



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES

Forty-Sixth Session

Hong Kong, China, 17-21 March 2014

PROPOSED DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR IDENTITY AND PURITY OF FOOD ADDITIVES ARISING FROM THE 77TH JECFA MEETING

Comments at Step 3

Comments of Costa Rica, European Union and Peru

COSTA RICA

Costa Rica welcomes the development of the document and has no comments.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union and its Member States (EUMS) would like to thank JECFA for preparing the draft specifications. The EUMS would like to submit the following comments:

General comments

The EUMS maintain the comments on the references to secondary additives in specifications as expressed in CX/FA 13/45/15 Add.2 and para. 121 of REP 13/FA.

Specific comments

Paprika extract

The EUMS take note that the specifications for Paprika extract (INS 160c (ii)) are now designed as full and the Committee is being asked to review these specifications with a view to recommending their adoption by the Commission.

The EUMS could generally agree with the adoption of the proposed specifications. However, the EUMS has concerns in relation to the inclusion of the following sentence in definition of Paprika extract: *“Commercial preparations may be diluted and standardised with respect to colour content using refined vegetable oil.”*

Rationale: The EUMS assume that JECFA would like to indicate (for information purposes) a possible presence of other substances included in commercial additive preparations. However, the EUMS' view is that the definition of the food additive should be related only to the food additive in question and not to its preparation because also the purity criteria do not take into account other substances which might be present in the preparation and the current wording of the definition might lead to an understanding that, for example, the limit for residual solvents or capsaicinoids is applicable to the paprika extract preparations containing vegetable oil.

Therefore, the EUMS are of the view that the mentioned sentence should be deleted from the definition. However, if the Committee considers that such information is useful, other means how to make this information available should be considered.

Potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments

The EUMS are kindly asking JECFA for clarification of the following issues related to the draft specifications proposed for Potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments:

1) The EUMS note that the functional use “carrier” is listed in the proposed specifications for Potassium aluminium silicate. The EUMS seek clarification whether, according to JECFA, Potassium aluminium silicate acts as a carrier (i.e. secondary additive) as defined in CAC/GL 36-1989 for Titanium dioxide and/or Iron oxide?

2) Could JECFA explain if and how it was considered whether Potassium aluminium silicate is used as a secondary additive for Titanium dioxide and/or Iron oxide?

3) The Combined Compendium of Food Additive Specifications¹ outlines the format and lists the headings normally included in specifications (see pages xv-xx). The EUMS wonder what were the criteria to consider Potassium aluminium silicate-based pearlescent pigments as food additives on their own reflecting that the draft specifications are lacking information on the chemical name, the CAS number, the chemical formula, the formula weight and the assay refers to Potassium aluminium silicate, Titanium dioxide and Iron oxide?

The EUMS would like to thank in advance for clarification of the issues raised.

PERU

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The Technical Committee on Food Additives took note; we will not give any opinion on this matter because we do not have any scientific evidence or support that allows us to comment on the matter.

It has requested to reserve its opinion until the videoconference.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: None.

¹ <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/a0691e/a0691e.pdf>