



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of  
the United Nations



World Health  
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

REP14/FA

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

*Thirty-seventh Session*

*Geneva, Switzerland, 14-18 July 2014*

### REPORT OF THE FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES

*Hong Kong, China*

*17 – 21 March 2014*

NOTE: This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2014/8-FA



**To:** Codex Contact Points  
Interested International Organizations

**From:** Secretariat,  
Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome, Italy

**Subject:** **Distribution of the Report of the Forty-sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives (REP14/FA)**

The report of the Forty-sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives will be considered by the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Geneva, Switzerland, 14-18 July 2014).

#### **PART A – MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 37<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

##### **Draft and Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts at Steps 8 or 5/8 of the Procedure**

- 1. Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Dietary Exposure to Food Additive (Revision of CAC/GL 3-1989)** at Step 5/8 (para. 52 and Appendix VIII);
- 2. Food additive provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA)***, at Steps 8 and 5/8, respectively (paras 17, 101 and App. IX);
- 3. Proposed draft amendments to the *International Numbering System for Food Additives***, at Step 5/8 (para. 113 and Appendix XIII);
- 4. Proposed draft *Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives***, at Step 5/8 (para. 123 and Appendix XIV).

##### **Other matters for adoption**

- 5. Amendments to the Notes of the GSFA** (para. 14 and Appendix II);
- 6. Revised provisions for aluminium-containing food additives in selected standards** (para. 20 and Appendix III);
- 7. Revised food additives sections of the standards for meat products** (para. 43 and Appendix VII);
- 8. Revised food additive provisions of GSFA food category 08.0 “Meat and meat products, including poultry” and its sub-categories** (para. 43 and Appendix IX, Part D).

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above texts should do so in writing to the Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy (e-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org)) **before 30 May 2014.**

#### **PART B - REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AT STEP 3**

- 9. Proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA** (paras 16, 90 and Appendix VII).

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments at Step 3 on the above matters should do so in writing to the Secretariat of the Codex Committee on Food Additives, China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment (CFSA), Building 2, No. 37 Guangqu Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100022, China, (E-mail: [secretariat@ccfa.cc](mailto:secretariat@ccfa.cc)), with a copy to the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy (e-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org)) **before 15 October 2014.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	page IV
REPORT OF THE 46 <sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES .....	page 1
SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK .....	page 17
	<b>Paragraph</b>
Introduction .....	1
Opening of the Session .....	2 - 4
Adoption of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1) .....	5 - 8
Matters referred by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex Committees and Task Forces (Agenda Item 2) .....	9 - 24
Matters of Interest arising from FAO/WHO and from the 77 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) (Agenda Item 3) .....	25 - 27
Endorsement and/or revision of maximum levels for food additives and processing aids in Codex Standards (Agenda Item 4a) .....	28 - 31
Alignment of the food additive provisions of commodity standards and relevant provisions of the GSFA (Agenda Item 4b) .....	32 - 45
Revision of the <i>Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Food Additive Intake</i> (CAC/GL 3-1989) (Agenda Item 4c) .....	46 - 52
Information on commercial use of selected food additives (Agenda Item 4d) .....	53 - 57
General Standard for Food Additives (Agenda Item 5)	
Introduction .....	57 - 61
Recommendations for provisions in Tables 1 and 2 for food additives listed in Table 3 with “Emulsifier, Stabilizer and Thickener” function (Agenda Item 5a) .....	62- 63
Provisions in Tables 1 and 2 of Table 3 food additives with: (i) “Acidity Regulator” function for other use than Acidity Regulators and (ii) for other Table 3 food additives with functions other than “Emulsifier, Stabilizer and Thickener”, “Colour” and “Sweeteners” function (Agenda Item 5b) .....	64 - 66
Food additive provisions of Food Category 14.2.3 “Grape Wines” and its sub-categories (replies to CL 2012/5-FA Part B, point 7) (Agenda Item 5c) .....	67 - 72
“Descriptors and food additive provisions of food category 01.1.1 “Milk and butter milk (plain)” and its sub-categories and food category 01.1.2 “Dairy-based drinks, flavoured and/or fermented (Agenda Item 5d) .....	73 - 77
Recommendations for the entry of new provisions, including those for Food Category 16.0 “Prepared Foods”, and for revision of existing food additive provisions (Agenda Item 5e).....	78 - 88
Proposals for provisions of nisin (INS 234) in food category 08.0 “Meat and meat products, including poultry and game and its sub-categories (replies to CL 2012/5-FA, Part B, point 8) (Agenda Item 5f).....	89 – 90
Discussion paper on use of Note 161 in provisions for selected sweeteners (Agenda Item 5g)...	91 – 97
Proposals for new and/or revised food additive provisions (Agenda Item 5h).....	98 – 99
Others .....	100
General conclusion for Agenda Item 5.....	101 - 104
Proposals for changes and/or addition to the <i>International Numbering System (INS) for Food Additives</i> (CAC/GL 36-1989) (Agenda Item 6) .....	105 - 113
Proposed draft Specifications for the identity and purity of food additives arising from the 77 <sup>th</sup> JECFA (Agenda Item 7a) .....	114 - 123
Discussion paper on use of additives in additives (secondary additives) (Agenda Item 7b) .....	124 - 128

Proposals for the additions and changes to the Priority List of food additives proposed for evaluation by JECFA (Replies to CL 2013/12-FA) (Agenda Item 8a) .....	129 – 136
Discussion paper on options for the use of outcomes of the prioritization exercise and other feasible steps to identify compounds for re-evaluation by JECFA (Agenda Item 8b) .....	137 - 144
Other Business (Agenda Item 9) .....	145 - 146
Date and place of the next session (Agenda Item 10) .....	147

#### LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix I:</b>	List of Participants .....	18
<b>Appendix II:</b>	Amendments to the Notes of the GSFA (for adoption) .....	36
<b>Appendix III:</b>	Revision of food additive provisions in commodity standards (for adoption) .....	42
<b>Appendix IV:</b>	Action required as a result of changes in the Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) status and other toxicological recommendations arising from the 77 <sup>th</sup> JECFA ..	43
<b>Appendix V:</b>	Status of endorsement and/or revision of maximum levels of food additives and processing aids in commodity standards .....	44
<b>Appendix VI:</b>	Decision tree for the recommended approach to alignment of the GSFA and commodity standards for food additive provisions (for information) .....	48
<b>Appendix VII:</b>	Proposed amendments to the food additives provisions of the Codex standards for meat products (for adoption).....	50
<b>Appendix VIII:</b>	Proposed draft Guidelines for the simple evaluation of dietary exposure to food additives (Revision of CAC/GL 3-1989) (for adoption at Step 5/8) .....	52
<b>Appendix IX:</b>	General Standard for Food Additives - Draft and proposed draft food additives provisions (for adoption at Step 8 and 5/8) .....	63
<b>Appendix X:</b>	General Standard for Food Additives - Discontinuation of work on draft and proposed draft food additives (for information) .....	86
<b>Appendix XI:</b>	General Standard for Food Additives - New provisions at Step 2 and Step 3 (for information) .....	93
<b>Appendix XII:</b>	General Standard for Food Additives - Revocation of food additives (for approval) .....	98
<b>Appendix XIII:</b>	Proposed draft changes and/or additions to the International numbering System for food additives (for adoption at Step 5/8).....	99
<b>Appendix XIV:</b>	Proposed draft specifications for the identity and purity of food additives (for adoption at step 5/8) .....	107
<b>Appendix XV:</b>	Priority list of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA (for FAO and WHO follow-up) .....	108

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Forty-sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives reached the following conclusions:

### Matters for Adoption/Approval by the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

#### **Draft and proposed draft Standards and Related Texts for adoption at Steps 8 or 5/8**

The Committee forwarded:

- Proposed draft *Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Dietary Exposure to Food Additive* (revision of CAC/GL 3-1989) for adoption at Step 5/8 (para. 52 and Appendix VIII);
- Draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives* (GSFA) for adoption at Steps 8 and 5/8 (paras 17, 101 and Appendix IX);
- Proposed draft amendments to the *International Numbering System for Food Additives* for adoption at Step 5/8 (para. 113 and Appendix XIII); and
- Proposed draft *Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives* for adoption at Step 5/8 (para. 123 and Appendix XIV).

#### **Other matters for adoption**

- Amendments to the Notes of the GSFA (para. 14 and Appendix II);
- Revised provisions for aluminium-containing food additives in selected standards (para. 20 and Appendix III);
- Revised food additives sections of the standards *for Luncheon Meat* (CODEX STAN 89-1981), *for Corned Beef* (CODEX STAN 88-1981), *for Cooked Cured Ham* (CODEX STAN 96-1981); *for Cooked Pork Shoulder* (CODEX STAN 97-1981) and *for Cooked Cured Chopped Meat* (CODEX STAN 98-1981) (para 43 and Appendix VII); and
- Revised food additives provisions of GSFA food category 08.0 "Meat and meat products, including poultry" and its sub-categories (para 43 and Appendix IX Part D).

#### **Codex Standard and Related Texts for revocation**

The Committee agreed to request the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission to revoke:

- Provisions for brilliant blue (INS 133) in food category 09.2.5 "Smoked, dried, fermented, and/or salted fish and fish products, including mollusks, crustaceans and echinoderms" of the GSFA (para. 24 and Appendix XII, Part A);
- Provisions related to ammonium acetate (INS 264), ammonium adipates (INS 359), ammonium lactate (INS 328), choline salts and esters (INS 1001), chlorine dioxide (INS 926), formic acid (INS 236) and potassium hydrogen malate (INS 351 (i)) (para. 56 and Appendix XII, Part B); and
- Food additive provisions of the GSFA (para. 101 and Appendix XII).

### Other Matters of Interest to the Commission and FAO and WHO

The Committee agreed:

- To request JECFA to (i) revise the specifications monograph for potassium acetate to list INS 261(i) and clarify whether the group ADI for potassium acetates also include the potassium diacetate and (ii) consider deleting the functional use of carrier in the specifications for potassium aluminium silicate (INS 555) (paras 22 and 122);
- To continue work on alignment food additive provisions of commodity standards and relevant provisions of the GSFA (para. 44);
- To prepare a discussion paper on secondary food additives, including a definition (para. 128);
- To request information on the availability of data for the re-evaluation of the prioritised six colours for consideration by the Working Group on Priority (para. 143);
- To forward the Priority List of substances proposed for evaluation to FAO and WHO for their follow-up (para. 136 and Appendix XV); and

- Prepare a discussion paper on inconsistent terminology related to flavourings in the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008) and other Codex standards (para. 146).

**Matters Referred / Interest to Codex Committees and Task Forces**

The Committee:

***Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (CCFFP)***

- Endorsed the food additive provisions forwarded by the CCFFP and noted that phosphates INS 342(i),(ii) and INS 343(i)-(iii) in the draft Standard for Fresh and Quick Frozen Raw Scallop Products were associated with functions of humectant or sequestrant, which were not listed in CAC/GL 36-1989 (para. 29 and Appendix V);
- Agreed to add a note to the provisions for phosphates in food category 09.2.2 “Frozen battered fish, fish fillets and fish products, including molluscs, crustaceans and echinoderms” of the GSFA to read: “At 400 mg/kg as phosphorous for use singly or in combination in breaded or batter coating is accordance with *Standard for Quick Frozen Fish Sticks (Fish Fingers), Fish Portions and Fish Fillets – Breaded or in Batter* (CODEX STAN 166-1989)” (para. 30).

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) held its Forty-sixth Session in Hong Kong (China) from 17 to 21 March 2014, at the kind invitation of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Dr Junshi Chen, Professor of the China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment (CFSA), chaired the Session. The Session was attended by delegates from 50 Member countries and one Member organization; Observers from 33 international organizations; and FAO and WHO. The list of participants is given in Appendix I.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Dr Xiaohong Chen, Vice Minister, National Health and Family Planning Commission (NHFPC) of the People's Republic of China, welcomed the delegates. In his remarks, the Vice Minister noted that CCFA was an important platform for exchange and communication of views on food additives management, and contributes towards protecting the health of consumers and improving food safety management. The Vice Minister also informed the Committee that China was committed towards establishing integrated Food Safety Standards systems by 2015 and that Codex standards would be the foundation for its operations. Finally, Dr Xiaohong Chen said that China will continue to participate actively in Codex and work with other countries, in order to safeguard global food safety. He wished the Committee successful deliberations.

3. Dr Wing-man Ko, the Secretary for Food and Health, Food and Health Bureau, Hong Kong, also addressed the Committee and underscored the importance of the Codex standards in assisting Hong Kong in food control activities especially in ensuring the safety of food imports.

## Division of Competence

4. The Committee noted the division of competence between the European Union and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, as presented in CRD 1.

## ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)<sup>1</sup>

5. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.

6. The Committee agreed to discuss under other business (Agenda Item 9) a document prepared by IOFI on inconsistency in the terminology for flavourings in the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008) and other Codex texts.

7. The Committee agreed to establish in-session Working Groups, open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, on:

- Endorsement and/or revision of maximum levels for food additives and processing aids in Codex standards (Agenda Item 4a) and the alignment of food additive provisions in commodity standards with the GSFA (Agenda Item 4b), chaired by Australia;
- The International Numbering System (INS) for food additives (Agenda Item 6), chaired by Iran; and
- The priority list of compounds proposed for evaluation by JECFA (Agenda Item 8a), chaired by Canada.

8. The Delegation of China informed the Committee that a workshop on the status of the database on processing aids, developed by China with the assistance of New Zealand, will be organised on 19 March 2014 during the lunch break and that CRD 13 provided additional information on this subject.

## MATTERS REFERRED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES (Agenda Item 2)<sup>2</sup>

9. The Committee noted relevant decisions of the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission and of the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Committee on Fishery and Fishery Products (CCFFP) related to its work.

10. The Committee also noted that matters arising from the 35<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Nutrition and Food for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) would be considered under Agenda Items 5(a) and (b).

---

<sup>1</sup> CX/FA 14/46/1

<sup>2</sup> CX/FA 14/46/2; CX/FA 14/46/2 Add.1; Comments of China, European Union, India, Japan, African Union (CRD 7); Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15).

### **Categories of Notes of the GSFA**

11. The Committee noted that the proposed amendments were purely of editorial nature and that other amendments/revision to the notes should be submitted in response to the Circular Letter on proposals for new or revised provisions of the GSFA.

12. The Committee agreed with the proposal in the Annex of CX/FA 14/46/2 to revise the texts of a numbers of notes of the GSFA to improve clarity and harmonise the language of notes, which express the same concept. The Committee also agreed to amend other four notes (i.e. notes 41, 84, 182, 192), which were not addressed in the Annex to CX/FA 14/46/2.

13. The Committee also agreed to remove Note 241 “For use as acidity regulator and raising agent”, which was not associated with any food additive provision (adopted or in the Step process) of the GSFA.

### **Conclusion**

14. The Committee agreed to forward the amendments to the notes of the GSFA to the Commission for adoption (Appendix II).

### **Exclusions to Food Categories 01.1.1 “Milk and buttermilk” and 12.2.1 “Herbs and spices” in the Annex to Table 3 of the GSFA**

15. The Committee agreed to revise the text associated with food category 12.2.1 “Herbs and Spices” in the Annex to Table 3 of the GSFA to read “Excluding Spices” to align it with the text associated with food category 01.1.1 “Milk and buttermilk”.

### **Cyclotetraglucose (INS 1504(i)) and Cyclotetraglucose syrup (INS 1504(ii))**

16. The Committee agreed to include the provisions in Table 3 of the GSFA for cyclotetraglucose (INS 1504 (i)) and cyclotetraglucose syrup (INS 1504 (ii)) for circulation at Step 3 and consideration at its next Session (Appendix XI, Part 1(a)).

### **Potassium hydrogen sulfate (INS 515(ii))**

17. The Committee agreed to forward the provisions for potassium hydrogen sulfate (INS 515 (ii)) in Table 3 of the GSFA to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix IX Part C).

### **Benzoates – Note 301 “Interim maximum level” and Food Category 14.1.4 “Water-based flavoured drinks, including “sport”, “energy”, or “electrolyte” drinks and particulated drinks”**

18. The Committee could not reach a consensus to remove Note 301 and, therefore, agreed to request JECFA to undertake an exposure assessment of benzoates in this food category. The Committee noted that such assessments would require submission of relevant data by countries and industry with usage levels in various food categories worldwide to provide meaningful information on dietary exposure. In this regard the delegations of Australia, European Union and Norway offered to provide data to assist JECFA.

19. The Committee agreed to request the in-session Working Group on Priority to include this request in the Priority List (Agenda 8a).

### **Provisions for aluminium-containing food additives**

20. The Committee agreed to forward to the Commission for adoption the revised provisions for sodium aluminium silicate (INS 554) and calcium aluminium silicate (INS 556) in the standards *for Milk Powders and Cream Powders* (CODEX STAN 207-1999), *for Edible Casein Products* (CODEX STAN 290-1995) and *for a Blend of Skimmed Milk and Vegetable Fat in Powdered Form* (CODEX STAN 251-2006), which had been inadvertently omitted in the report of the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA (Appendix III).

21. The Committee recalled that JECFA had established a new PTWI of 2 mg/kg body weight for aluminium from all sources and that CCFA had revised the provisions for aluminium-containing food additives in several commodity standards, as well as in the GSFA, in response to the JECFA recommendation to decrease the use of aluminium-containing food additives to the extent possible.

### **Potassium acetates (INS 261)**

22. The Committee agreed to: (i) request JECFA to revise the specifications monograph for potassium acetate to list INS 261(i); and (ii) clarify whether the group ADI for potassium acetates also include the potassium diacetate.

23. The Committee noted that JECFA would require data and information to reply to this request.



**Brilliant blue (INS 133)**

24. In response to the request of the 33<sup>rd</sup> CCFFP, the Committee agreed to request the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission to revoke the provision for brilliant blue (INS 133) in food category 09.2.5 “Smoked, dried, fermented, and/or salted fish and fish products, including mollusks, crustaceans and echinoderms” (Appendix XII, Part A).

**MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO/WHO AND FROM THE 77<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (JECFA) (Agenda Item 3)<sup>3</sup>**

25. The Representatives of WHO, speaking on behalf of FAO and WHO and referring to CX/FA 14/46/3, informed the Committee on activities carried out by FAO and WHO in the area of scientific advice to Codex and Member countries relevant to the Committee as well as other activities of interest.

26. In particular, the Joint Secretariat of JECFA presented the recommendations listed in Table 1 of CX/FA 14/46/3 for the food additives evaluated by the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting of JECFA (Rome, Italy, 4-13 June 2013), which were endorsed by the Committee.

**Conclusion**

27. The final recommendations regarding action required as a result of changes to the status of ADI and other toxicological recommendations are summarized in Appendix IV.

**ENDORSEMENT AND/OR REVISION OF MAXIMUM LEVELS FOR FOOD ADDITIVES AND PROCESSING AIDS IN CODEX STANDARDS (Agenda Item 4a)<sup>4</sup>**

28. The Committee considered the recommendations of the in-session Working Group on endorsement, led by Australia, related to the food additive provisions forwarded by the 33<sup>rd</sup> CCFFP as follows:

***Draft Standard for Fresh and Quick Frozen Raw Scallop Products***

29. The Committee endorsed the food additive provisions as proposed by CCFFP and noted that CAC/GL 36-1989 did not associated the functions of humectant or sequestrant with INS 342(i),(ii) and INS 343(i)-(iii).

***Standards for Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns (CODEX STAN 92-1981); for Quick Frozen Lobsters (CODEX STAN 95-1981); for Quick Frozen Blocks of Fish Fillets, Minced Fish Flesh and Mixtures of Fillets and Minced Fish Flesh (CODEX STAN 165-1989); for Quick Frozen Fish Sticks (Fish Fingers), Fish Portions and Fish Fillets – Breaded or in Batter (CODEX STAN 166-1989); and General Standard for Quick Frozen Fish Fillets (CODEX STAN 190-1995)***

30. The Committee endorsed the proposed new and revised provisions in the above standards as proposed by CCFFP and agreed to add a note to the provisions for phosphates in food category 09.2.2 “Frozen battered fish, fish fillets and fish products, including molluscs, crustaceans and echinoderms” of the GSFA to read: “At 400 mg/kg as phosphorous for use singly or in combination in breaded or batter coating is accordance with *Standard for Quick Frozen Fish Sticks (Fish Fingers), Fish Portions and Fish Fillets – Breaded or in Batter (CODEX STAN 166-1989)*”.

**Conclusion**

31. The status of endorsement of food additive provisions is presented in Appendix V.

**ALIGNMENT OF THE FOOD ADDITIVE PROVISIONS OF COMMODITY STANDARDS AND RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE GSFA (Agenda Item 4b)<sup>5</sup>**

32. The Delegation of Australia introduced the report of the in-session Working Group on the alignment of the food additive provisions of commodity standards and relevant provisions of the GSFA (CRD 3). The Delegation explained that the Working Group had agreed that it was high priority to complete the work on the five meat standards and that, to do this work, it had used the decision tree, as amended by the EWG,

<sup>3</sup> CX/FA 14/46/3; Comments of African Union (CRD 8).

<sup>4</sup> CX/FA 14/46/4; CX/FA 14/46/4-Add.1; Report of the in-session Working Group on Endorsement (CRD 3); Comments of China, European Union, Philippines, Thailand, African Union and ICA (CRD 9); Russian Federation (CRD 15)

<sup>5</sup> CX/FA 14/46/5; Report of the in-session Working Group on Endorsement and/or Revision of Maximum Levels for Food Additives and Processing Aids in Codex Standards and on Recommendations on the Alignment of the Food Additive Provisions of Commodity Standards and Relevant Provisions of the GSFA (CRD 3); Comments of China, European Union, India, Philippines, Thailand, African Union and ICA (CRD 9); Indonesia (CRD 14); Russia Federation (CRD 15).

established by the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA<sup>6</sup>. The Working Group had focused its work in solving the outstanding issues related to additives limited by GMP in the respective commodity standards and already listed in Table 3 of the GSFA.

33. The Committee further noted that, as result of the Working Group's exercise, the food additive sections of the five meat standards had been replaced with references to the GSFA and the GSFA had been amended to include the food additive provisions of the five meat standards and a number of notes (in Table 1 and 2 and in Table 3) which aimed at preserving the identity of the food additive provisions used in the commodity standards.

### **Discussion**

34. The Committee considered the recommendations of the Working Group and made the following comments and conclusions.

#### Recommendations 2 and 3

35. The Committee noted the changes made to the decision tree and the principles to guide its work on alignment and agreed to append the revised decision tree to this report for reference for its further work on alignment (Appendix VI).

#### Recommendations 4, 5 and 6

36. The Committee endorsed recommendation 4 relating to the provisions for food additives in food category 08.0 "Meat and meat products, including poultry" and its sub-categories. The Committee agreed to delete: (i) "added" in the listing of phosphates in food category 08.2.2 "Heat-treated processed meat, poultry and game products in whole pieces or cuts" as this was covered by the new Note BB-1; (ii) the reference to the level of residual nitrite in Note AA-1; and the maximum level of phosphorus in the new Note BB-1.

37. In food category 08.3 "Processed comminuted meat, poultry and game products" the Committee agreed to replace the two provisions for nitrites (INS 249-250) with one provision for nitrites of 80 mg/kg associated with new Note XX: "For use in products conforming to the *Standard for Luncheon Meat* (CODEX STAN 89-1981) and the *Standard for Cooked Cured Chopped Meat* (CODEX STAN 98-1981)" and YY: "Except for use in products conforming to the *Standard for Corned Beef* (CODEX STAN 88-1981) at 30 mg/kg as residual NO<sub>2</sub> ion".

38. The Committee endorsed recommendations 5 and 6 concerning: (i) addition of specific notes in food categories 08.0, 08.2 "Processed meat, poultry and game products in whole pieces or cuts", 08.2.2, 08.3 and 08.3.2 "Heat-treated processed comminuted meat, poultry and game products" to provisions of food additives not listed in the five meat standards; and (ii) amendments to Table 3 and the Annex to Table 3.

39. The Committee noted that in CRD 3 the name of potassium chloride (INS 508) was not correct and that sodium citrates (INS 331) is listed in Table 3 as individual additives: sodium dihydrogen citrate (INS 331(i)) and trisodium citrate (INS 331(iii)).

40. The Committee noted that the Codex Secretariat will consider how best to reflect the above decisions related to the addition of specific notes to Table 3 and its Annex.

#### Recommendation 7

41. The Committee endorsed the recommendation to replace the food additive listing in the five meat standards with a reference to the GSFA.

#### Recommendation 8

42. The Committee endorsed the recommendation to establish an EWG to continue work on alignment and complete the task assigned by the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA.

### **Conclusion**

43. The Committee agreed to forward to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption:

- Revised food additive sections of the standards for *Luncheon Meat* (CODEX STAN 89-1981), for *Corned Beef* (CODEX STAN 88-1981), for *Cooked Cured Ham* (CODEX STAN 96-1981); for *Cooked Pork Shoulder* (CODEX STAN 97-1981) and for *Cooked Cured Chopped Meat* (CODEX STAN 98-1981) (Appendix VII) and ;
- Revised food additive provisions of the GSFA (Appendix IX Part D).

---

<sup>6</sup> CX/FA 14/46/5 Appendix I.

44. The Committee further agreed to establish an EWG, led by Australia and working in English only, on the alignment of food additive provisions in Codex commodity standards with the GSFA to:

- Consider the application of the decision tree (Appendix VI) to the *Standard for Bouillons and Consommés* (CODEX STAN 117-1981) and the standards for chocolate and cocoa products;
- Consider the food additive provisions of the GSFA that, according to the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV) are not technologically justified in specific food categories covered by the standards for *Certain Canned Citrus* (CODEX STAN 254-2007), for *Preserved Tomatoes* (CODEX STAN 13-1981) and for *Processed Concentrates* (CODEX STAN 57-1981);<sup>7</sup> and
- Develop a draft list of prioritised commodity standards for application of the decision tree approach to guide future work on alignment.

45. The CCFA Chairperson noted that the work on alignment was a very complex task and that the completion of the alignment work on the five meat standards with the GSFA was an important accomplishment for the Committee that will facilitate work on the alignment of other commodity standards and contribute to make the GSFA the single authoritative reference point for food additives in Codex.

#### **REVISION OF THE GUIDELINES FOR THE SIMPLE EVALUATION OF FOOD ADDITIVES INTAKE (CAC/GL 3-1989) (N08-2013) (Agenda Item 4c)<sup>8</sup>**

46. The Delegation of Brazil, as lead country, provided a summary of the work of the electronic Working Group (EWG) on the revision of the *Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Food Additives Intake* (CAC/GL 3-1989) and highlighted key issues of discussions and revisions made to the document. The Delegation further informed the Committee that a revised proposal had been prepared, which included changes resulting from the written comments submitted for consideration by the Committee (CRD 10).

##### **General comments**

47. The Committee noted that the purpose of the document was to develop a tool for the simple evaluation of dietary exposure at national level and that it did not contradict the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*, since the objective of the two documents were different.

48. In view of the general support for the proposed draft revision, the Committee agreed to base its discussion on CRD 10.

##### **Specific comments**

49. The Committee considered the proposed draft Guidelines section by section and agreed with most of the proposals made and, in addition to editorial corrections, made the following decisions and comments:

- The reference to developing countries was deleted, however it was reiterated by the Committee that the principles and methods for the exposure assessment of chemicals in food are described in EHC 240 and that the current document was intended to provide a tool for the simple evaluation of dietary exposure to countries with limited resources;
- A clarification on the use of the budget method, as described in EHC 240, was included as a footnote.
- The text in Table 1 on the characteristic of population-based method was amended to give less emphasis on these data which were less useful;
- A simple approach for the determination of food consumption of “high consumers” was included;
- It was clarified that since the Guidelines were providing a simple approach to dietary exposure for those countries that have limited data, it was not realistic to discuss a detailed assessment for the exposure of groups of children of different ages and body weights;
- It was also clarified that the purpose for checking the data for average consumption of “eaters” was to verify that they were not higher than those of the whole population;
- It was noted that in the prioritization process the inclusion of additional and/or more refined criteria could result in a complex process;

<sup>7</sup> REP13/PFV paras 109-114.

<sup>8</sup> CX/FA 14/46/6; Comments at Step 3 of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Peru and CCC (CX/FA 14/46/6 Add 1); European Union, India, Japan, Kenya and JECFA Secretariat (CX/FA 14/46/6 Add 2); Comments of China, European Union, India, Philippines, Thailand, African Union and ICA (CRD 9); Brazil (CRD 10); Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); Brazil (CRD 23).

- It was agreed that the criteria for prioritization i.e. low ADI and high level of additives authorized in food do not represent a risk *per se*;
- The example was amended to make it consistent with the document and to include the estimation of consumption of high consumers;

50. The Committee discussed the possible inclusion of actual highest use levels within the example to estimate the EDI to account for consumer's brand loyalty and concluded that this would increase the complexity of the example without major benefit.

### **Conclusion**

51. The Committee noted that all comments had been addressed and that no outstanding issues remained and, therefore, agreed that the document was ready to progress in the Step Procedure.

### **Status of the proposed draft revision of the Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Food Additive Intakes (CAC/GL 3-1989) (N08-2013)**

52. The Committee agreed to forward the renamed Guidelines for the Simple Evaluation of Dietary Exposure to Food Additives to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix VIII).

### **INFORMATION ON COMMERCIAL USE OF SELECTED FOOD ADDITIVES (REPLIES TO CL 2013/8-FA, PART B, POINT 4) (Agenda Item 4d)<sup>9</sup>**

53. The Committee noted that in reply to CL 2013/8-FA, Part B, Point 4, requesting information on the commercial use of 16 food additives listed in the GSFA and for which no corresponding specifications had been developed by JECFA, information had been provided for the following substances: dipotassium tartrate (INS 336 (ii)), monopotassium tartrate (INS 336 (i)), potassium bisulfite (INS 228), monosodium tartrate (INS 335(i)), potassium adipates (INS 357), potassium ascorbate (INS 303), potassium malate (INS 351(ii)), sodium adipates (INS 356), and propane (INS 944).

54. Consistent with the decision taken at its 45<sup>th</sup> Session, the Committee agreed to include these nine substances in the JECFA Priority List (Appendix XV), with the understanding that commitment for the submission of full dossiers (data and sponsor) for JECFA evaluation would be confirmed not later than the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA.

55. The Committee noted that a number of these substances would require a full re-evaluation, e.g. propane for which the evaluation in 1979 was very brief, while in other cases a re-evaluation might be acceptable.

### **Conclusion**

56. The Committee agreed to remove from the GSFA the remaining seven compounds for which information on their commercial use was not provided, namely: ammonium acetate (INS 264), ammonium adipates (INS 359), ammonium lactate (INS 328), choline salts and esters (INS 1001), chlorine dioxide (INS 926), formic acid (INS 236) and potassium hydrogen malate (INS 351 (i)) and revoke the related provisions (Appendix XII, Part B).

57. The Committee noted that Members and Observers could propose the re-evaluation of these substances through the Circular Letter on the Priority list of Substances Proposed for Evaluation by JECFA.

### **GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (Agenda Item 5)<sup>10</sup>**

58. The Committee noted that the pre-session Working Group on the GSFA, led by the United States of America, had made recommendations on:

- Provisions in Tables 1 and 2 of Table 3 food additives with "emulsifier, stabilizer and thickener" function (Agenda Item 5a);
- A portion of provisions in Tables 1 and 2 of Table 3 food additive with; (i) "acidity regulator" function for other use than acidity regulators; and (ii) for other table 3 food additive with functions other than "emulsifier, thickener, stabilizer", "colour" and "sweetener" (Agenda Item 5b); :

<sup>9</sup> CX/FA 14/46/7 (Replies of Australia, Costa Rica, European Union and OIV); CX/FA 14/46/7 Add.1 (Replies of India); Comments of China, European Union, India, Philippines, Thailand, African Union and ICA (CRD 9); Indonesia (CRD 14).

<sup>10</sup> CRD 2 (Report of physical Working Group on the GSFA); Comments of China, Egypt, European Union, India, Japan, Kenya, Philippines, Thailand, African Union, ICA, IFFA (CRD 6).

- Food additives provisions of food category 14.2.3 “Grape wines” and its sub-categories (Agenda Item 5c); and
- Discussion paper on the Use of Note 161 in provisions for selected sweeteners (Agenda item 5g)

59. The Working Group made recommendations for approximately 700 provisions of the GSFA (550 recommended for adoption and 159 for discontinuation). The Chairperson of the Working Group noted that the adoption of these provisions by the Commission would result in the GSFA containing more adopted provisions than provisions in the Step process for the first time.

60. The Committee noted that, due to time constraints, the Working Group could not complete work on Agenda Item 5b and on the remaining agenda items, which included: (i) proposals for new provisions, including those for food category 16 “Prepared foods” and for revision of existing food additive provisions (Agenda Item 5e); (ii) proposals for provisions for nisin (INS 234) in food category 08.0 “Meat and meat products, including poultry and game” and its sub-categories (Agenda Item 5f); and (iii) proposals for new additive provisions and/or revision of food additive provisions of the GSFA (Agenda Item 5h). The Committee also noted that Agenda Item 5(d) on descriptors and food additives provisions of selected dairy food categories had not been included in the mandate of the Working Group.

61. The Committee considered recommendations 1-11 of the Working Group and made decisions and commented as follows.

**Matters related to Agenda Item 5a “Recommendations for Provisions in Tables 1 and 2 for Food Additives Listed in Table 3 with “Emulsifier, Stabilizer and Thickener” Function”<sup>11</sup>**

Recommendation 1

62. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding the adoption at Step 8 or Step 5/8 of the draft and proposed draft provisions for Table 3 food additives with “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener” function contained in CRD 2 Appendix 3, Part A, with the exception of the provisions for calcium carbonate (INS 170(i)) and calcium sulfate (INS 516) in food category 06.2.1 “Flours” that were retained in the GSFA at the Step 7, as they were not used as emulsifiers in these products. The Committee further agreed to associate with the provisions listed in CRD 2 Appendix 3, Part A:

- A new Note BB “For use only in fresh minced meat which contains other ingredients apart from comminuted meat” to all provisions of food category 08.1.2 “Fresh meat, poultry and game, comminuted” as the food category included products with no other ingredients or food additives;
- A new Note EE “Singly or in combination: INS 1412, 1413, 1414 and 1440 in products conforming to the *Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants* (CODEX STAN 72-1981)” to the relevant provisions in food category 13.1.1 “Infant formulae” to align it with the food additive provisions in the Standard; and
- A new Note FF “Singly or in combination: INS 1412, 1413, 1414 and 1422 in products conforming to the *Standard for Follow-Up Formula* (CODEX STAN 156-1981) to the relevant provisions in food category 13.1.2 “Follow-up formulae” to align with the food additive provisions in the Standard.

Recommendation 2

63. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding discontinuation of work on the draft and proposed draft provisions for Table 3 food additives with “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener” function contained in CRD 2 Appendix 4, Part A.

**Matters related to Agenda Items 5b “Provisions in Tables 1 and 2 of Table 3 Food Additives with: (i) “Acidity Regulator” Function for other use than Acidity Regulators; and (ii) for other Table 3 Food Additives with Functions other than “Emulsifier, Stabilizer and Thickener”, “Colour” and “Sweeteners” Function”<sup>12</sup>**

Recommendation 8

64. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding the adoption at Step 8 or Step 5/8 of the draft and proposed draft provisions for Table 3 food additives with acidity regulator function for use other than as acidity regulators, and for other Table 3 food additives with functions other than “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener”, “colour” or “sweetener” contained in CRD 2 Appendix 3, Part B, with the exception of the

<sup>11</sup> CX/FA 14/46/8; CX/FA 14/46/8 Add.1; Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); Philippines (CRD 17).

<sup>12</sup> CX/FA 14/46/9; Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15).

provision for ascorbic acid, L- (INS 300) in food category 02.1.2 “Vegetable oils and fats” as the food category had a full correspondence with the relevant standards, which did not contain this provision. The provision was therefore discontinued.

65. The Delegations of European Union and Norway expressed general reservation as to the use of erythorbic acid (INS 315) at GMP level as a numerical ADI was established for these additives in European Union.

#### Recommendation 9

66. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding discontinuation of work on the draft and proposed draft provisions for Table 3 food additives with acidity regulator function for use other than as acidity regulators, and for other Table 3 food additives with functions other than “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener”, “colour” or “sweetener” contained in CRD 2 Appendix 4, Part B.

#### **Matters related to Agenda Item 5c “Food Additive Provisions of Food Category 14.2.3 “Grape Wines” and its Sub-categories”<sup>13</sup>**

67. The Delegation of the United States of America, as the Chair of the pre-session Working Group, while introducing this item explained that the Working Group had agreed to the recommendation of the EWG that food additives with “acidity regulator” and “emulsifier, stabilizer and thickener” function should be considered on a case-by-case basis in food category 14.2.3 “Grape wines and its sub-categories” and, therefore, had considered each provision in these food categories on an individual basis.

#### Recommendation 4

68. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding the discard of the proposed new provisions for: calcium tartrate DL- (INS 354), potassium tartrate DL-, tartaric acid DL-, monopotassium tartrate (INS 336(i)), dipotassium tartrate (INS 336(ii)), calcium phosphates (INS 341), ammonium phosphates (INS 342), agar (INS 406), potassium sulfate (INS 515), potassium citrate (INS 332), and malic acid, L(-) compiled in the various appendices of CX/FA 46/16/10, with the understanding that substances used as processing aids can be nominated for inclusion in the database for processing aids.

#### Recommendation 5

69. The Committee endorsed the recommendation regarding discontinuation of work on the draft and proposed draft provisions listed in CRD 2 Appendix 4, Part C, with the understanding that substances used as processing aids can be nominated for inclusion in the database for processing aids.

70. The Committee agreed to discontinue work on the provision for calcium carbonate (INS 170(i)), noting that it was used in wine only as a processing aid, and could be nominated for inclusion in the database for processing aids.

#### Recommendations 6 and 7

71. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to: (i) include the new provision for sodium carboxymethyl cellulose (INS 466) in the GSFA at Step 2; and (ii) hold the provisions listed in CRD 2 Appendix 6, with the exception of the provision for calcium carbonate, with the understanding that information would be requested on the technological function and use level (GMP or numerical) of these provisions when they will be circulated for comments.

#### **Conclusion**

72. The Committee noting that the Working Group had not discussed the mechanisms to request and consider these information, agreed to the proposal of the CCFA Chairperson to establish an EWG, led by France and working in English only, to collect information on the actual levels of use in provisions listed in Appendix 6 of CRD 2, including sodium carboxymethyl cellulose (INS 466) and prepare recommendations on a case-by-case basis.

#### **“Descriptors and food additive provisions of food category 01.1.1 “Milk and butter milk (plain)” and its sub-categories and food category 01.1.2 “Dairy-based drinks, flavoured and/or fermented (e.g. chocolate milk, cocoa, eggnog, drinking yoghurt, whey-based drink)” (Agenda Items 5d)<sup>14</sup>**

73. The Delegation of New Zealand, as the Chair of the EWG, introduced CX/FA 14/46/12 and pointed out

<sup>13</sup> CX/FA 14/46/10; Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15).

<sup>14</sup> CX/FA 14/46/11; CRD 2 (Report of the physical Working Group on GSFA); CRD 6 (Comments of China, Egypt, European Union, India, Japan, Kenya, Philippines, Thailand, African Union, ICA and IFFA); CRD 14 (Comments of Indonesia); CRD 15 (Comments of Russian Federation).

the conflicts between the definition of “milk” in the *General Standard for the Use of Dairy Terms* (CODEX STAN 206-1999) and the descriptor of food category 01.1.1 “Milk (plain)” and its sub-categories. The Delegation also noted that the current food category system and descriptors do not address reconstituted/recombined plain milk and other plain (non-flavoured) milk products. The EWG identified three options for addressing these inconsistencies and recommended Option 3 as the preferred option.

### **Discussion**

74. The Committee agreed that the food additive descriptors needed to be revised to address these inconsistencies.

75. The Committee considered the three options, while noting that Option 1 would not delay the current work on the GSFA. However, the Committee agreed that Option 3 would be more suitable as it would also allow addressing the issues of recombined milks, which are currently not included. Several delegations stated that no additives were needed for pasteurised milk and that only very limited additive uses were justified in sterilised and UHT milk (i.e. phosphates and sodium citrate) and that the revision should not result in allowing additional additives in the GSFA.

76. The Committee noted that in order to implement Option 3 it was necessary to also undertake an analysis of the implications of the proposed changes on the current food additive provisions of the GSFA.

### **Conclusion**

77. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by New Zealand, and working in English only to:

- Further revise the structure of food category 01.1 “Milk and dairy-based drinks” and its subcategories to resolve the issues identified regarding the correct placement of certain dairy products in the food category system; and
- Prepare a project document for new work, which would also include an analysis of the implications of the proposed revision on the current provisions in the GSFA.

### **Recommendations for the Entry of New Provisions, including those for Food Category 16.0 “Prepared Foods”, and for Revision of Existing Food Additive Provisions (Based on Replies to CL 2012/5-FA, Part B, Points 9 and 10) (Agenda Item 5e)<sup>15</sup>**

78. The Delegation of the United States, as the Chairperson of the Working Group, drew the attention of the Committee to the recommendations of the EWG charged to prepare recommendations for entry of new provisions into the GSFA, including those for food category 16.0 “Prepared food” and for revision of existing food additive provisions.

79. The Delegation explained that the EWG recommendations (discard, include in the GSFA at Step 2) were based upon whether information submitted proved that the provisions meet the minimum requirements for the inclusion of a food additive provision in the GSFA, i.e. that the additive: (i) has a full Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) established by JECFA; (ii) an INS number; and (iii) is used in international trade. It was further explained that consideration against the specific criteria in Section 3.2 of the Preamble to the GSFA would take place when the provisions are circulated for comments at Step 3.

80. The Delegation of the European Union, supported by Norway, expressed concern that sufficient technological justification, as required in the *Procedure for Consideration of the Entry and Review of Food Additives Provisions in the GSFA*<sup>16</sup>, had not been provided for several provisions being proposed for entry into the GSFA.

81. In response to the above concern, it was clarified that the *Procedure*, which was relatively new, had not been strictly adhered to by the CCFA. It was proposed that, in the future, the Circular Letter for new entry and or revision of food additive provisions in the GSFA would include a form for the submission of proposals, which would clearly identify the seven criteria for initiation of work, i.e.: (i) Evaluation by JECFA; (ii) INS number; (iii) Functional Effect(s); (iv) Conditions of Use; (v) Justification of Technological Need; (vi) Dietary Intake Assessment (as appropriate); and (vii) Justification that Use Does not Mislead Consumer.

82. Information provided with this form would be compiled in a working document and considered by the physical Working Group on the GSFA, which will make recommendations as to their inclusion in the GSFA at Step 2.

83. The Chairperson of the CCFA emphasised that the Committee should work towards a more uniform

---

<sup>15</sup> CX/FA 14/46/12; CRD 2 (Report of the physical Working Group on GSFA); Russian Federation (CRD 15).

<sup>16</sup> Procedural Manual

approach based on the established procedures and that the proposals for new entry should be evaluated based on the required information.

84. The Committee agreed to consider the EWG recommendations, noting that they referred to outstanding proposals dating back to the 44<sup>th</sup> CCFA and that these provisions would be entered into the GSFA at Step 2 and subsequently circulated for comments at Step 3 to consider information on technological justification.

85. The Committee considered the recommendations of the EWG as follows:

#### **New Proposals (CX/FA 14/46/12 Appendix 1)**

86. The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the EWG to:

- Include specific new food additive provisions in the GSFA at Step 2, to be circulated at a later date for comments at Step 3 (Appendix XI, Part 2 (b) ); and
- Discard all the other proposals.

#### **Proposals for Revision or Revocation of Existing Provisions in the GSFA (CX/FA 14/46/12 Appendix 2)**

87. The Committee agreed:

- To include proposals for revision of adopted provisions in the GSFA at Step 2, to be circulated at a later date for comments at Step 3 (Appendix XI, Part 2(b)); and
- Not to include proposals for revision of provisions currently in the Step process, recognising that the proposed revision could be discussed when these provisions are circulated for comments.

88. The Committee did not support the proposal to revoke the provisions for:

- Calcium hydroxide (INS 526) and sodium hydroxide (INS 524) in food category 02.2.1 “Butter”; and
- Pectins (INS 440) in food categories 01.2.1.1 “Fermented milks (plain), not heat-treated after fermentation”; 01.2.1.2 “Fermented milks (plain), heat-treated after fermentation”; and 01.2.2 “Renneted milk (plain)”.

#### **Proposals for provisions of nisin (INS 234) in food category 08.0 “Meat and meat products, including poultry and game” and its sub-categories (replies to CL 2012/5-FA, Part B, point 8) (Agenda Item 5f)<sup>17</sup>**

89. The Delegation of the United States of America, which was charged by the 44<sup>th</sup> CCFA to compile in a structured form the proposal submitted for the use of nisin in food category 08.0 “Meat and meat products, including poultry and game” and its sub-categories, recalled that at its 45<sup>th</sup> Session the Committee had agreed to postpone consideration of new proposals until the current session to take into consideration the outcome of the 77<sup>th</sup> JECFA evaluation (Agenda Item 3).

90. The Committee considered the proposals in CX/FA 14/46/15, which compiled the document and comments submitted at the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA, and agreed:

- Not to include the provision for nisin in food category 08.0, noting that the provision had previously been discontinued at its 44<sup>th</sup> Session<sup>18</sup>; and
- To include into the GSFA at Step 3 the provisions for nisin in food categories: 08.2.2 “Heat treated processed meat, poultry, and game products in whole pieces or cuts”; 08.3.2; “Heat treated processed comminuted meat, poultry, and game products in whole pieces or cuts” and 08.4 “Edible casings (e.g. sausage casings)”, to be circulated for comments at Step 3 (Appendix XI, Part 1 (b)).

#### **“Discussion Paper on Use of Note 161 in provisions for selected sweeteners (Agenda Item 5g)<sup>19</sup>**

##### Recommendation 3

91. In introducing this recommendation, the Delegation of the United States of America, as the Chair of the pre-session Working Group, explained that in the Working Group there appeared to be a strong consensus to remove Note 161 from the GSFA and that the use of sweeteners was justified in energy reduced foods and foods with no-added sugar. However, it was evident that the Working Group could not reach consensus on the use of sweeteners in food which do not meet the definition of energy-reduced or no-added sugars.

<sup>17</sup> CX/FA 14/46/15; Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); El Salvador (CRD 16).

<sup>18</sup> REP12/FA, para. 80.

<sup>19</sup> CX/FA 14/46/14; Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); El Salvador (CRD 16); Ghana (CRD 18); ICGA (CRD 19); CCC (CRD 20); FoodDrink Europe (CRD 21)



92. There was a general support by the Committee to: advance work on Note 161 and to establish a new EWG. However, there was no consensus on the recommendation 3 of the Working Group and on whether the EWG should base its work on Option 3 or both Option 1 and 3 (contained in para. 11 of CX/FA 14/46/14).

93. Delegations which supported Option 3 were of the opinion that this approach would ensure more focused work and faster progress towards the replacement of Note 161. They were of the opinion that there was no value to consider Option 1, which did not meet the consensus of the in-session Working Group's discussion and noted that the mandate of the EWG in Recommendation 3 allowed the possibility to explore additional notes for specific food categories where the replacement note was not appropriate.

94. Delegations which supported both Options 1 and 3 were of the opinion that this approach would allow a more balanced discussion in the EWG and make its work more systematic by allowing a deeper analysis of the effects of the replacement of Note 161 on international trade. These delegations also noted that this approach would make the EWG more open to consider the views expressed by those in support of Option 1, who were of the opinion that consideration of only Option 3 would not include many products now in trade.

### **Conclusion**

95. After an extensive debate, the CCFA Chairperson noted that Option 3 was included in Recommendation 3, but that this did not imply that in the future the Committee will use the Note (based on Option 3) to solve all the problems related to Note 161. He further noted that Recommendation 3 gave a mandate to the EWG to explore and assess the consequences and the impact of the Note and that, if the analysis will show huge consequences, the Committee would continue to explore other alternative notes. The Chairperson urged all interested Members and Observers to actively participate and provide information to allow the EWG to accomplish its mandate.

96. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by the United Kingdom with the assistance of the United States of America and working in English only, to request information on the effect of the application of the following Note: "*For use only in energy-reduced food or food with no added sugars as defined in CAC/GL 23-1997*" to provisions for sweeteners contained in Appendix 8 of FA/45 CRD 2.

97. The EWG will utilise this information to determine if the application of this Note on a general basis for provisions for sweeteners in specific food categories is appropriate, or if alternative Notes can be developed to address concerns for the provisions for sweeteners in specific food categories when the replacement Note is not appropriate. The EWG can make recommendations on:

- The amendment of adopted provisions;
- Progression of provisions within the Step process;
- Progression of new provisions into the Step process.

### **“Proposals for New and/or Revised Food Additive Provisions (Replies to CL 2013/8-FA Part B, Point 5) (Agenda Item 5h)”<sup>20</sup>**

98. The Committee agreed to the proposal that the Circular Letter for new entry and or revision of food additive provisions in the GSFA would include a form for the submission of proposals, which would clearly identify the seven criteria for initiation of work as outlined in the *Procedure for Consideration of the Entry and Review of Food Additives Provisions in the GSFA*. It was further agreed that the replies submitted would be compiled by the Secretariat in a working document and considered by the physical Working Group on the GSFA, which will make recommendations as to their inclusion in the GSFA at Step 2.

### **Conclusion**

99. In view of this decision, the Committee agreed not to consider the proposals for new and/or revised food additive provisions submitted in reply to CL 2013/8-FA Part B, Point 5 and to request Members and Observers to resubmit their proposal in reply to the next Circular Letter.

### **Others (Recommendations to the in-session Working Groups on the INS and the JECFA Priority List)**

#### **Recommendations 10-11**

100. The Committee endorsed the two last recommendations in CRD 2 and noted that the request to consider the inclusion of new functional classes to selected food additives (Recommendation 10) had not been discussed by the in-session Working Group and would be considered by the EWG on INS (see Agenda Item 6).

---

<sup>20</sup> CX/FA 14/46/15; Comments of Russian Federation (CRD 15).

### **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS FOR AGENDA ITEM 5**

101. The Committee agreed to forward to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission:

- Draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA for adoption at Step 8 and Step 5/8 (Appendix IX)<sup>21</sup>; and
- Food additive provisions recommended for revocation (Appendix XII)<sup>22</sup>.

102. The Committee agreed to discontinue work on a number of draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA as presented in Appendix X<sup>23</sup> and to include a number of food additive provisions at Step 2 and 3 in the GSFA (Appendix XI).<sup>24</sup>

### **Work for the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFA**

#### **Electronic Working Group on the GSFA**

103. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG led by the United States of America and working in English only, to:

- Prepare proposals for the provisions in Tables 1 and 2 of the GSFA for Table 3 food additives with “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener” function, for their use for technological function other than as emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener”; and
- Prepare proposals for consideration of the provisions in Table 1 and 2 in food categories 01.2 through 08.4, with the exclusion of food categories 04.1.2.4 “Canned or bottled (pasteurized) fruit”, 04.2.2.4 “Canned or bottled (pasteurized) or retort pouch vegetables (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes, and aloe vera), and seaweeds”, 04.2.2.5 “Vegetable (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes, and aloe vera), seaweed, and nut and seed purees and spreads (e.g. peanut butter)”, 04.2.2.6 “Vegetable (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes, and aloe vera), seaweed, and nut and seed pulps and preparations (e.g. vegetable desserts and sauces, candied vegetables) other than food category 4.2.2.5”, 05.1.1 “Cocoa mixes (powders) and cocoa mass/cake”, 05.1.3 “Cocoa-based spreads, including fillings” and 05.1.4 “Cocoa and chocolate products”, for those food additives without “colour” or “sweetener” function.

#### **Physical Working Group on the GSFA**

104. The Committee agreed to establish a physical Working Group, which would meet immediately prior to its 47<sup>th</sup> Session and be chaired by the United States of America and work in English only, to consider and prepare recommendations for the Plenary on:

- Outstanding provisions related to Agenda Item 5b;
- The reports of the electronic Working Group on (i) the GSFA; (ii) Food category 14.2.3 “Grape wines”; (iii) revision of food category 01.1 “Milk and dairy-based drinks” and its subcategories; and (iv) Note 161; and
- New proposals for entry or revision of food additive provisions (reply to Circular Letter) and provisions circulated for comments at Step 3.

### **PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES AND/OR ADDITION TO THE *INTERNATIONAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (INS) FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (CAC/GL 36-1989) (Agenda Item 6)***<sup>25</sup>

105. The Delegation of Iran introduced the report of the in-session Working Group on the International Numbering System (INS).

106. The Committee considered the recommendations of the Working Group and made the following comments and conclusions.

#### **Recommendation 1**

107. The Committee agreed to add the technological purpose of “stabilizer synergist” to the functional class

<sup>21</sup> Appendix IX includes recommendations for adoption related to Agenda Items 2, 4b, 5a and 5b.

<sup>22</sup> Appendix XII includes recommendations for revocation arising from Agenda Items 2 and 4d.

<sup>23</sup> Appendix X includes recommendations for discontinuation related to Agenda Items 5a, 5b and 5c.

<sup>24</sup> Appendix XI includes recommendations related to Agenda Items 2, 5c, 5e and 5f.

<sup>25</sup> CX/FA 14/46/16; Comments at Step 3 of Costa Rica, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, United States of America, IFAC (CX/FA 14/46/16 Add.1); European Union and ICA (CX/FA 14/46/16 Add.2); Report of the in-session Working Group on INS (CRD 4); Comments of Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); Ghana (CRD 18); IDF (CRD 21); .

of "stabilizer", and add the technological purpose of "thickener synergist" to the functional class of "thickener".

#### **Recommendation 2**

108. The Committee agreed to add new INS numbers, functional classes and technological purposes for eleven additives listed in Table 2 of CRD 4.

109. While agreeing with the recommendation, the Delegation of the European Union informed the Committee that potassium aluminium silicate based-pearlescent pigments were regulated differently in the European Union and were not recognized as food additives on their own.

#### **Recommendation 3**

110. The Committee agreed to change the names and INS numbers of eight additives listed in Table 3 of CRD 4.

#### **Recommendation 4**

111. The Committee agreed to add new functional classes and technological purposes associated with 57 food additives, listed in Table 4 of CRD 4.

#### **Conclusion**

112. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, led by Iran and working in English only, to consider the replies to the Circular Letter requesting proposals for changes and/or additions to the INS and to prepare proposals for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at its next Session.

#### **Status of the amendment to the International Numbering System (INS) for Food Additives**

113. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft amendments to the INS to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix XIII).

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE IDENTITY AND PURITY OF FOOD ADDITIVES ARISING FROM THE 77<sup>th</sup> JECFA (Agenda Item 7a)<sup>26</sup>**

114. The JECFA Secretariat presented the results of the 77<sup>th</sup> Meeting of JECFA regarding the specifications for identity and purity of food additives, as outlined in the document CX/FA 14/46/17. The JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that these specifications have been published in the FAO JECFA Monographs 14, 2013. The Monographs are available in printed form and also accessible on the FAO web site at: [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/agns/pdf/jecfa/FAO\\_Monograph\\_14\\_final\\_updated\\_Jan\\_2014.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agns/pdf/jecfa/FAO_Monograph_14_final_updated_Jan_2014.pdf)

115. The individual specifications have also been included in the FAO JECFA Specifications database (available at: <http://www.fao.org/food/food-safety-quality/scientific-advice/jecfa/jecfa-additives/en/>)

116. In total 23 specifications monographs were considered at the 77<sup>th</sup> JECFA meeting. Of these, 11 were made full, 3 maintained, 8 tentative and 1 was withdrawn. The JECFA Secretariat clarified that the reason for withdrawal of the specification for glycerol ester of tall oil rosin (GETOR) (INS 445(ii)) was that no data were submitted and that JECFA was informed that the substance was no longer supported by the previous data sponsor.

117. The JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that for the tentative specifications additional data were needed to complete the evaluation. The specific requested data were outlined in the individual specifications monographs, and time limits for submitting the information were indicated in Annex 2 of the FAO JECFA Monographs 14, 2013. The Committee further noted that in the case of the additives containing aluminium and/or silicon, the 77<sup>th</sup> JECFA received only a limited part of the previously requested data and that the tentative specifications would be withdrawn, if the required information is not received by end of 2014.

118. The Committee considered the full specifications for endorsement, and the following issues were discussed:

119. The Delegation of the European Union, reiterated its reservation on the references to food additives used in food additives in specifications, as expressed at the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA...

#### **Paprika extract (INS 160c(ii))**

120. In response to the concern expressed by several delegations in relation to the inclusion of information

---

<sup>26</sup> CX/FA 14/46/17; Comments at Step 3 of Costa Rica, European Union, Peru (CX/FA 14/46/17 Add.1); China, India, African Union (CRD 11); Ghana (CRD 18).

on commercial preparation in the definition, the JECFA Secretariat explained that this information was an integral part of the description of the manufacturing process included in the specifications. Such information was important both for food manufacturers and consumers and was standard practice for JECFA to include such information.

### **Potassium aluminium silicate (PAS) (INS 555) and PAS-based pigments**

121. In response to the three questions raised by the Delegation of the European Union (CX/FA 14/46/17 Add. 1) the JECFA Secretariat explained that:

- i. In the case of PAS-based pigments, the PAS did not comply with the Codex definition for carriers as it plays a critical role in the generation of the pearlescent colour and, therefore exerts a technological function in the pigments.
- ii. Since PAS is an integral part of the pigments, it could not be considered as a secondary additive; and
- iii. The format for the specifications monographs, outlined in the Combined Compendium, was a guideline and the individual criteria should be included as appropriate. In the case of PAS-based pigments, JECFA did not consider the inclusion of the criteria mentioned in the question appropriate.

### **Conclusion**

122. Based on this discussion the Committee endorsed all the full specifications with the exception of PAS (INS 555), which was referred back to JECFA for consideration of deleting the functional use of carrier.

### **Status of the Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives**

123. The Committee agreed to forward full specifications for food additives to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Steps 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix XIV).

### **DISCUSSION PAPER ON USE OF ADDITIVES IN ADDITIVES (SECONDARY ADDITIVES) (Agenda Item 7b)<sup>27</sup>**

124. The Delegation of European Union introduced CX/FA 14/46/18 and pointed out that secondary additives (additives in additives) were normally incorporated in food additives, enzyme preparations, flavourings and nutrients in order to facilitate their storage, sale, standardisation, dispersing, dilution or dissolution. The Delegation noted that there was no single consolidated source of information on secondary additives, but such information was scattered in other documents such as: the Preamble to the GSFA; the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008); and the General Specifications and Considerations for Enzyme Preparations Used in Food Processing<sup>28</sup>. The Delegation also noted that there were no harmonised principles and rules to deal with secondary additives and, therefore, there was a need to develop harmonised criteria based on available information. The Delegation finally drew the attention of the Committee to the recommendations in CX/FA 14/46/18, which offered various options to consider this issue.

### **Discussion**

125. The CCFA Chairperson invited the Committee to consider whether to proceed with work on this topic.

126. Delegations recognised that issues related to secondary additives were an important topic to be dealt with by the Committee and that principles and criteria could be developed to help clarifying on how best secondary additives can be managed. However, there were differing views on how to proceed. Delegations noted that: it was not the right time to commit CCFA resources due to urgent need to deal with the existing backlog of provisions in the GSFA; that there were no reported safety concerns in relation to the use of secondary additives; and that the existing mechanisms, both within JECFA and CCFA, were adequate to address any related safety issues.

127. The CCFA Chairperson noted that there was a need to have a common understanding on what secondary additives are and, as a starting point, to develop a definition and analyse the implications of undertaking new work on this topic. The Chairperson then proposed that the discussion paper be improved to focus on the definition and analysis of the issue.

### **Conclusion**

128. The Committee supported the proposal of the Chairperson and agreed to establish an EWG, led by

<sup>27</sup> CX/FA 14/46/18; Comments of China, India, African Union (CRD 11); Indonesia (CRD 14); Russian Federation (CRD 15); El Salvador (CRD 16); Ghana (CRD 18).

<sup>28</sup> [http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/jecfa-additives/docs/enzymes\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/jecfa-additives/docs/enzymes_en.htm) .

the European Union and working in English only, to further develop the discussion paper and, in particular to:

- Develop a definition for secondary food additives; and
- Analyse the issue of secondary food additives including potential inconsistencies in their current handling by the CCFA, and;
- Make recommendations, if appropriate, to the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA on possible ways to address the use of secondary food additives

### **PROPOSALS FOR ADDITIONS AND CHANGES TO THE PRIORITY LIST OF FOOD ADDITIVES PROPOSED FOR EVALUATION BY JECFA (Replies to CL 2013/12-FA) (Agenda Item 8a)<sup>29</sup>**

129. The Delegation of Canada introduced the report of the in-session Working Group on Priority.

130. The Committee was reminded that requests for work by JECFA needed to be submitted using the "Form on Which Information on the Compound to be Evaluated by JECFA is Provided" and recalled that the nature of a request needs to be clearly indicated.

131. The Committee considered the recommendations of the Working Group and made the following comments and conclusions:

#### ***Acacia polyacantha* var. *Campylacantha*, kakamut gum, arabino-galactan protein complex**

132. The Committee agreed to keep the substance on the list (not with high priority) with the understanding that if confirmation of availability of the required data, as well as appropriate information on the type of data and identification of the data provider, will not be received by the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA, the substance will be removed from the list.

#### **Potassium acetates (INS 261)**

133. The Committee agreed that the Codex Secretariat would request, through a Circular Letter, information on use of potassium diacetate (INS 261(ii)) in food before deciding whether this substance should be included in the List. It was understood that if no information is received, the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA will not consider potassium diacetate.

#### **Others**

134. The Committee noted that the JECFA Secretariat suggested to consider planning priorities for a number of years ahead. This approach is working well in the pesticides committee, which is able to set priorities for the next five years.

135. The Committee recalled its decision to add in the Priority list the nine substances for which information on their use was sent in reply to CL 2013/8-FA, Part B, Point 4.

#### **Conclusion**

136. The Committee agreed to forward the Priority List of Compounds Proposed for Evaluation to FAO and WHO for their follow-up (Appendix XV).

### **DISCUSSION PAPER ON OPTIONS FOR THE USE OF OUTCOMES OF THE PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE AND OTHER FEASIBLE STEPS TO IDENTIFY COMPOUNDS FOR RE-EVALUATION BY JECFA (Agenda Item 8b)<sup>30</sup>**

137. The Delegation of Canada, as lead country, provided a summary of the work of the EWG on identification of compounds for re-evaluation by JECFA.

138. The pros and cons of options presented in the discussion paper were discussed by the Committee and in particular it was noted that:

- A systematic process for the periodic re-evaluation of food additives would use too much of the JECFA resources; and
- Some of the assessments done by JECFA a long time ago were not complying with current scientific quality standards.

139. The JECFA Secretariat proposed to allocate a limited proportion of JECFA meetings on food additives

<sup>29</sup> CX/FA 14/46/19; Report in-session Working Group on Priority (CRD 5); Comments of African Union (CRD 12); Russian Federation (CRD 15); AIDGUM and AIPG (CRD 22).

<sup>30</sup> CX/FA 14/46/20; Comments of IOFI (CRD 12); Russian Federation (CRD 15); Ghana (CRD 18).

to the re-evaluation of compounds, as prioritized by CCFA, and emphasized the fact that confirmation of data availability was a key criterion for allowing re-evaluation.

140. The Committee agreed that, by comparison with the process for new substance applications, there would need to be an additional step in the process for re-evaluation of substances, to ensure that data would be provided.

141. The Committee supported the JECFA proposal and agreed to start the process on a trial basis using the prioritization exercise done for the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA on food colours (CX/FA 13/45/17).

### **Conclusion**

142. The Committee decided to use the colours, listed as priority in Group 1 and Group 2<sup>31</sup>, as amended by the 45<sup>th</sup> CCFA<sup>32</sup>, as a working example, and agreed to integrate them in the list of compounds to be examined by the Working Group on Priorities at its next Session.

143. The Committee agreed that:

- The Codex Secretariat will issue a circular letter requesting information on the availability of data to re-evaluate the six colours; and
- Based on responses, the Working Group on Priority of the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA will provide JECFA with a final list of compounds prioritized for re-evaluation.

144. The Committee further agreed that the report of the 47<sup>th</sup> CCFA Working Group on Priority will contain two separate tables: one addressing new requests and the other the re-evaluation of colours.

### **OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 9)<sup>33</sup>**

#### **Inconsistencies of terminology for flavourings**

145. The Observer from IOFI presented CRD 13 on inconsistencies of terminologies related to flavourings between various standards on labelling and the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008).

146. The Committee supported further work to address the problem identified in CRD 13 and agreed to request the United States of America to prepare a discussion paper to analyse and make recommendations to address the issue of inconsistent terminology related to flavourings between the Guidelines and other Codex standards.

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 10)**

147. The Committee was informed that its Forty-seventh Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in China in from 23 to 27 March 2015. The exact venue would be determined by the host Government in consultation with the Codex Secretariat.

---

<sup>31</sup> CX/FA 13/45/17

<sup>32</sup> REP 13/FA para. 133

<sup>33</sup> Comments of China, ICA and IOFI (CRD 13)