

# codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 57971 Telex: 625825-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6)5797.4593

---

ALINORM 95/19

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Twenty-first Session  
Rome, 3 - 8 July 1995

REPORT OF THE NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE CODEX  
COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE

Stockholm, Sweden, 16 - 20 May 1994

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The summary and conclusions of the 19th Session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Europe are as follows:

### Matters for consideration by the Commission:

The Committee:

- agreed to seek the advice of the Executive Committee on the possibility to appoint host countries as Regional Coordinators (para. 101)
- agreed to nominate Dr. Stuart Slorach (Sweden) for appointment as Regional Coordinator by the 21st Session of the Commission (para. 105)

### Other matters of interest to the Commission:

The Committee:

- expressed its support for pursuing its activities regarding the exchange of information on food legislation and food control; it was especially useful to those countries which were reviewing their national food systems and could benefit from the experience of other countries (para. 95-96)
- agreed that better cooperation would be required regarding exchange of information on import/export matters in the Region (para. 45)
- supported the recommendations of CCGP regarding the review and clarification of the relations between general committees and commodity committees (paras. 11-12)
- supported the recommendations of CCGP to improve transparency in the proceedings of JECFA and JMPR (para. 65) and expressed its support for transparency in the procedures for risk assessment and risk management (para. 89)
- reviewed the measures taken by governments to improve consumer participation in the formulation of food legislation and encouraged governments to involve consumers in the preparation of Codex meetings at the national level and the development of programmes to educate consumers (para. 65)
- agreed to bring the following concerns to the attention of the Committee on Food Hygiene: the risks of contamination arising from the lack of consumer education on food safety and the problems associated with foodstuffs with a reduced shelf-life (para. 78)
- agreed that there should be more participation by European countries in the GEMS/Foods Programme, and that the reporting systems of foodborne diseases should be improved at the national level (para. 83)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening of the Session . . . . .	1-4
Adoption of the Agenda . . . . .	5-7
<b>MATTERS OF INTEREST</b>	
a) Matters of Interest arising from FAO, WHO, the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex Committees . . . . .	8-14
b) Matters arising from activities of other international organizations . . . . .	15-19
Progress Report on Acceptances of Codex Standards . . . . .	20
Report on Food Safety/Food Control Activities of FAO and WHO complementary to the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission since the 18th Session of the Committee . . . . .	21-33
Harmonization and cooperation in food legislation and food control matters . . . . .	34-53
Consumer Participation in Codex work and related matters . . . . .	54-65
Information on Food Contamination in Europe . . . . .	66-83
Other Business and Future Work . . . . .	84-100
Nomination of Coordinator . . . . .	101-106
Date and Place of Next Session . . . . .	107
<b>APPENDIX I - List of Participants . . . . .</b>	<b>page 18</b>

**OPENING OF THE SESSION ( Agenda item 1)**

1. The Codex Coordinating Committee for Europe held its Nineteenth Session from 16 to 20 May 1994 in Stockholm, by courtesy of the Government of Sweden, under the chairmanship of Dr Stuart Slorach, Coordinator for Europe, Deputy Director General of the National Food Administration. The Session was attended by 53 delegates from 19 member countries, one observer country and five International Organizations. A complete list of participants including the Secretariat is provided in Appendix 1 to this report.
2. The Chairman invited Mr Mats Denninger, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Agriculture to open the Session. Mr Denninger welcomed the Delegates and made special reference to the new members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission from the Region - Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia and Slovakia. The Committee was informed of the cooperation existing between the Nordic countries and the States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The European Economic Area Agreement, which came into force on 1 January 1994, further increased the cooperation between the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries and the European Union (EU). He further noted that Sweden and three other EFTA countries had applied for membership of the EU.
3. Mr Denninger also stated that cooperation between European States in the field food control took place in the framework of certain regional and international organizations, but advised on the need to avoid duplication of work among the organizations. Mr Denninger referred to the status ascribed to Codex Standards and related texts in the GATT Agreements on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures and Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), noting that this would certainly create additional work in the future, as appeared from the discussions held during the 11th Session of the Codex Committee on General Principles, where the role of science and other factors such as consumer concerns, animal welfare and ethical issues in the elaboration of Codex Standards and related texts were considered.
4. The Committee was informed of the international symposium to be held in Stockholm during the week of the Session on the theme of "World food prospects beyond the year 2000". In conclusion, Mr Denninger said that Sweden, and indeed Europe, attached great importance to the results and recommendations to be provided by the Committee at the end of its meeting and wished the participants all success in their work.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 2)**

5. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda (CX/EURO 94/1) after noting the following amendments. In order to facilitate discussion on Regional Developments in Food Legislation and Control, the Committee agreed to discuss Agenda item 7 concerning Training together with Agenda item 6, and also to discuss Risk Assessment under Agenda item 10 - Other Business. The Committee was informed about additional documents to be presented under Agenda items 3 (CX/EURO 94/2-Add.1), 6 (CRD 2 and 3) and 9 (CRD 1). It was also noted that at the request of the Committee during its 18th Session, a publication entitled Food Law Enforcement Practitioners Bulletin (FLEP) was also made available.
6. The Committee agreed on the proposal of the Regional Representative to the Executive Committee to consider CX/EXEC 94/41/5 - Implications for the Codex Alimentarius Commission arising from the Final Act of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations related to Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and Technical Barriers to Trade and CX/EXEC 94/41/7 - Strategies for achieving the Medium-Term Objectives of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, in order to obtain comments on the documents.

7. The Chairman informed the Committee about a request for the admission of the press to the Session and no objections were raised to such participation, with the understanding that it would be limited to taking written notes of the proceedings.

### **MATTERS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 3)**

#### **a) Matters arising from FAO, WHO, the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Other Codex Committees**

8. The Committee had for its consideration document CX/EURO 94/2, presenting the aforesaid matters of interest. The Secretariat further informed the Committee of the conclusions of the Committees which had held sessions in early 1994.

9. The Committee noted that the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling had considered the Proposed Draft Codex General Guidelines on Sampling and had agreed to circulate the amended draft at Step 3 for comments. Governments were also invited to provide comments on Development of Objective Criteria for Assessing the Competence of Testing Laboratories involved in the Import and Export Control of Foods. The Committee had also recommended for adoption three Protocols to be used for Codex purposes and had proposed five General Methods for Contaminants in Codex Standards for adoption at Step 8 by the Commission at its 21st Session.

10. The Committee was informed of the conclusions of the Committee on General Principles regarding the proposed amendment of Rule IV.6 of the Rules of Procedure reducing to one-third the quorum required to amend the Codex Statutes and Rules of Procedure. The Committee had considered the integration of science and other factors in the Codex decision-making process and elaboration procedures, in the perspective of the SPS and TBT Agreements, and identified a number of sections in the Procedural Manual which would require amendments to address the mandate given by the Commission in this respect. It was however recognized that extensive work was still required to complete this task and that another session of CCGP would be needed prior to the next session of the Commission. A number of amendments had also been proposed to the Procedural Manual, and especially to the General Principles of Codex, the Guidelines for Codex Committees, among which a statement to the effect that Codex sessions would be held in public, and the Relations between Commodity Committees and General Committees.

11. The Committee felt that the relations between Commodity and General Committees should be carefully reviewed and clarified, especially in the perspective of the horizontal approach now followed in Codex work. The Delegation of France pointed out that Commodity Committees had an important role to play, as they had the required expertise to give advice to the general committees on specific technical matters; in particular they had to justify the technological need for food additives in specific foodstuffs and decisions in this area should not be deferred exclusively to CCFAC. The Secretariat pointed out that under current Codex procedures it was the responsibility of Commodity Committees to propose additives in specific foodstuffs on the basis of technological need, and that for an additive to be proposed or withdrawn for endorsement by CCFAC, general consensus was required at the level of the commodity committee itself. This was done with the understanding that additive provisions would be subject to further review in the framework of the Draft Proposed General Standard for Food Additives.

12. The Delegation of Greece indicated that the horizontal approach was also followed within the EC, especially for food additives and that it was essential to ensure that technical advice was available whether "vertical" committees existed or not. The Delegations of the United Kingdom and Switzerland pointed out that many commodity committees had been adjourned *sine die* and some difficulties might arise as to the availability of technical advice for consideration by the "horizontal" committees; the Delegation of Romania stressed the need for guidance from CCGP in this area, as decisions which required specific expertise should be reached through cooperation between General and Commodity Committees. It was however recognized that where no specialized committee was in operation, technical advice should be sought at the level of the general committees themselves. The Chairman recalled that the question was under discussion in CCFAC and that a paper on technological justification and need would be prepared for consideration by its next

session. The Committee was also informed that the Committee on General Principles had initiated work on a review of the Relations between Commodity Committees and General Committees and requested clarification from the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants on how it proposed to interact with Commodity Committees within the framework of the General Standard for Food Additives. It had also requested General Committees to review the general statements of policy included in the Instructions for Codex Committees in order to give them wider applicability. CCEURO agreed on the necessity to address these issues in order to provide clear guidance for the future work of General and Commodity Committees.

13. The Committee was further informed of the conclusions of the last session of the Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, whereby the revision of a number of standards for canned and quick-frozen products had been completed in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission. The Committee had also undertaken the comprehensive revision of the Codes of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products and had agreed to integrate the HACCP approach in all codes under review as well as the proposed draft codes, such as the Code for the Products of Aquaculture.

14. With reference to the last session of the Committee on Pesticide Residues, the Delegation of France was of the opinion that there should be more transparency in the assessment of the actual need for pesticides use in every country concerned. The Chairman of the Committee on Pesticide Residues, Dr Van Eck (Netherlands) informed the Committee about specific issues of concern to European countries discussed by CCPR, especially the implications of Good Agricultural Practices in MRL setting, where no consensus existed. This question had been put forward for consideration by the Working Group on Acceptances but no agreement had been reached so far and the Committee could not come to a decision.

#### **b) Matters Arising from Activities of Other International Organizations**

##### **IAEA**

15. In the absence of a representative from IAEA, the Chairman indicated that document CX/EURO 94/2-Add.1 presented the activities of this organization since the last session of the Committee.

16. The Delegation of Sweden informed the Committee that food irradiation was not allowed in Sweden and that two methods of analysis were now available for the detection of irradiated food. Screening was carried out with a DNA method developed by Sweden, and confirmation was carried out with a collaboratively tested Gas Liquid Chromatography / Mass Spectrometry (GLC/MS) method. These methods had been used successfully to detect irradiated poultry products.

17. The Delegation of Switzerland pointed out that national legislation on irradiation differed greatly from one country to another and asked for some clarification on the possibility for individual countries to maintain legislation preventing the use of irradiation, although this treatment had been recognized as safe at the international level. In relation to the SPS and TBT Agreements, it was noted that when international standards or related texts existed, Members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) who did not apply these measures would be required to justify their decision. In the case of SPS measures, this justification should rely on scientific evidence only whereas in the case of TBT measures other factors, such as legitimate consumer concerns, could be taken into consideration.

18. The Delegation of Hungary informed the Committee that irradiation was now authorized in that country and asked for further information on the EC regulations in this area. The Observer from the EC indicated that EC legislation provided for the labelling of irradiated foods, but that the decision to allow irradiation of specific foodstuffs rested with individual EC Member countries as no harmonization had been possible so far. However, new proposals would be presented in the near future for consideration by the Council of Ministers of the EC.

## **IOCU**

19. The Observer from IOCU informed the Committee that the Organization had recently opened a regional office for Africa in Harare, Zimbabwe and was now represented world-wide with regional offices for Europe, Latin America and Asia respectively in London, Santiago and Penang with the Head Office in London as well. He also indicated that the next session of the IOCU World Congress would be held in September 1994 in Montpellier, France.

## **PROGRESS REPORT ON ACCEPTANCES OF CODEX STANDARDS (Agenda Item 4)**

20. The Committee noted that no further information on acceptances had been presented since the last session of the Committee and therefore no paper had been prepared for this item. In reply to a question by the Delegation of Switzerland on the present status of "acceptance with specified deviations", the Secretariat recalled that the 10th CCGP Session had decided to retain this possibility in order to allow for transparency, pending further discussion in the perspective of the GATT Agreements. The last (11th) session of CCGP had agreed that some sections of the Procedural Manual dealing with acceptance (D. General Principles and E. Guidelines for the Acceptance Procedures) should be revised so as to take into account the obligations under the WTO Agreements.

## **REPORT ON FOOD SAFETY/FOOD CONTROL ACTIVITIES OF FAO AND WHO COMPLEMENTARY TO THE WORK OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (Agenda Item 5)**

21. The Committee had before it document CX/EURO 94/4 which presented the activities of FAO and WHO at the national and regional levels.

### **Joint Activities**

22. The Committee was informed of the outcome of the Joint FAO/WHO International Conference on Nutrition which was held in Rome in December 1992. The Conference had adopted the World Declaration and Plan of Action for nutrition to eliminate hunger and all forms of malnutrition within the decade. Specific areas for action were identified and countries were urged to prepare their national plans of action to achieve these goals.

23. The Committee noted the assistance to Eastern European FAO and WHO Member countries in the preparation and finalization of their national plans and documents for the ICN. It was reported that the countries expressed great interest for further assistance in strengthening their national plans of action. The Delegation of Slovakia expressed appreciation for the regional meeting held in Nitra.

24. The Committee noted the activities of JECFA, JMPR, UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring and Assessment Programme (GEMS/Food) and the FAO/WHO/IAEA International Consultative Group on Food Irradiation (ICGFI). The Committee was informed of publications of results collated under the GEMS/Food programme.

### **FAO Activities**

25. The Committee was informed of some of the selected activities of FAO of interest to the Committee at the international, regional and national levels.

### **Global and Interregional Activities**

26. The Committee was informed of the agreement at the 59th Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems held in Rome in June 1993, to promote sustainable development through trade. Other activities included the 19th Session of the Committee on World Food Security held in Rome in March 1994. The Committee had considered the implications for food security of the Uruguay Round Agreement.

## National and Regional Activities

27. Some of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe such as Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia were being assisted to strengthen their food control infrastructures. Further assistance was provided to the Czech Republic and Slovakia to set up mechanisms to monitor contamination of their milk, meat and dairy products by PCBs. The Committee was informed that in August 1993, FAO was fully involved in a joint Nordic-Baltic Seminar on Food Legislation and Food Control held in Tartu, Estonia, and that follow-up activities in cooperation with the Nordic States might be considered for the future. The Committee noted that FAO held a Regional Seminar on Management of Food Control Programmes in Seibersdorf, Austria and Modra, Slovakia in September 1993. Based on the success of these seminars, a training session on another aspect of food control was being considered for the future.

28. In the discussions which followed, the Delegation of Hungary informed the Committee that the FAO funded project helped to rebuild that country's food control system. The Delegation of the Czech Republic informed the Committee of the Seminar planned to be held in Prague in Autumn 1994. In response to an enquiry by some delegations, the Secretariat informed the Committee that requests to FAO for technical assistance could be channelled through the appropriate government organ in their country or the country's Representative to FAO.

## WHO Activities

29. The Committee considered the section of document CX/EURO 94/4 presenting an overview of activities of WHO-Headquarters and WHO/EURO. Most of the items of this document were presented for information only.

30. The Committee was informed about the WHO European Programme for Monitoring and Assessment of Dietary Exposure to Potentially Hazardous Substances (GEMS/Food-EURO) and its major objectives to provide information on food contaminants in/on food to Member States, Codex Alimentarius and other relevant institutions. The role of the technical subcommittees for Analytical Quality Assurance, for Data Management, for Veterinary Drug Residues and for Assessment and Evaluation of Dietary Exposure was discussed.

31. The Committee was informed that the WHO Surveillance Programme for Control of Foodborne Infections and Intoxications in Europe through its Steering Committee would encourage all new Member States of WHO/EURO to participate in this network.

32. The Committee was informed about the background of the Concern for Europe's Tomorrow (CET) report and the other documents which will be presented to the second Conference of European Ministers for Environment and Health in Helsinki, Finland, in June of this year. Problems during the preparation stage of the sectorial report on food contamination were discussed with special reference to reliability and comparability of data collected from the Member States.

33. The Committee was informed about the Food Safety Application of the so-called CARE Telematics Project within the European Nervous System, whereby two databases would make accessible the results of the WHO Surveillance Programme on Control of Foodborne Infections and Intoxications and the GEMS/Food-EURO programme. For both programmes data entry and processing packages were created, which now are available free of charge to the National Contact Points and the Member States of WHO/EURO. Another database provides information on Food Safety Services in the WHO/EURO region. Up to now this information was presented in publications i.e. 'Food Safety Services in Europe'. In addition to the already existing data, detailed information on responsibilities for legislation and on contact points (persons) at different levels within the country, including addresses, telephone and telefax numbers will also be provided. A fourth database provides information on Legal Limits for pesticides and other contaminants in/on food. All the afore-mentioned databases are accessible by all Member States and authorities which are equipped with a personal computer (PC) and a modem. To assure a reasonable performance of the



telematics system in the Food Safety Application, it is necessary to use codes for most of the data to be stored and retrieved. This is achieved by using an internal code translation system, which also enables the participating countries to use their own existing code lists.

### **HARMONIZATION AND COOPERATION IN FOOD LEGISLATION AND FOOD CONTROL MATTERS (Agenda Item 6)**

34. The Committee had before it the comments of governments in reply to Circular Letter CL 1993/36-EURO, as presented in documents CX/EURO 94/4 Part I (Norway, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom) and Part II (France, Portugal, Switzerland), CRD 2 (Hungary) and CRD 3 (Finland). The Committee noted that the updated survey of national control authorities, food legislation and control would be considered without establishing strict distinctions between these aspects as they were closely related, and several delegations gave the following additional information on these matters.

#### **Information on Food Control Authorities, Legislation and Inspection**

35. The Delegation of the United Kingdom indicated that local government was currently undergoing administrative reorganization; however, enforcement would remain under the responsibility of the local authorities. The Delegation of Sweden emphasized the importance of in-house control, which had been made compulsory in 1989; food establishments should prepare a HACCP-based control programme, including provisions for monitoring, sampling and records and submit it for approval to the National Food Administration or the municipal food control authority. Penal action could be taken in case of non-compliance with the programme and/or whenever contamination of the end-product was found on inspection. The Delegation pointed out that the development of such programmes had required extensive consultations and training to make the industry aware of its obligations and responsibilities in this respect, especially small businesses where the concepts applied were relatively new.

36. The Observer from IOCU noted that extensive information on the organization of food control in different countries was available but that a somewhat more detailed analysis would be necessary to indicate which type of organization gave the better results as to consumer protection; he expressed the view that inspection services should be independent from authorities involved in production.

37. The Delegation of Switzerland informed the Committee that the revised Food Law now allowed the authorities to take into account international or regional standards; in view of its extensive trade with countries of the EC and EEA, Switzerland had harmonized its legislation in a large measure with that of the EC. Enforcement was carried out by the cantonal authorities, except slaughterhouse inspection, which was under the responsibility of the veterinary services.

38. The Delegation of Finland indicated that all food legislation was being revised at the moment and that the regulations relating to fish and fishery products had already been finalized. The Delegation of Hungary stressed the importance of adequate coordination between the different administrative services responsible for food control, and pointed out that FAO assistance had been useful in the reorganization of the inspection system. The EC Directive on the Official Control of Foodstuffs had also been taken into account when updating the inspection system.

39. The Delegation of the Czech Republic pointed out that food legislation had been entirely revised through the elaboration of a Law on Foodstuffs, which would enter into force on 1 January 1995. Besides this law, basic rights and obligations of the industry and trade were included in the Commercial and Civil Codes; protection of human health was addressed through a Law on people's health care (including matters such as additives) which was currently being extensively revised. The provisions relating to food control, product certification, accreditation of laboratories were laid down in a general Law on State Testing. The Delegation of Slovakia indicated that a new general Food Law had been elaborated and that provisions relating to chemicals in food were currently under review.

40. The Delegation of Malta indicated that the implementation of food legislation was carried out by the Department of Health; elaboration of legislation was under the responsibility of the Food Standards Board, and basic food laws were currently being updated. Official food analyses were carried out by the Public Health Laboratory. The Delegation of Estonia informed the Committee of some difficulties in the organization of food control due to the distribution of competence between different ministries. Legislation was set out in three basic laws: Veterinary Health Protection, Consumer Protection and a General Food Law. Consultations were currently taking place to decide on the most efficient system of food inspection, but it appeared essential to establish some measure of coordination between responsible services.
41. The Delegation of Romania informed the Committee that a revision of the basic food laws on food safety was underway, and that three main authorities were responsible for food inspection: Veterinary Inspection for meat and milk, Health Inspection and Office for Consumers' Protection; it was therefore necessary to develop coordination between these services. The Delegation noted the interest of receiving information on various food regulations and inspection systems developed by countries of the Region and wished to know how FAO proposed to give general recommendations in this area, in view of the wide differences which appeared from one country to another. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the "Guidelines for Developing an Effective National Food Control System", prepared by FAO/WHO in 1976, and to the FAO/WHO Model Food Law which were currently used in the framework of FAO projects on the management of food control programmes. The Secretariat also stressed that such general texts and guidelines were provided as guidance, and not as a model which should be followed exactly, each country should consider how different elements could be used in the context of its specific situation and requirements, to answer its individual needs. This was the approach followed in the FAO Technical Cooperation Programmes Projects, as presented under Agenda Item 5.
42. The Observer from the EC informed the Committee of recent developments concerning harmonization of legislation and food inspection. Council Directive 93/43/EC would require all food businesses to establish in-house control systems based on HACCP Principles, it also provided for the development of codes of hygienic practice by the industry on a voluntary basis and set out a procedure for the official recognition of these codes as European standards. In order to complete the provisions of Directive 89/397/EEC on the Harmonization of the Official Control of Foodstuffs, a further Directive to be adopted at the end of 1994 provided for the accreditation of food control laboratories and the establishment of a small body of inspectors, recruited primarily from present inspectors in EC countries, who would have the task of advising national inspection bodies and of reporting on any difficulties which might be observed. The Observer also recalled the Commission's support of initiatives undertaken by CEN (Comite Europeen de Normalisation) and further clarified its role as an industry committee elaborating standards to be applied on a voluntary basis by its members.
43. The Chairman recalled that the last session of the Committee had noted the creation of FLEP (Food Law Enforcement Practitioners) operating as an informal network for cooperation between food control agencies and had agreed that further information should be presented at the next session. The Delegation of the Netherlands presented the September 1993 issue of the FLEP Bulletin, which was made available to the Committee, and noted that the last meeting had taken place in March 1994. The Delegation of Austria indicated that this informal body, including 18 countries (from EU and EFTA) offered a very useful forum for exchange of practical information on actual problems faced by food inspectors. It was also noted that other countries might attend FLEP meetings as observers. Questions relating to import control in member countries were discussed in a similar perspective to CCFICS within Codex. It appeared that principles of food law were identical but labelling requirements might differ from one country to the other. The issue of "light" products in particular was considered but, as in the case of the EC, member countries still followed different approaches in this area.
44. The Delegations of France, the United Kingdom and Switzerland pointed out that they had established informal bilateral exchanges and cooperation between specific regions, and that such an arrangement gave very satisfactory results to consider and solve practical food control problems.

## Exchange of Information on Import/Export Matters

45. The Chairman recalled that Draft Guidelines for Information Exchange in Food Control Emergency Situations had been elaborated by CCFICS and forwarded to the Executive Committee and that Draft Guidelines for the Exchange of Information on Rejections were being revised and would be reconsidered at the next session of CCFICS. The Committee noted that this work should not be duplicated, and agreed that adequate information on rejections was not always available and that better cooperation between countries in the Region would be required in this field.

46. The Observer from the EC gave updated information on the Alert System (RAPEX) whereby EC countries informed the Commission of rejections on safety grounds and the information was forwarded to other member states; it was also transmitted to the EFTA Secretariat, so that all EEA countries were ultimately informed. This procedure applied to all consumer products, including foodstuffs, and had been formalized in the Product Safety Directive.

47. The Chairman highlighted the need for adequate information and the difficulties of exporting countries when they did not know on what grounds their products had been rejected; this would also prove useful for FAO to provide assistance to interested countries in the area of food control, and especially export control. The Delegation of Finland pointed out that their Customs Laboratory was responsible for import control, and that it was sometimes difficult to determine the destination of rejected products, which might be reexported to a neighbouring country. To this effect, an informal system of cooperation had been established between Nordic countries.

## General Discussion and Conclusions

48. The Committee noted that extensive information was now available on food legislation and inspection and had an exchange of views on the use which should be made of such information, if it should contribute to the improvement of control systems in the Region. The Committee felt that specific work at the level of the Committee was not required on the collection and analysis of data as other coordinating activities had already been developed at the regional level, through the EC, EEA and in particular through WHO's European Regional Office.

49. The Representative of WHO informed the Committee that the information previously contained in the publication on Food Safety Services (1988) had been updated and was now available on database only and free of charge for Member States of WHO/EURO, as part of the Food Safety Application of the CARE Telematics System described under Agenda Item 5 (see para 33). The Committee agreed that data relating to Food Safety Services as well as legislation should be regularly updated. The Secretariat indicated that FAO was also collecting relevant information on food control infrastructures, especially in the framework of the Regional Seminar on Management of Food Control Programmes and was currently following-up on these activities (see para. 27). Countries in the region were encouraged to provide updated information on the aspects under discussion.

50. The Delegation of Denmark highlighted the problems posed by the division of competence between centralized services responsible for one type of inspection (export for example) and local authorities which were more consumer oriented; such a system might not function with the required efficiency and the economic cost of regular coordination might prove very high, especially as food control in Denmark was under the authority of three ministries. In many cases a division of labour between different authorities was necessary; in any case, the responsibility of an authority should correspond clearly to its general policy and priorities and any distribution of work should be based on this essential requirement. The Delegation of Sweden drew the attention of the Committee to similar problems with the enforcement of food control through local authorities, which had other issues, such as environmental pollution, to deal with and did not necessarily give priority to food control. It was however noted that major food industries were under the control of the state administration, as well as specialized technical control such as veterinary drugs and pesticide residues; veterinary food inspection itself was integrated into the overall food inspection system.

51. The Delegation of Switzerland informed the Committee of its experience with a decentralized system of food inspection, under the responsibility of cantonal authorities, which was not always well known and understood by the public in general and especially the media. The Delegation of France indicated that its inspection system was based on the intervention of central authorities, operating through regional services, and that in such a case, care should be taken to integrate local characteristics and the public's concerns at the regional level in order to achieve a balance between central and local authorities.

52. The Delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that caution should be exercised when comparing different systems, since the situation was different in each country. The important objective was to ensure that food control was satisfactorily carried out, according to the circumstances. The Observer from the EC stressed the importance of the principle of equivalence in the EC, whereby no detailed harmonization was sought but similar objectives and principles were accepted and acted upon by member states, according to their specific conditions. It was also important to ensure transparency in national systems, so that each country made its system clearly known to the others; these provisions were completed by the establishment of the body of EC inspectors already mentioned above (see para 42). In reply to a question, the Observer further indicated that this body was not an inspection service in its own right (as was the EC Veterinary Inspection Service) but that whenever difficulties were encountered, it would proceed through bilateral discussion and give advice to the country concerned.

53. The Secretariat noted that recommendations put forward in cooperation projects included a clear distribution of responsibilities and regular coordination between all sectors involved in food control; it was also important to develop the awareness of consumers and the industry as to their responsibilities towards a common objective of ensuring food safety. The Chairman gave a summary of the discussions and conclusions of the Committee, indicating that no single model should be proposed for the organization of food control in each country, as it should answer specific national needs and circumstances, that countries could use as a basis or starting point such elements as a Model Food Law, with veterinary control distinct from other control sectors or integrated in an overall inspection system. The Committee agreed that in any case, it was essential to achieve efficient coordination at the national level and transparency in the relations between food control services.

#### **CONSUMER PARTICIPATION IN CODEX WORK AND RELATED MATTERS (Agenda Item 8)**

54. The Committee had for discussion document CX/EURO 94/7 which reiterated the need for national governments to increase the involvement of consumers in the decision-making process in Codex work, and also contained the responses of France, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom in reply to CL 1993/36-EURO. The Chairman mentioned the Report of the Consultation on the "Integration of Consumer Interest in Food Control", and pointed out that, although not a Codex document, its contents were very relevant to the agenda item. The Chairman requested additional information from countries which had provided responses.

55. The Delegation of Sweden stated that the four members who represented consumers on the Board of the National Food Administration were civil servants. The National Food Administration had tried many methods to obtain the opinions of consumers on relevant issues and had identified certain target groups among consumers. The Committee was informed that the Administration planned to provide further information to pregnant women on the adverse effects of consuming polluted fish, and also to educate consumers on food handling and hygiene in the home in order to minimise the number of outbreaks of foodborne diseases.

56. The Delegation of France informed the Committee that at the local level consultative bodies (Committees for consumer affairs) included an equal number of representatives of consumers and the industry.

57. The Delegation of the United Kingdom said that there were a large number of consumer organizations with varying spheres of interest. Normally, consumer organizations with a broad base of

interest were consulted to provide appropriate inputs to programmes designed for the benefit of consumers; more specialized organizations were consulted where necessary. The Delegation added that consumers were involved in the preparation for relevant Codex meetings and in the planning of food surveillance. It suggested that the Committee should support the recommendations of the Committee on General Principles that Codex elaboration procedures and the activities of JECFA and JMPR be made more transparent. The Delegation drew attention to the importance of the recommendations in the Consultation Report to the effect that consumer organizations should have a coordinated voice both at the national and international level.

58. The Observer from IOCU expressed its appreciation to the Delegations which responded to the circular letter (CL1993/36-EURO). The Observer remarked that Europe usually provided guidance in consumer education and information but there were still some aspects of consumer concerns especially in southern Europe which required attention. The Committee was reminded that in addition to consumer education/information, the World Declaration and Plan of Action adopted at the end of the ICN requested governments to initiate actions to increase consumer participation in the decision making process regarding food safety/control. The Observer further stated that, in the overall interest of educating the consumer, governments should also consider providing advisory services to the industry. It was, however, necessary to ascertain the objectives of consumer organizations, as some of them were Trade Unions or Cooperative Movements which saw themselves as consumer organizations but whose motives were different to those of IOCU or similar organizations. In the opinion of the Observer, the Consumer Consultative Committee set up by the EC appeared to place more emphasis on other aspects of safety than those which related to the health of consumers.

59. The Representative of the EC remarked that the Consumer Consultative Committee was not directly involved in food safety because it had wider responsibilities, but that the Advisory Committee on foodstuffs was more specifically concerned with problems associated with foodstuffs. Furthermore, the Observer stressed the necessity for early receipt of Codex documents to permit wide circulation within the Community and for the collation of responses.

60. The Delegation of Austria informed the Committee that there was a Federal Minister for Health, Sports and Consumer Protection, and that consumers participated in the preparative work for Codex meetings. In Austria there was only one consumer organization and it was currently required to provide comments on legal drafts. The government also provided funds to this Consumer Organization for developing consumer information and educative materials for publication.

61. The Delegation of Romania informed the Committee that there was no real involvement of consumers in Codex work in its country although there was an office for Consumer Affairs. The government often solicited the opinions of consumers while carrying out different aspects of nutrition surveys, and although consumers were represented in the news media, no real consumer organizations existed.

62. The Delegation of Switzerland informed the Committee that there were three consumer organizations in Switzerland which needed to strengthen their cooperation. The Delegation advised that consumer organizations should not see themselves as critics of government endeavours but should cooperate with government and play an active role in food control such as being involved in the discussions of risk assessment issues for Codex purposes. The Delegation remarked that the lack of adequate funding might be detrimental to the effectiveness of most consumer organizations.

63. The Delegation of Finland informed the Committee that the Food Administration being itself a part of the Consumer Administration, was in close contact with the consumer organizations present in the country. The organizations are being provided with funds by the government. However they considered that funding was still inadequate.

64. The Observer from IOCU suggested that the programme to encourage consumer participation in monitoring and involvement in decision making could include the monitoring of temperature indicators in food cold cabinets in supermarkets, checking of labelling provisions, suitable packaging materials, reporting of violations of the food laws and enabling regulations and in organizing surveys - shopping bag sampling.

The Observer expressed his appreciation of the work of the Codex Committee on Food Import/Export Inspection and Certification Systems for encouraging transparency in the operation of food inspection, which "should be open to scrutiny by consumers and their representative organizations..." (ALINORM 95/30, para.30). The Observer added that the industry tended to be in compliance when independent consumer organizations were involved in monitoring actions. Governments might therefore wish to consider delegating some measure of responsibility for consumer concerns to NGOs.

65. After an extensive discussion on the subject, the Committee supported the view of CCGP that experts who served on consultations or on committees such as JECFA and JMPR should declare their interests to achieve the required transparency in the proceedings. The Committee agreed that governments should consider very seriously the participation of consumers in Codex preparative meetings, and the development of programmes to educate consumers on food safety and on diet/health problems. The Committee also agreed that consumer organizations needed to improve their representation and coordination at the national and international levels.

### **INFORMATION ON FOOD CONTAMINATION IN EUROPE (Agenda Item 9)**

66. The Committee had before it Conference Room Document 1 prepared by the Delegation of Sweden. The Committee was informed that currently in Sweden, consumer preference for food with less additives such as preservatives or less sugar and salt tended to reduce the shelf life and hence the safety of foodstuffs. To overcome this problem, food processors tended to use vacuum packing, however this practice often caused the growth of anaerobic pathogens of public health concern.

67. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that although the trend towards "healthier" foods had not given rise to the same level of concern set out in the Swedish paper, the government's Advisory Committee on the microbiological safety of foods had issued a report on the vacuum packing of foods. The Delegation of Hungary proposed to include this topic in the Committee's future work, because it considered it to be of great interest. Currently in Hungary there was much competition among food producers, some of which did not pay enough attention to product safety and in-house control.

68. The Delegation of Finland supported further discussion of the agenda item during the next meeting when delegations could provide more information. In Finland a survey of shops indicated that some foodstuffs such as meat were contaminated although hygienic standards in processing plants were satisfactory. Therefore it appeared that contamination was more likely to occur at the retail stage than during production and processing.

69. The Delegation of France informed the Committee of the problems faced in that country as a result of the extended shelf-life and dates of minimum durability for foodstuffs. The Delegation highlighted the importance for food processors to consider actual storage, transport and distribution conditions when determining the products' shelf-life. Moreover, consumers appeared to be ignorant of the proper ways to store food. In most cases the temperature of consumers' refrigerators was not as low as would ensure adequate keeping qualities. The Delegation of Switzerland reported similar experience due to consumers' requests for health foods and stressed the need to define what health food should be in order to address labelling requirements when food was presented as unprocessed, unpreserved, natural etc. Production of safe food required multidisciplinary action by operators throughout production, processing and distribution of food.

70. The Delegation of the Netherlands said that attention was being paid to the cold chain and to consumer education regarding the maintenance and use of refrigerators and asked if the Committee on Food Hygiene had considered the issue raised. The Secretariat confirmed that the Committee on Food Hygiene had specifically included a section on consumer education and information in the proposed Draft Revised General Principles of Food Hygiene currently under consideration; this issue was also discussed in relation to the control of contamination by Salmonella and Listeria monocytogenes. As to the possible use of raw

milk, CCFH was considering a specific section on cheese made from raw milk within the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Uncured/Unripened Cheese and Ripened Soft Cheese with the definition of a specific HACCP system for such products.

71. The Chairman reminded the Committee that CCEURO was not a technical committee such as the CCFH but had the right to consider the issue which was seen as a real problem in Europe. While CCFH continued work in this area, the Chairman encouraged members to continue educating and informing consumers on the proper methods to keep food safe. Education in food hygiene in schools ought to be considered a national necessity by member nations. The Delegation of the United Kingdom supported this view and informed the Committee that the UK had produced a consumer education leaflet on how to maintain their refrigerator and the proper ways to store food. A "Food Safety Week" sponsored by the British food industry was to be held shortly and would be directed at consumers, especially as to how to keep their food safe until consumption.

72. The Delegation of Austria also reported that a brochure on how consumers should preserve their food to prevent contamination from salmonella had been produced. The sale of raw milk and unpreserved foodstuffs which was not previously permitted in Austria was now developing and the Delegation was interested in more information about practices in this area in other countries.

73. In response to the Delegation of Austria, the Delegation of the United Kingdom said that milk exposed for sale was pasteurised. Raw milk was only sold by small dairy concerns directly to their clients and was not to be found into the normal distribution chain. This applied to England and Wales, as the sale of raw milk was not permitted in Scotland.

74. The Representative of WHO informed the Committee that WHO had published many leaflets relevant to the topic being discussed and would be prepared to make these available to interested delegates. The Representative advised that the concept of HACCP should be applied in view of the tendency for food processors to produce foodstuffs with reduced shelf life.

75. The Delegation of Sweden pointed out that the education of consumers alone would not solve the problems. Food producers should be required to make use of all available technology in order to prevent contamination in products with reduced shelf life.

76. The Delegation of Switzerland stressed that the adequacy of refrigerated transportation should be also considered. Several years ago, a survey conducted in Switzerland showed that some trailers did not comply with adequate refrigerated storage conditions.

77. The Delegation of France informed the Committee that manufacturers of refrigerators had agreed in principle to introduce thermometers in cold boxes to advise consumers of the temperature therein. Moreover consumers were to be advised on the variation of temperature within the cold box and how to utilise this knowledge in the proper storage of food.

78. In conclusion the Committee agreed to continue discussion of the topic at its next meeting, in the light of further decisions reached by CCFH. In the meantime it was agreed that the concerns raised should be brought to the attention of the next session of CCFH.

79. The Chairman noted that chemical contamination was considered in the framework of the Concern for Europe's Tomorrow Report and the forthcoming conference of European Ministers for Environment and Health, to be held in June of this year.

80. The Representative of WHO indicated that a new Report of GEMS/Food EURO would be available at the next meeting of the Committee. The exercise had indicated that the presence of nitrates in food was a problem in Europe and quality assurance schemes were being considered to address the problem. Microbiological contamination was reported in the database in the CARE Telematics system and in the Newsletter of the Berlin Collaborating Centre for Food Borne Diseases.

81. The Delegation of Sweden disclosed that a recent survey on food poisoning, carried out by the National Food Administration in collaboration with a statistical institute, revealed a higher percentage of occurrence than previously recorded. Whereas the number of reported cases was 2 000 every year, the survey revealed 750 000 cases, in a population just over 8 million, so that 90 persons out of every 1 000 suffered from food poisoning every year. The survey also revealed that most of the cases recorded were due to poor food handling and hygiene practices in the home.

82. The Delegation of the United Kingdom also informed the Committee of a study which was to establish the incidence, sources, causes and socio-economic costs of foodborne diseases in England. The purpose of the study was to provide a better scientific basis for understanding human foodborne illness and for developing preventative strategies. The report of the study was expected to be published in mid 1995.

83. The Committee agreed that there ought to be more participation by countries in Europe in the GEMS/Food EURO Programme, and that efforts should be intensified in improving the reporting systems for outbreaks and cases of foodborne diseases in order to provide a more realistic survey of the problem and define adequate preventative strategies.

## **OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 10)**

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **1) Risk Assessment**

84. The Committee had for its consideration document ALINORM 93/37, presented to the 20th Session of the Commission. The Delegation of Switzerland expressed the view that the recommendations of the paper had not been followed with the required action at the level of the relevant committees concerning common principles of risk analysis and a model for decision. Moreover, the Committee on General Principles had not reached a conclusion on the integration of science and other factors in the decision-making process, as wide differences of approach had appeared regarding the preeminence of science; it would therefore be useful for the Committee to propose a common regional position.

85. The Delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that, although JMPR had taken a critical view of the aforesaid paper, the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants and the Committee on Pesticide Residues had agreed on the importance of developing risk assessment and were initiating action in this respect; the need for harmonizing procedures used within Codex for risk assessment and risk management to the extent desirable had also been recognized. Both Committees underlined the importance of communication to the public in general for the sake of transparency. It was however a long process and the development of such procedures required careful consideration, the document itself should be seen as a starting point and might be improved and completed in the future through further recommendations.

86. The Delegation of Sweden pointed out that this was a very important matter, especially in the perspective of the GATT SPS and TBT Agreements, and member countries in the Region should be encouraged to participate actively in further discussions on these issues; concerning the Recommendations of the document under consideration, the Delegation was of the view that risk management was as important as risk assessment, especially where the evaluation of intake was concerned.

87. The Delegations of France and the United Kingdom were of the view that clear distinction should be made between risk assessment which was conducted on a scientific basis, and risk management, which involved different considerations in the definition of the level of protection each country wished to establish in specific areas. The Observer from IOCU expressed the opinion that the lack of decision regarding the issues discussed at CCGP would delay the progress of future Codex work, which created concern among European consumers; the questions relating to the scientific basis of decisions should be clarified and consumers' concerns should be effectively taken into account.



88. In reply to a number of questions on the different factors to be considered in relation to the SPS and TBT Agreements, the Secretariat clarified the status of different measures and Codex standards and related texts in this context. SPS measures were defined by the purpose of protecting health and safety and should be based exclusively on scientific evidence; when WTO Members applied SPS measures differing from international recommendations to imports, they would be requested to inform the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the reasons for this. Technical regulations under TBT could apply to any purpose, including consumers' concerns, ethical and cultural considerations, and science was one of the factors among others to be taken into account. Such measures would have to be justified in the framework of the WTO and should not create unnecessary obstacles to international trade. In the context of Codex work, standards and codes of practice adopted with the object of ensuring food safety were subject to SPS disciplines whether subject to Codex acceptance or not, whereas provisions relating to fair trade were covered by the TBT Agreement; this applied to essential and non-essential requirements within Codex standards. It should be noted that non-essential provisions dealing with commercial quality, whether transferred to an advisory appendix or a code of practice, could be subject to TBT disciplines, irrespective of acceptance. In reply to questions on the composition and decisions of the Expert Committees, the Secretariat further indicated that the decisions of such committees were reached through consensus, that geographical representation was carefully taken into consideration in the selection of independent experts, and that this matter had been considered by the last session of CCGP, which had emphasized the need for better transparency in the work of the expert groups and the procedures followed by Codex committees regarding risk assessment and risk management. It was pointed out that consideration of these complex issues involving many aspects of Codex work would require extensive discussions, at the level of the Committees dealing specifically with risk assessment and CCGP; moreover, decisions in Codex should be reached through general consensus, whether at the level of the Committees or the Commission.

89. The Chairman summarized the discussions of the Committee and noted that the definition of other factors (besides scientific evidence) to be taken into consideration required further consideration, as well as the justification of this factors; further clarification would be provided when the new WTO became operational. There was however general consensus on the overall need for transparency and better information in the procedures for risk assessment and risk management, whether at the level of the expert committees or Codex committees.

90. In relation to this question, the Committee also considered document CX/EXEC 94/41/5 on the Implications for the Codex Alimentarius Commission arising from the Final Act of the Uruguay Round. The Committee agreed that this document was very useful but noted that it had been prepared before the last session of CCGP and that other aspects discussed there should be taken into consideration, such as the necessity to update standards and related texts. The Chairman indicated that the Executive Committee would take into account the discussions and conclusions of Codex Committees relevant to the implications of the SPS and TBT Agreements on Codex work.

## **2) Strategies for achieving medium-term objectives**

91. The Committee had before it document CX/EXEC 94/41/7, scheduled for discussion at the 41st Session of the Executive Committee. The Delegation of the United Kingdom noted the considerable references to the NAFTA Agreement as one of the factors which would influence medium-term planning, whereas economic or trade developments in Asia and Europe, particularly the proposed and possible extension of the EC, which could be of equal significance, were not referred to. The Delegation of France drew the attention of the Committee on a significant difference between the GATT and NAFTA Agreements; in the GATT Agreements, the country which deviated from international standards should give the justification; on the contrary in NAFTA the responsibility for giving such evidence rested with the country which complained about the non conformity of another country's system.

92. The Delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that a statement to the effect that Codex was "a science based organization" (para. 27) might be in contradiction with proposals to integrate other factors in the decision-making process. In reply to a question, the Secretariat recalled that the Commission had approved an amendment to the terms of reference of the Committee for Nutrition and Special Dietary Uses

in order to strengthen its horizontal work, at the request of the Committee, and that the next session of CCNFSDU would further discuss its terms of reference in this perspective. The Committee had an exchange of views on the role of this Committee, as proposed in the paper under discussion and the Delegation of the United Kingdom expressed the view that where "food composition" was concerned, commodity committees were responsible for the definition of essential composition criteria, and care should be taken not to duplicate work in this area.

93. The Chairman noted that further comments on the above documents should be sent in writing to the Regional Representative for Europe, Dr. Van Hoogstraten of the Netherlands and that the Executive Committee would be informed of the discussions of the present Committee.

## **FUTURE WORK**

94. The Chairman indicated that the activities of the Committee should be carefully envisaged in the specific European context, where other organizations had developed regional coordination concerning food legislation and control, and the Committee had an extensive exchange of views on the work which should be developed by the Committee in the future. The Delegation of the United Kingdom was of the opinion that the Committee should review the need for further meetings in view of the developments of European economic integration through the EC and EEA. If meetings were to be held, there was a need to ensure that items of substance requiring discussion were included in the Agenda; exchange of information was not enough.

95. The Delegations of Switzerland and Austria pointed out that the Region of Europe had had a leading role in many areas and should keep on following closely the work of Codex, especially in the perspective of increased international trade and the GATT Agreements; the Committee also offered an opportunity to discuss questions of common interest and receive information on activities of other organizations at the regional level.

96. The Delegations of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Romania also shared this view and emphasized the usefulness of this Committee as a forum to exchange experience in the field of food legislation, food inspection, and more generally to discuss matters of interest arising from other Codex Committees. The Delegation of Estonia stressed the need for information at the regional level, especially for countries wishing to review their food control system and improve the training of food inspectors.

97. The Secretariat pointed out that although economic integration was certainly very advanced in Europe, this concerned a relatively small number of countries in relation to the Region as a whole; such economic integration or cooperation was also being developed in other regions of the world, such as North America or Asia but their purpose was different from that of Codex, and this did not affect the specific aims of Codex work. It was also of great interest and use to FAO and WHO to identify the specific needs of member states concerning food legislation and inspection in the framework of the Coordinating Committees; it was also the responsibility of member countries to make the Committee's work efficient and successful and they should be encouraged to participate as actively as possible in its activities.

98. The Chairman noted that there was strong support for pursuing the activities of the Committee in the field of exchange of information on food legislation and food control, that the length of the meeting itself might be reduced, whereas the frequency corresponded to the Codex biennium and allowed for updated information on Codex work. Proposed items on the Agenda should be considered carefully and issues of global concern to the Region should be especially highlighted.

99. The Delegation of Sweden recalled that the last session of the Committee had considered Guidelines for the work of Codex Contact Points and National Committees and that further consideration should be given to this question at the next session of the Committee, as exchange of information between responsible authorities would be very useful. The Delegation of Slovakia expressed the view that chemical contamination should be considered more specifically as a subject of interest to the Region. The Delegation of Switzerland noted that the Committee would be interested to receive more detailed information on the activities of

industry organizations in Europe, and it was noted that this information was regularly solicited from international organizations invited to the meeting as observers. The Delegation of Austria highlighted the importance of discussing the general policy and evolution of Codex at the regional level, especially in relation to the SPS and TBT Agreements, and stressed that the next session would have to follow closely these developments after the next session of CCGP and the Commission.

100. The Committee agreed that these suggestions should be taken into consideration when drafting the Agenda for the next session, which would also include standing items such as Codex, FAO and WHO activities, updated information on food control authorities, food legislation and inspection, training, as well as consumer participation in Codex work.

#### **NOMINATION OF COORDINATOR (Agenda Item 11)**

101. At the suggestion of the Chairman, the Committee discussed the possible advantages of appointing host countries for Coordinating Committees and allowing them to appoint the Coordinator instead of the present procedure whereby the Coordinating Committee nominated and the Commission appointed individuals as Coordinators. The Committee agreed with the proposal for such a change and agreed that the Chairman should raise this question at the 41st Session of the Executive Committee and recommend that CCGP discuss this matter again if it held a session prior to the CAC meeting in 1995.

102. The Committee had before it document CX/EURO 94/9, setting out the Rules governing the appointment of the Coordinator as published in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Rule II.4).

103. The Committee was informed that the Coordinator had served his first term and that he was eligible under Rule II.4 (b) to hold the office of Coordinator for Europe for the next succeeding term.

105. The Delegation of Switzerland supported by all delegations proposed that Dr. Stuart Slorach be re-nominated for appointment as the Coordinator for Europe by the 21st Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and until the end of the 22nd Session of the Commission.

106. The Committee expressed its warm appreciation to Dr. Slorach as well as to the Swedish Government for their support of the Committee's work.

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 12)**

107. The Committee was informed that its 20th Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in Sweden either in Stockholm or Uppsala in May 1996. The exact date and venue would be determined between the Swedish and the Codex Secretariat, subject to confirmation by the Commission.

## SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject Matter	For action by	Document Reference in ALINORM 95/19
Appointment of Regional Coordinator	CCEXEC	para. 101
Exchange of information on Food Legislation and Food control	Secretariat - Governments 20th CCEURO	paras. 95-96
Exchange of information on Import/Export Matters	Secretariat - Governments 20th CCEURO	para. 45
Consumer participation	Secretariat - Governments 20th CCEURO	para. 65
Food contamination	CCFH 20th CCEURO	para. 83

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

**Chairman**  
**Président**  
**Presidente**

Dr Stuart Slorach  
Coordinator for Europe  
National Food Administration  
Box 622  
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
Tel: + 46-18-17 55 94  
Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

**AUSTRIA**  
**AUTRICHE**

Dr. Arnulf Sattler  
Federal Ministry of Health, Sports and  
Consumer Protection  
Radetzkystrasse 2  
A-1030 Vienna, Austria  
Tel: + 43-1-711 72 48 05  
Fax: + 43-1-711 72 46 81

Dr. Hedwig Wögerbauer  
Official in Charge of Sub-Div. III/A/3b  
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and  
Forestry  
Stubenring 12  
A-1010 Vienna, Austria  
Tel: + 43-1-711 00 28 82

Prof Dr Herbert Woidich  
Lebensmittelversuchsanstalt  
Blaasstrasse 29  
A-1190 Vienna, Austria  
Tel: + 43-1-36 88 555 11  
Fax: + 43-1-36 88 555 20

Kommerzialrat Prof. Walther Stuller  
Deputy Chairman of the Austrian Codex  
Commission  
Stubenbastei 10/8  
A-1010 Vienna, Austria  
Tel: + 43-1-513 69 58

Dr. Hermann Redl  
Director, Div. for Multilateral Affairs  
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and  
Forestry  
Stubenring 12  
A-1010 Vienna, Austria

**CZECH REPUBLIC**  
**REP. TCHEQUE**  
**REP. CHECA**

Mrs Vladka Pivonková  
Director, Food Production Dept.  
Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech  
Republic  
Tesnov 17  
117 05 Praha 1, Czech Republic  
Tel: + 42-2-2862 212  
Fax: + 42-2-2314 117

Mr Pavel Dobrovský  
Food Production Dept.  
Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech  
Republic  
Tesnov 17  
117 05 Praha 1, Czech Republic  
Tel: + 42-2-2862 521  
Fax: + 42-2-2314 117

**DENMARK/DANEMARK  
DINAMARCA**

Mr Sten Strömgen  
Head of Division  
Danish Veterinary Service  
Rolighedsvej 25  
DK-1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark  
Tel + 45-31-35 81 00  
Fax + 45-31-35 36 19 12

**ESTONIA/ESTONIE**

Ms Kaja Kuivjõgi  
Ministry of Social Affairs  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Gonsiori 29  
Tallinn EE0104, Estonia  
Tel:+ 372-2-42 12 67  
Fax:+ 372-2-42 62 68

**FINLAND/FINLANDE/FINLANDIA**

Mrs Pirkko Raunemaa  
Deputy Director  
National Food Administration  
P.O. Box 5  
00531 Helsinki, Finland  
Tel: + 358-0-77 26 76 18  
Fax: + 358-0-77 26 76 66

**FRANCE/FRANCIA**

Mr Jean-Pierre Doussin  
Chef de délégation  
Ministère de l'Economie  
DGCGRF  
59 Boulevard Vincent Auriol  
F-75013 Paris, France  
Tel: + 33-1-44 97 34 70  
Fax:+ 33-1-44 97 30 37

Mrs Myriam Ferran  
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche  
DGA1, 175 Rue du Chevaleret  
F-75646 Paris cedex 13, France  
Tel:+ 33-1-49 55 58 33  
Fax: + 33-1-49 55 51 06

**GREECE/GRECE/GRECIA**

Loucas Theoharopoulos  
Ministry of Agriculture  
6, kapnocopticiou stz.  
Athens 10176, Greece  
Tel: + 30-1-52 91 493 - 82 15 894  
Fax: + 30-1-82 30 730

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE  
HUNGRIA**

Mr A. Salamon  
Head of the Hungarian National Codex  
Commission  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Kossuth L.tér 11  
H-1860 Budapest 55, Hungary  
Tel: + 36-1-1315 362  
Fax: + 36-1-1530 518

Mr E. Rác  
Head of the Hungarian Codex Committee  
on Food Import and Export Inspection and  
Certification  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Kossuth L.tér 11  
H-1860 Budapest 55, Hungary  
Tel: + 36-1-1315 362  
Fax: + 36-1-1530 518

**MALTA/MALTE**

Mr John Sammut  
Industrial Chemist  
Standards Laboratory  
Evans Building  
Merchants Street  
Valletta CMR 02, Malta  
Tel: + 356-22 13 35 or 22 18 73  
Fax: + 356-23 62 37

**NETHERLANDS**  
**PAYS-BAS/PAISES BAJOS**

Dr W.H. van Eck  
 Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural  
 Affairs  
 Food and Product Safety Division  
 P.O. Box 3008  
 NL-2280 MK Rijswijk, Netherlands  
 Tel: + 31-70-340 69 66  
 Fax: + 31-70-340 51 47

Mrs A.B. Mortensen-van der Veen  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature  
 Management and Fisheries  
 Executive Officer for Codex Alimentarius  
 Department for the Environment, Quality  
 and Nutrition  
 P.O. Box 20401  
 NL-2500 EK The Hague, Netherlands  
 Tel: + 31-70-379 21 04  
 Fax: + 31-70-3477 55 52

**NORWAY/NORVEGE/NORUEGA**

Mr Yann de Caprona  
 International Liaison Officer  
 Norwegian Food Control Authority  
 P.O. Box 8187 Dep.  
 N-0034 Oslo, Norway  
 Tel: + 47-22-57 99 00  
 Fax: + 47-22-57 99 01

**POLAND/POLOGNE**  
**POLONIA**

Mrs Anna Skrzynska  
 Chief of Section  
 Quality Inspection Office  
 Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations  
 32/34 Zurawia  
 Warsaw, Poland  
 Tel: + 48-2-625 20 28  
 Fax: + 48-2-621 48 58

**PORTUGAL**

Mr Joaõ de Oliveira Barros  
 Director  
 Hygiene and Quality of Foodstuffs  
 Rua Conde Valbom 98  
 1000 Lisboa, Portugal  
 Tel: + 351-1-795 89 82/3  
 Fax: + 351-1-797 17 50

Mr Carlos Alberto M. de Andra de Fontes  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 Pr. Rainha Santa, 6  
 Lisboa, Portugal  
 Tel: + 351-1-346 35 04  
 Fax: + 351-1-347 16 40

**ROMANIA/ROUMANIE**  
**RUMANIA**

Mrs Tudor Stanca  
 Director-General  
 Department of Food Industry of MAF  
 Street Walter  
 Mârâcineanu 1-3, Sektor 1  
 Bucarest, Romania  
 Tel: + 40-1-615 43 13  
 Fax: + 40-1-614 89 41

Mr Ovidiu Popescu  
 Director  
 Institute for Food Chemistry  
 Garlei Str. 1, Sektor 1  
 Bucarest, Romania  
 Tel: + 40-1-679 50 90  
 Fax: + 40-1-212 03 05

**SLOVAKIA**  
**SLOVAQUIE**

Mr Ladislav Rosival  
 Professor, Institute of Preventive and  
 Clinical Medicine  
 Limbova 14  
 833 01 Bratislava, Slovakia  
 Tel: + 42-7-373 782

**SPAIN/ESPAGNE/ESPAÑA**

Ms Begoña Nieto  
 Ministerio Agricultura, Pesca, Alimentacion  
 Paseo Infanta Isabel, 1  
 28071 Madrid, Spain  
 Tel: + 34-1-347 53 92  
 Fax: + 34-1- 347 50 06

Ms Micaela Garcia Tejedor  
 Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo  
 Paseo del Prado 18-20  
 28071 Madrid, Spain  
 Tel:+ 34-1-596 19 93  
 Fax: + 34-1-596 44 09

**SWEDEN/SUEDE/SUECIA**

Mr Arne Kardell  
 Director General  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 55 55  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Eva Lönberg  
 Swedish Codex Contact Point  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel:+ 46-18-17 55 47  
 Fax:+ 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Anna-Maj Hultgård  
 International Secretariat  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 S-103 33 Stockholm, Sweden  
 Tel:+ 46-8-763 11 06  
 Fax: + 46-8-20 64 96

Professor Sven Lindgren  
 Internal Scientific Council  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 55 00  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Ingrid Lodén  
 Swedish Consumer Council  
 Herdevägen 19  
 S-163 55 Spånga, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-8-36 51 72  
 Fax: + 46-8-761 61 72

Mr Lars-Börje Croon  
 Food Control Division 2  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 57 17  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mr Leif Chrona  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 55 10  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mr Per-Erik Nistér  
 Head of Legal Division  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 55 05  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Jeanette Sundquist  
 Legal Division  
 National Food Administration  
 Box 622  
 S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
 Tel: + 46-18-17 55 95  
 Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

**SWITZERLAND  
SUISSE/SUIZA**

Mr Pierre Rossier  
 Head of Codex Section  
 Federal Office of Public Health  
 Postfach  
 CH-3000 Berne 14, Switzerland  
 Tel: + 41-31-322 95 72  
 Fax: + 41-31-322 95 74



Mr Olivier Bindschedler  
Nestec SA  
Avenue Nestlé 55  
CH-1800 Vevey, Switzerland  
Tel: + 41-21-924 42 13  
Fax: + 41-21-924 45 47

**UNITED KINGDOM  
ROYAUME-UNI/REINO UNIDO**

Mr C. Cockbill  
Head of Consumer Protection Division  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food  
Ergon House, c/o Nobel House  
17 Smith Square  
London SW1P 3JR, United Kingdom  
Tel: + 44-71-238 62 78  
Fax: + 44-71-238 67 63

Mr I. Forsyth  
Senior Executive Officer  
Health Aspects of the Environment and  
Food (A) Division  
Department of Health  
Skipton House  
80 London Road  
London SE1 6LW, United Kingdom  
Tel: + 44-71-972 50 62  
Fax: + 44-71-972 51 41

**OBSERVER COUNTRY  
PAYS OBSERVATEUR  
PAIS OBSERVADOR**

**MOROCCO/MAROC  
MARRUECOS**

Mr Abdellatif Dahmani  
Chef du Service Technique a la Direction  
de la Protection des Vegetaux, des  
Controles Techniques et de la Représion  
des Fraudes  
Division de la Repression des Fraudes  
25 av Alaouiynes  
Rabat, Morocco  
Tel: + 212-7-238 45 or 273 16  
Fax: + 212-7-238 45

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
ORGANISATIONS  
INTERNATIONALES  
ORGANISACIONES  
INTERNACIONALES  
EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)  
COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE  
COMMUNIDAD EUROPEA**

Mr R. Hankin  
Chef d'Unité Adjoint  
Direction Générale Industrie  
Commission Europeenne  
Rue de la Loi 200  
B-1049 Bruxelles, Belgium  
Tel: + 32-2-295 97 73  
Fax: + 32-2-295 17 35

**(MARINALG INTERNATIONAL)  
WORLD ASSOCIATION OF  
SEAWEED PROCESSORS**

Mr Dick Toet  
Hercules Regulatory Affairs  
Veraartlaan no 8 - P.O. Box 5822  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk, Netherlands  
Tel: + 31-1-42 65 41 58  
Fax: + 31-1-42 65 02 05

**CESDA/UNESDA (CONFEDERATION  
OF EUROPEAN SOFT DRINKS  
ASSOCIATIONS)**

Dr Rolph Langlais  
Coca-Cola GmbH  
Max-Keith Str. 66  
D-45116 Essen, Germany  
Tel: + 49-201-821 1361  
Fax: + 49-201-821 1773

**UNESEM**

Ms Françoise de Buttet  
Chambre Syndicale des Eaux Minérales  
10, rue de la Tremoille  
F-75008 Paris, France  
Tel: + 33-1-47 20 3110  
Fax: + 33-1-47 20 2762

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
OF CONSUMER UNIONS (IOCU)**

Dr John Beishon  
Chief Executive  
Consumers' Association  
2, Marylebone Road  
London NW1 4 DX, United Kingdom  
Tel: + 44-71-830 60 00  
Fax: + 44-71-935 24 16

**JOINT FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT**

Mrs Selma H. Doyran  
Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards  
Programme  
FAO  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla  
I-00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel: + 39-6-5225 58 26  
Fax: + 39-6-5225 45 93

Mr George O. Baptist  
Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards  
Programme  
FAO  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla  
I-00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel: + 39-6-5225 38 32  
Fax: + 39-6-5225 45 93

**WHO**

Dr Peter Weigert  
WHO European Centre for  
Environment and Health  
Via Vincenza Bona, 67  
I-00156 Rome, Italy  
Tel: + 39-6-411 66 44  
Fax: + 39-6- 411 66 49

**SWEDISH SECRETARIAT**

Mrs Harriet Böckman-Supert  
National Food Administration  
Box 622  
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
Tel: + 46-18-17 55 60  
Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Agneta Andersson  
Swedish Codex Contact Point  
National Food Administration  
Box 622  
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
Tel: + 46-18-17 56 02  
Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Anneli Lennartsson  
National Food Administration  
Box 622  
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden  
Tel: + 46-18-17 57 20  
Fax: + 46-18-10 58 48

Mrs Agneta Karlsson  
International Secretariat  
Ministry of Agriculture  
S-103 33 Stockholm, Sweden  
Tel: + 46-8-763 11 33  
Fax: + 46-8-10 50 61