## CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION





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

Agenda Item 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 5a, 5b, 6, 10, 11 and 12

NFSDU/41 CRD 32

Original language only

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND FOODS FOR SPECIAL DIETARY USES

**Forty-first Session** 

Dusseldorf, Germany 24 – 29 November 2019

Comments by Nigeria

**AGENDA ITEM 3** 

Comment: Nigeria is of the view that Biofortification is useful in the context of Codex work and it

will improve trade of biofortifed crops. The country is developing regional standards

on Biofortified Foods.

Justification: Currently biofortification of staple crops is on the increase across regions in the developing

countries for sustainable and improved nutrition.

**AGENDA ITEM 4a** 

Comment: Nigeria supports retaining the last sentence of clause 9.6.4, with the removal of

square bracket and the deletion of the word "label" such that the sentence reads "cross promotion between product categories is not permitted on the labeling of the

product"

Justification: Cross promotion discourages breastfeeding and creates confusion about the use of

infant formula.

**AGENDA ITEM 4b** 

Comment: Nigeria supports the recommendation of the eWG for the deletion of Dextrose

Equivalent (DE) from the Standard Follow-Up Formula.

Justification: DE is not a quality parameter in infant formula and does not measure the degree of

sweetness.

**AGENDA ITEM 4C** 

Labelling Clause 9

Comment: Nigeria proposes adoption of labeling provisions in section A of the Follow Up

Formula upon incorporation of the amendment introduced by CCFL45 during

endorsement of labeling provisions for section A.

Justification: Products are related to those covered by section A.

**AGENDA ITEM 4D** 

Comment: Nigeria supports the proposed text in Recommendation 1.

Rationale: DE (DE is a term used to determine the degree of hydrolysis of starch) is not a critical

parameter in the standard and may not be important for infant formula.

Glucose polymers do not impact sweet taste to final product when used.

Recommendation 2

Comment: Nigeria supports the retention of the statement under 3.2.1.

Justification: It is consistent with the objective of recommendation 1. The statement will emphasize

the need of avoiding sweetening agent in Follow up Formula.

Recommendation 3

**Comment:** Nigeria supports the adoption of the texts as proposed for the two sections of the standard.

NFSDU/41 CRD 32 2

Justification: This text makes provision that ingoing ingredients must comply with the requirement

to ensure safe and quality products.

Recommendation 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8:

Comment: Nigeria supports adoption of the recommendations as presented by eWG.

Justification: The recommendations make references to existing Codex text and other texts for

similar products.

Recommendation 9

Comment: Nigeria support adoption of option 2 for both Section A and Section B of the draft standard

Justification: The text provides a better direction to the users of the standard and includes reference to

section 4 of GSFA preamble (Carry-over of food additives) as intended by option 1.

Recommendation 10

Comment: Nigeria proposes that flavoring agent should not be used in section A of standard.

Nigeria supports that artificial flavoring agent should not be used in section B of the

standard.

Justification: Natural fruit extracts will provide good source of nutrient to Follow Up Formula and

promote healthy diet.

Recommendation 11-15 (Paragraph on Contaminants, Hygiene, Food Additives, Fill of Container, And

Method of Analysis):

Comment: Nigeria supports adoption of the recommendation by EWG.

Justification: As a norm the recommendation makes reference to relevant existing Codex text

under the respective clauses

**AGENDA ITEM 5A** 

Comment: Nigeria has supported the preamble and still supports the preamble as proposed.

Justification: It gives important reference materials that must be used together with the guidelines

in formulating RUTF products.

(b) Good Manufacturing:

Comment: Nigeria supports the proposed draft test for "good manufacturing" and good hygiene

practices".

Justification: The text makes reference to Codex Standards related to hygiene which is consistent

with the Codex procedural manual.

(c) Method of Analysis

Comment: Nigeria proposes amendment of the proposed text to read as follows:

> It is recommended that methods of analysis and sampling of RUTF be in accordance with the Recommended Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CXS 234-1999), General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Food (CXS 193-1995), The Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria Related to Foods (CXG-21-1997), Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Foods (CXC-75-2015), and other relevant Codex Alimentarius texts. When needed, specific methods of analysis should be developed in accordance with appropriate Guidelines on Measurement Uncertainty (CXG 54-2004), Protocol for the Design, Conduct and Interpretation of Method Performance

Studies (CXG 64-1995), and Harmonized IUPAC.

In addition, new clauses on contaminants and pesticide residue limits should be introduced to make reference to Codex Standard CXS 193-1995 and levels established by Codex

Alimentarius Commission for pesticide residue.

Justification: Reference should be made to the codex methods of analysis and sampling (CXS 234-

1999.)

(d) Packaging

Comment: Nigeria supports to the proposed text for "packaging" section of the guidelines.

Justification: The proposed text is consistent with similar clauses in existing texts. NFSDU/41 CRD 32 3

(e) Labeling:

Comment: Nigeria agrees to amend the first bullet of additional mandatory labeling by replacing

"medical" with 'health worker".

Justification: The text addresses the labeling aspects and makes reference to existing Codex

labeling Standards.

**AGENDA ITEM 5B** 

Recommendation 1: (FOOD ADDITIVES)

Comment: Nigeria appreciates the work of EWG of RUTF and proposes that this table should be

sent to CCFA for their rectification.

Justification: CCFA is best suitable to assign the food category.

Recommendation 4.2: (Identification of Food category for RUTF).

Comment: Nigeria supports the adoption of clause 4.2.

Justification: 10-12% total energy contribution from protein will ensure that patient receives enough

protein content that they are able to metabolize.

Recommendation 5 (Processing Technology):

Comment: Nigeria supports adoption of proposed texts.

Justification: The text provides specific guidance on how to choose the processing methods while

allowing choice of methods by the producer.

Recommendation 6 (Carbohydrates):

Comment: Nigeria agrees to the proposed test on carbohydrate in RUTF Guidelines.

Justification: The proposed text provides a quantitative limit for free sugars in the final products.

This is an objective measure for limiting the use of free sugars in the products.

**AGENDA ITEM 6** 

Comment: Nigeria supports the development of code of practice for the reduction of the levels of

TFAs.

**AGENDA ITEM 10** 

Comment: Nigeria commends the effort of Germany in preparing this discussion paper and

supports the development of the proposed guidelines to better prioritize the work of

the Committee.

Justification: The draft guideline has elaborated on a clear guideline on the step that will be

considered before a new work item is initiated including where an existing Codex text

has to be revised.

**AGENDA ITEM 11** 

Comment: Nigeria appreciates the work of Argentina in drafting this paper and supports the

development of draft Guidelines for Probiotics.

Justification: It is important to provide guidance on probiotics because there are still existing

scientific gaps on the benefits associated with probiotics.

**AGENDA ITEM 12** 

Comment: Nigeria thanked Costa Rica, United States of America and Paraguay in drafting this

discussion paper and supports the commencement of work on the development of

guidelines to establish nutritional profile for food labeling.

Justification: It makes work easy and a better way to inform consumer on true nutrition content of

products.