

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 2

CRD27

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON SPICES AND CULINARY HERBS

Seventh Session

Kochi, Kerala India

29 January – 2 February 2024

REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONS FROM CCMAS TO CCSC TO ASSIST IN THE ENDORSEMENT OF METHODS

Agenda item 2

	Questions/clarifications from CCMAS	Justification/recommendations
Standard for dried roots, rhizomes, and bulbs – dried or dehydrated ginger (CXS 343-2021); the Standard for dried floral parts – cloves (CXS 344-2021) and Standard for dried basil (CXS 345-2021)		
1	ISO 927 is identified as a Type I whole dead insects, but only as a Type IV for live insects. Is there a reason for this difference in tying?	ISO 927 analytical method for live insects is also a direct method based on visual examination followed by gravimetry and is also a Type 1 method. <i>It is recommended to correct the classification of the method for the analysis of live insects to Type I.</i>
2	MPM V8 is listed as a Type IV for Mammalian/Other Excreta, however ISO 927 appears to capture this category and is identified as a Type I at other parts of the table, is there a reason for selecting a Type IV for this provision?	In this context, ISO 927 includes the method for rodent excreta only. As the provision is for mammalian excreta and other excreta, MPM V-8 is a more suitable method of analysis for mammalian excreta. Based on the discussion in the committee, we classify MPM V-8 is as a Type II method since this method is the one designated reference method and other Type I methods do not apply.
Standard for Dried Floral Parts – Saffron (CXS 351-2021)		
1	The taste strength, aroma strength, coloring strength provisions uses the ISO 3632-2 and is listed as Type IV. As this ISO standard is specific to saffron, is there a reason it is listed as a Type IV and not a Type I?	Taste strength, aroma strength, and coloring strength provisions of saffron are defined by these analytical methods. Hence these methods can be considered as Type 1 methods. <i>It is recommended to change the classification of these methods to Type I from Type IV.</i>
Standard for Dried or Dehydrated Chilli Pepper and Paprika (CXS 353-2022),		
3.	For the provision Live Insect there are 2 methods listed and both identified as Type I. Are these methods identical? If not, one must be endorsed as the Type I method and the other removed.	ISO 927 analytical method for live insect is a Type 1 method. Hence AOAC 960.51 may be removed.

	Questions/clarifications from CCMAS	Justification/recommendations
Draft Standard for dried small cardamom and draft Standard for spices derived from dried fruits and berries (Part A – allspice, juniper berry and star anise)		
1	There are Type I and Type IV methods listed for the provisions “whole dead insects” and “insect fragments”. While listing both a Type I and Type IV is allowed, there should be a compelling reason for the listing. Would it be possible to explain the reasoning for this request?	The first method ISO 927 (type I) is applicable to whole dead insects in whole spices. AOAC 975.49 is “Light filth in spices and condiments”, which would be applicable to insect fragments for dried allspice, juniper berries, and star anise – in ground/small piece forms. Both these methods are required to analyze these two forms and two provisions.
2	There are parenthetical comments in the provision for ‘filth’ and ‘light filth’, which says list all the filth here – for example – mammalian excreta? It is unclear if this is text should have been removed.	This text has evolved since then and has been removed.
Comparison between different CCSCH standards		
1.	In the Standard for dried roots, rhizomes and bulbs – dried or dehydrated ginger (CXS 343-2021) ISO 927 is a Type IV for ‘mammalian / other excreta’, but in the Standard for dried seeds – nutmeg (CXS 352-2022) ISO 927 is listed as a Type I for this same provision. Is there a reason for the different typing of the same method for the same provision?	In this context, ISO 927 includes the method for rodent excreta only. As the provision is for mammalian excreta and other excreta, MPM V-8 is a more suitable method of analysis for mammalian excreta. Based on the discussion in the committee, we classify MPM V-8 is as a Type II method since this method is the one designated reference method and other Type I methods do not apply.
2	In some standards the provision is listed as ‘mould visible’ and in others it is listed as ‘visible mould’, is there a significance to this difference or could a single name for the provision be used consistently across standards.	‘Mould visible’ and ‘visible mould’ imply same provision. For consistency, the CCSCH standards would use the terminology given in respective references based on the criteria and methods of analysis.
3	Across standards, there are some differences in provision groups. One example, in the draft Standard for dried small cardamom the provision is ‘whole insect live / dead’, while in the Standard for dried roots, rhizomes and bulbs - dried or dehydrated ginger (CXS 343-2021), the provisions are listed separately as ‘whole dead insects’ and ‘live insect’. Are these intentional?	Based on the nature of the spice, and references available for that provision, the committee may combine the two provisions or list it separately.