris
Metróloga
Normas y Metrología
Autoridad de Protección al Consumidor y Defensa
de la Competencia
Vía Fernández de Córdoba, Plaza Córdoba
Panamá
Panamá
Tel: (507) 510-1313
Email: eharris@acodeco.gob.pa

PARAGUAY

Mrs Ana María Viedma
Jefe Dpto. Negociaciones América Latina y el
Caribe
Unidad de Asuntos Internacionales
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Salud Animal
(SENACSA)
Calle Ciencias Veterinarias km 10,5 - San
Lorenzo
Paraguay
Tel: 595 21 590 453
Email: anaviedma@senacsa.gov.py

Mrs María Inés Ibarra Colmán
Punto de Contacto del Codex, Paraguay
Instituto Nacional de Tecnología, Normalización y
Metrología - INTN
Avda. Artigas 3973 casi Gral. Roa
Asunción
Paraguay
Tel: +595 21 290160
Email: codex@intn.gov.py

PERU - PÉROU - PERÚ

Ms Susan Karin Dioses Córdova
 Miembro Titular de la Comisión Técnica del
 Codex sobre Frutas y Hortalizas Frescas
 Especialista en Inocuidad Agroalimentaria
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria - SENASA
 Av. La Molina 1915
 Lima
 Perú
 Tel: 511-3133300 Ext.:1422
 Email: sdioses@senasa.gob.pe

Mr Jorge Augusto Vigil Mattos
 Miembro de Comisión Técnica Nacional de
 Grasas y Aceites
 Comité Nacional del Codex Alimentarius Perú
 Tizón y Bueno n.º 709 - Jesús María
 Lima
 Perú
 Tel: 944569888
 Email: jvigil@snp.org.pe

**SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS –
 SAINT-KITTS-ET-NEVIS –
 SAINT KITTS Y NEVIS**

Mr Hiram Williams
 Director
 St. Kitts and Nevis Bureau of Standards
 La Guerite
 BASSETERRE
 Saint Kitts and Nevis
 Tel: 8696623339
 Email: mplbos@gmail.com

SAINT LUCIA - SAINTE LUCIE - SANTA LUCÍA

Ms Samantha Williams
 Standards Officer
 Saint Lucia Bureau of Standards
 Email: s.williams@slbs.org

**SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES –
 SAINT-VINCENT/GRENADINES –
 SAN VICENTE/GRANADINAS**

Mr Ezra Ledger
 Executive Director
 Ministry of Economic planning, Sustainable
 Development, Industry, Information and Labour
 St. Vincent and the Grenadines Bureau of
 Standards
 C/O SVG Bureau of Standards Campden Park
 Industrial Estate P.O Box 1506 VC0100
 Kingstown
 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
 Tel: 7844578092
 Email: deledger@hotmail.com

SURINAME

Mr Radjendre Debie
 Codex Focal point
 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and
 Fisheries
 Letitia Vriesdelaan # 6-10
 Paramaribo
 Suriname
 Tel: 00597-479112 Ext. 1228
 Email: radebie@hotmail.com

URUGUAY

Eng Pedro Friedrich
 Punto de Contacto Codex para Uruguay
 Departamento de Evaluación de la Conformidad
 Laboratorio Tecnológico del Uruguay
 Avda. Italia 6201
 Montevideo
 Uruguay
 Email: pfriedri@latu.org.uy

NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES BAJOS

Ms Heleen Van Rootselaar
 Representative for CCEURO
 Ministry of Economic Affairs
 PO Box 20401
 The Hague
 Netherlands
 Tel: +31 65 207 4566
 Email: h.vanrootselaar@minez.nl

SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA

Mrs Awilo Ochieng Pernet
 Chairperson, Codex Alimentarius Commission
 Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO
 International Affairs
 Bern
 Switzerland
 Tel: + 41 58 462 00 41
 Email: awilo.ochieng@blv.admin.ch

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA –
 ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE –
 ESTADOSUNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

Ms Mary Frances Lowe
 U.S. Codex Manager
 Food Safety and Inspection Service
 Office of CODEX
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 1400 Independence Ave; SW
 Washington, DC
 United States of America
 Tel: +1-202-205-7760
 Email: MaryFrances.lowe@fsis.usda.gov

Mr Kenneth Lowery
International Issues Analyst
U.S. Codex Office
1400 Independence Avenue SW Room 4861-
South Building
Washington DC
United States of America
Tel: +1 202 690 4042
Email: kenneth.lowery@fsis.usda.gov

**OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS –
ORGANISATIONS OBSERVATEURS –
ORGANIZACIONES OBSERVADORAS**

**CARIBBEAN AGRICULTURAL HEALTH AND
FOOD SAFETY AGENCY (CAHFSA)**

Dr Gavin Peters
Animal Health Specialist
Animal Health
Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety
Agency
Letitia Vriesdelaan #10
Paramaribo
Suriname
Tel: 5977195318
Email: gavin.peters@cahfsa.org

**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR
COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA)**

Dr Robert Gaynor Ahern
Leader
Agricultural Health and Food Safety
IICA
Vázquez de Coronado
San José
Costa Rica
Tel: 506 2216 0222
Email: robert.ahern@iica.int

Mr Eric Bolaños Ledezma
Especialista, Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad
de Alimentos
SAIA
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la
Agricultura (IICA)
Apto Postal 55-2200, San José Vázquez de
Coronado San Isidro 11101
Costa Rica
Tel: + 506 2216 0418
Email: erick.bolanos@iica.int

Mr Jaime Flores Ponce
Representante IICA en Chile
IICA-Chile
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la
Agricultura (IICA)
Calle Rancagua No.0320, Providencia
Santiago
Chile
Tel: (56-2) 2225-2511
Email: jaime.flores@iica.int

Dr Lisa Harrynanan
Agricultural Health & Food Safety Specialist
AHFS
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on
Agriculture
10 Austin Street
St Augustine
Trinidad and Tobago
Tel: 868 7636513
Email: lisa.harrynanan@iica.int

Ms Paula Ponzano
Especialista, Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad
de Alimentos en Chile
IICA-Chile
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la
Agricultura (IICA)
Calle Rancagua No.0320, Providencia
Santiago
Chile
Tel: (56-2) 2225-2511
Email: paula.ponzano@iica.int

**ASOCIACIÓN LATINOAMERICANA DE
AVICULTURA (ALA)**

Dr J. Isidro Molfese
Observador por ALA al Codex A.
ALA - Asociación Latinoamericana de Avicultura
Mar del Plata
Argentina
Tel: 54 911 45392595
Email: molfese@ciudad.com.ar

GLOBAL PULSE CONFEDERATION (CICILS)

Ms Lois Rossi
Consultant
Global Pulse Confederation
1050 N. Taylor Street, Unit 512
Arlington
United States of America
Email: rluisa1@aol.com

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF BEVERAGES
ASSOCIATIONS (ICBA)**

Mr Ilton Azevedo
Advisor
International Council of Beverages Associations
Rio de Janeiro
Brazil
Email: iazevedo@coca-cola.com

Ms Daniela Ferreira
Technical Advisor
International Council of Beverages Associations
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1100
Washington DC
United States of America
Email: danferreira@coca-cola.com

INTERNATIONAL LIFE SCIENCES INSTITUTE (ILSI)

Mrs Viviana Aranda
President
ILSI South Andean
Santiago
Chile
Tel: 56-222649420
Email: ilsurandino@tie.cl

Ms Cristina Avalos
Nestlé
Email: cristina.avalos@nestle.com

Ms Mayra Carreno
Tresmontes Lucchetti
Email: mcarreno@tmluc.com

Ms Maria De La Luz Valdes
Coca-Cola de Chile S.A.
Email: marvaldes@coca-cola.com

Ms Lilia Masson
Trustee
ILSI South Andean
Email: masson_lilia@yahoo.es

Dr Pedro Prieto
Vice President
ILSi South Andean
Email: pedro.prieto@usek.cl

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Ms Marilia Nutti
HarvestPlus Manager for Latin America and the Caribbean
HarvestPlus - IFPRI
Email: m.nutti@cgiar.org

Dr Anne Mackenzie
HarvestPlus - IFPRI
Email: a.mackenzie@cgiar.org

Mr Jose Luiz Viana De Carvalho
HarvestPlus Brazil Deputy Manager
HarvestPlus - IFPRI
Email: j.l.viana@cgiar.org

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF FOOD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (IUFOST)

Ms. Judith Meech
Secretary-General
International Union of Food Science and Technology
IUFoST
Oakville, Canada,
Tel: +9058151926
Email: jmeech@iufost.org

Dr Pamela Byrne
Chief Executive Officer
Food Safety Authority of Ireland
Dublin, Ireland
Tel: +353 1 817 1369
Email: pambyrne@fsai.ie

Dr. Samuel Godefroy
Full Professor
Food Risk Analysis and Regulatory Policies
Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences
Department of Food Science
University of Laval
Quebec, Canada
Tel. +418656 3058
Email: samuel.godefroy@fsaa.ulaval.ca

Dr. Susana Socolovsky
Technical Consultant Latin America
Regulatory and Scientific Affairs
Pentachem
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Tel: +541147746033
Email: susanasocolovsky@pentachem.com.ar

**FAO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE LA FAO
PERSONAL DE LA FAO**

Dr Eve Crowley
Deputy Regional Representative for Latin America and the Caribbean
FAO Representative in Chile
FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
Av. Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura
Santiago
Chile
Tel: (56 2) 2923 2304
Email: eve.crowley@fao.org

Mrs Marisa Caipo
Food Safety and Quality Officer
Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
3241 Dag Hammarskjöld
Santiago
Chile
Tel: (56-2) 2923-2162
Email: Marisa.Caipo@fao.org

Mr Leopoldo Del Barrio
Veterinary Public Health Specialist
FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
Av. Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura
Santiago
Chile
Tel: (56 2) 2923 2304
Email: Leopoldo.DelBarrio@fao.org

Ms Mary Kenny
 Food Safety and Quality Officer
 Office of Food Safety
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 Rome
 Italy
 Tel: +390657053653
 Email: Mary.kenny@fao.org

**WHO PERSONNEL
 PERSONNEL DE L'OMS
 PERSONAL DE LA OMS**

Dr Kazuaki Miyagishima
 Director
 Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses (FOS)
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20, avenue Appia
 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Tel: +41 22 791 2773
 Email: miyagishimak@who.int

Mrs Catherine Mulholland
 Administrator Codex Trust Fund
 Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses (FOS)
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20, avenue Appia
 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Tel: +41 22 7913080
 Email: mulhollandc@who.int

Dr Marcos Monteverde
 Food Safety and Surveillance Specialist
 Food Safety
 Pan American Health Organization
 Av. Governador Leonel de Moura Brizola, 7778
 Duque de Caxias
 Brazil
 Email: monteverdem@paho.org

Dr Simone Raszl
 Specialist, Laboratory Management
 Food Safety
 Pan American Health Organization
 Av. Governador Leonel de Moura Brizola, 7778
 Duque de Caxias
 Brazil
 Email: raszls@paho.org

**CCLAC SECRETARIAT – SECRÉTARIAT DE
 CCLAC – SECRETARÍA DE CCLAC**

Ms Cassandra Pacheco Vásquez
 Asesor
 Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad
 Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Nueva York 17, piso 4
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: +56 2 27979900
 Email: cassandra.pacheco@achipia.gob.cl

Ms Claudia Villarroel Venegas
 Asesor
 Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad
 Alimentaria, ACHIPIA
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Nueva York 17, piso 4
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: +56 227979900
 Email: claudia.villarroel@achipia.gob.cl

Ms Constanza Vergara
 Asesor Técnico
 Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad
 Alimentaria, ACHIPIA
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Nueva York 17, piso 4
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: 56 227979900
 Email: constanza.vergara@achipia.gob.cl

Ms Marianne Kyling
 Asesor Técnico
 Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad
 Alimentaria, ACHIPIA
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Nueva York 17, piso 4
 Santiago
 Chile
 Tel: 56 227979900
 Email: marianne.kyling@achipia.gob.cl

**CODEX SECRETARIAT –
 SECRÉTARIAT DU CODEX – SECRETARÍA
 DEL CODEX**

Ms Annamaria Bruno
 Senior Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
 Via delle Terme di Caracalla
 Rome
 Italy
 Email: Annamaria.Bruno@fao.org

Mr Tom Heilandt
 Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 Tel: 06 5705 4384
 Email: tom.heilandt@fao.org

Ms Gracia Brisco
 Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 Rome
 Italy
 Tel: +39 06 5705 2700
 Email: gracia.brisco@fao.org

Mr Giuseppe Di Chiera
Consultant
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
Roma
Italy
Tel: 06 5705 52533
Email: giuseppe.dichiera@fao.org

APPENDIX II**KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY MVZ HUGO FRAGOSO SÁNCHEZ,
GENERAL DIRECTOR FOR FOOD SAFETY AND QUALITY AT SENASICA, MEXICO****The importance of evaluating and monitoring national food control systems**

The implementation, development and strengthening of national safety systems in countries has increased over recent years. Some of the reasons for this are better detection and recording systems of food-borne diseases, the need for food buyers and distributors to meet food safety standards, consumer demand for healthy food, increased global food trade, awareness of health and agricultural authorities of the need to strengthen prevention in primary production and processing, rather than react to outbreaks, as well as greater cooperation between countries and regulatory authorities on this matter.

Countries have a huge responsibility for producing healthy food for their population. The possibility that this food may access other world markets calls for greater commitment to ensure that the consumer has what is wanted in the food, helping not only to mitigate hunger and comply with nutritional requirements, but also to prevent it becoming a disease-carrier that puts the rest of the population at risk and to promote greater investment in government resources to combat diseases.

To ensure that the state fulfils its role in this area, it is necessary to rely on a food safety system based on principles that encourage better performance. For this, consideration must be given to the following:

- Legal basis and authority to control food monitoring and safety.
- Human, physical and financial resources to plan, organize and apply safety policies.
- Authority and technical expertise, reference laboratories, capacity for risk assessment, food monitoring, alert system protocols, certification systems, identification and traceability systems, communication capacities.
- Relationship with stakeholders; consultation, official coordination, accreditation/authorization and/or delegation, participation of producers and other stakeholders.
- Access to markets, relations with other countries and international organizations.

An assessment should be made to decide if the system can prevent and eliminate safety risks, founded on principles such as enforcing producers and packers to officially register with authorities, based on a national identification and traceability system to set minimum safety standards for fresh or minimally processed produce.

The food monitoring programme should consider all stages of the production and supply chain. The recommendation is to work with comparable methodologies between countries, which is why it is very important that these are based on the standards of international organizations such as FAO, PAHO and OIE.

Countries should have a safety alert plan based on the participation of different regulatory and decision-making bodies. The plan should be evaluated and validated through field and office exercises. The plan should cover both domestic and imported foods as well as food for which notification is received from another country or from an international alert network.

The lack of a robust system to handle alerts and emergencies could result in major losses for countries that export fresh food. There is extensive data on the costs of not having such a system, which can be summarized as follows:

- Loss of labour productivity, medical and research costs for the disease, losses in income due to the closure of businesses and markets, complaints and refunds, plant closures, regulatory fines, lawsuits, individual and collective damage to reputation, bad publicity, new investment in controls, loss of import market confidence and loss of income for export countries.

Countries should work to strengthen their technical capabilities through closer collaboration with each other and with other regions for greater understanding of their alert models, such as the European Union's RASFF, PulseNet and the United States' Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). A better outcome will be achieved by increasing national training and by renewed commitment to WHO/FAO systems such as INFOSAN (International Food Safety Authorities Network).

Evaluation of the safety system should be constant; however, there are some questions that will help to indicate how well it is working. Is the system capable of detecting an outbreak of a food-borne disease effectively and of taking containment measures? Is the scientific and technical information that it generates reliable? Are there trained groups to act in an emergency? Is there authority to suspend and sanction? Is it capable of timely communication? Is it clear and appropriate? Does it have strategies to reduce the risk identified?

The use of international standards in monitoring programmes will give the systems greater resilience given that they will be able to rely on comparable technical and scientific standards between countries, helping to resolve conflicts when there are disputes.

The development and evaluation of the system based on these principles will reduce the risk of outbreaks from food-borne diseases and implement prevention and mitigation strategies based on safety risk analysis.

APPENDIX III**PROPOSED DRAFT REGIONAL STANDARD FOR YACON****(At Step 5/8)****1. SCOPE**

The purpose of this standard is to define the quality requirements for yacon at the export-control stage after preparation and packaging. However, if applied at stages following packaging, products may show, in relation to the requirements of the standard:

- A slight lack of freshness and turgidity;
- For products graded in classes other than the "Extra" Class, a slight deterioration due to their development and tendency to perish.

The holder/seller of products may not display such products or offer them for sale, or deliver or market them in any manner other than in conformity with this standard. The holder/seller shall be responsible for observing such conformity.

2. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to the tuberous roots of varieties and/or commercial types of yacon grown from *Smallanthus sonchifolius*, (Poepp. & Endl.) H. Robinson, from the *Asteraceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer after preparation and packaging. Yacon for industrial processing is excluded.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY**3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the yacon must be:

- intact;
- sound, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free from pests;
- free of damage caused by pests affecting the flesh;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- fresh in appearance;
- firm;
- free of mechanical damage and bruising;
- free of damage caused by frost or low temperatures;
- free of damage caused by cracking or high temperatures;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;

The cut at the distal (narrow) of the yacon should not exceed 2 cm in diameter.

The stalk end should have a clean cut between 1 cm and 2.5 cm in length in case of varieties and/or commercial types that have distinct stalk.

The development and condition of the yacon must be such as to enable it:

- To withstand transportation and handling; and
- To arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

3.1.1 Minimum Maturity Requirements

The yacon must have reached an appropriate degree of maturity for trade and consumption in conformity with the characteristics of the variety, and/or commercial type and the growing area.

3.2. CLASSIFICATION

The yacon is classified into three classes defined below:

3.2.1 "Extra" Class

The yacon in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. They must be free from defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

3.2.2 Class I

The yacon in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- slight defects in shape;
- scarring or healed damage, not exceeding 10% of the surface area;
- scraped areas, not exceeding 10% of the product surface.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the pulp of the product.

3.2.3 Class II

This class includes yacon that do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 3.1 above. The following defects may be allowed, provided the yacon retains the essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape;
- scarring or healed damage, not exceeding 20% of the surface area;
- scraped areas, not exceeding 20% of the product surface.

The flesh must be free of major quality defects.

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

The yacon may be sized by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section of each root (thicker cross section) and by the weight of each root, in accordance with existing trade practices. The package must be labeled with the corresponding size according to the following table which is a guide and may be used on an optional basis.

Size Code	Larger diameter (mm)	Weight (g)
1	> 70	> 300
2	> 50 to 70	> 120 to 300
3	30 to 50	≤ 120

All sizes may have the following forms: fusiform, oval or ovate, obovate and irregular; because some yacon cultivars tend to form more smooth and symmetrical than other roots.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

5.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

At all marketing stages, tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each lot for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

5.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent (5%), by number or weight of yacon not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class I.

5.1.2 Class I

Ten percent (10%), by number or weight of yacon not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class II.

5.1.3 Class II

Ten percent (10%) by number or weight of yacon satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce s affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering them unfit for consumption.

5.2. SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes if sized: ten percent (10%) by number or weight of yacon not satisfying the requirements as regards to sizing.

6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

6.1. UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package or lot must be uniform as to the form and contain only yacon of the same origin, variety and/or commercial type, colour, quality and size.

The visible part of the content of the package must be representative of the entire content.

However, a mixture of yacon of different varieties and/or commercial types may be packaged together provided they are uniform in quality and the origin of each variety and/or commercial type is the same.

6.2 PACKAGING

Yacon must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must of food-grade quality, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or a stamps bearing trade specifications, is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Stickers individually affixed to the produce shall be such that, when removed, they neither leave visible traces of glue nor lead to skin defects.

Yacon shall be packed in each container in compliance with the *Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

6.2.1 Description of Containers

The container shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of yacon.

Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING AND LABELING

7.1. CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the *General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods* (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

7.1.1 Nature of Produce

Each package shall be labeled as to the name of the produce and may be labeled as to the name of the variety and/or commercial type.

7.1.2 Origin of Produce

Country of origin¹ and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties of yacon of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety and/or commercial type concerned.

7.2. NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

¹ The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.

For yacon transported in bulk (directly loading into a transport vehicle) these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods, and attached in a visible position inside the transport vehicle.

7.2.1 Identification

Name and address of the exporter, packer and / or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)².

7.2.2 Nature of Produce³

Name of the produce, variety and/or commercial type (optional).

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties and/or commercial types, names of the different varieties and/or commercial types.

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties and/or commercial types and/or colours of yacon, which are not visible from the outside, varieties and/or commercial types and/or colours and the quantity of each in the package must be indicated.

7.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin⁴ and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties and/or commercial types of yacon of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety and/or commercial type.

7.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size.

7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

8. FOOD ADDITIVES

This Standard applies to yacon as identified in Food Category 04.2.1.1 Untreated fresh vegetables (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes, and aloe vera), seaweed and nuts and seeds, and therefore no food additives is allowed in accordance with the provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives* (CODEX STAN 192-1995).

9. CONTAMINANTS

9.1 The product covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this product is applied.

9.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

10. HYGIENE

10.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CAC/RCP 1-1969), *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP 53-2003) and other relevant Codex texts such as codes of hygienic practice and codes of practices.

10.2 The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods* (CAC/GL 21-1997).

² The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark, and the code mark should be preceded by the ISO 3166 (alpha) country/area code of the recognizing country, if not the country of origin.

³ The product covered by the provisions of this standard should allow traceability in accordance with appropriate sections of "*Principles for traceability / product tracing as a tool in the context of food inspection and certification*" (CAC/GL 60-2006)

⁴ The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.