Review and Update of Methods in CXS 234

Recommended Methods of Analysis for Cereals, Pulses, Legumes and Derived Products (CPL)
What was the task given to the EWG?
Electronic Working Group (EWG) – CPL Terms of Reference

- The purpose of the review is to ensure that the methods of analysis listed in CXS 234 are fit-for-purpose and to re-type if necessary
- *Not* to add new methods unless necessary
- Agreement to work closely with SDOs
What was the background to this work?
• Preparation for the review of methods belonging to the cereals, pulses, legumes and derived products commodity group began under the guidance of the American Association of Cereal Chemists (AACC), currently the Cereals & Grains Association (C&G)

• As part of this work, spreadsheet templates were created using the format prepared by New Zealand for the Dairy Workable Package
  • Spreadsheets were developed for methods present in CXS 234 under the cereals, pulses and legumes and derived products commodity category
  • Spreadsheets for each method/commodity combination were compiled into workbooks which were shared with experts from each of the Standard Development Organizations (SDOs: AOAC, ICC, ISO)
  • SDO experts reviewed the methods and completed the workbooks
Workbooks completed by SDOs were shared with the EWG-CPL Chair as a starting point for the 2021 work.

An invitation to join the EWG – CPL was extended to CCMAS delegates.
- Delegates from 16 countries and seven SDOs joined the EWG.
- SDO participation was important to aid in clarifying questions, etc., and they kindly agreed to join the EWG in an advisory capacity in case of questions.

Methods belonging to the cereals, pulses, legumes and derived products category of CXS 234 were sorted into two groups.
- Group 1: Methods aligning under proximate analyses (e.g., ash, fat, moisture and protein)
- Group 2: Other methods
How did you approach this work?
• Proximate methods are Type I

• Decision was made to consider Group 1, proximate methods, during the first phase of the EWG

• Group 2, other methods, were gathered for review as part of the plan for future work

• The Codex Forum was identified as the source of information exchange for the EWG – CPL (assignments, responses, etc.)

• EWG participants were initially asked to identify their method accessibility to help in preparing EWG assignments
What steps did you take in your plan?
• EWG method assignment list and workbooks were shared with participants via the Codex Forum

• Participants reviewed assigned methods and provided feedback, largely via the Codex Forum

• The review comments were compiled for each method/commodity combination and cross-checked for accuracy

• Method summaries were prepared to aid in considering whether methods were identical
What came next?
Appendix I identifies methods considered during 2021/22 EWG

- Methods identified as:
  - Appropriate methods remained in the table unchanged
  - Inappropriate methods for certain matrices, etc., remained in the table with strikethrough
  - Methods identical in terms of steps, etc., were indicated as such (/)

- A column was added to Appendix I to share comments, for example:
  - A single Type I method should be listed
  - A method should be replaced, due to reagent usage (e.g., mercury)
  - The commodity standard does not have quantitative limits, etc.
  - Reviewer’s reason for method removal
Can you explain the 3 appendices?
Appendix II identifies method/commodity pairs not considered during 2021/22 EWG

- Group 2 methods, i.e., those present in CXS 234, but not belonging to Group 1 methods
- Group I methods found in commodity standards, but not present in CXS 234

Appendix III reports

- Methods identified by SDOs for addition to CXS 234
- Potential replacement methods identified during the review
What are the main considerations for the EWG moving forward?
Considerations for EWG – CPL Forward Plan

- Decide whether specific methods for moisture determination should be prescribed for ash, protein and fat methods

- Based on EWG work in 2021/22, some methods were identified to be revoked from CXS 234 due to chemicals used (e.g., mercury catalyst)
  - Some methods identified in Appendix III could replace methods recommended to be revoked
  - This work could be considered as part of the EWG effort as follow up to work on Appendix I

- Remaining method/commodity combinations in Appendix III would fall outside the EWG’s Terms of Reference and may be suggested for consideration via the CCMAS endorsement process
What are the main activities planned for phase 2?
Phase 2 Activities EWG – CPL 2022/23

- Address outstanding actions for Appendix I
  - Select Type I methods from among non-identical methods
  - Review methods in Appendix I that are present in commodity standard, but not in CXS 234
  - Assess methods in Appendix III as replacements for those methods recommended for deletion by the current EWG
  - If decided, prescribe a moisture method for each proximate method (i.e., ash, fat, protein)

- Review Appendix II
  - Review methods that are found in Appendix II, which includes those methods present in commodity standards, but not in CXS 234
In consultation with the Codex Secretariat and CCMAS determine the best route to assess methods in Appendix III (beyond those aligning with Appendix I):

Either by deciding that

• The evaluation is made by CCMAS via the PWG on endorsement of methods using *Comprehensive guidance for the process of submission, consideration and endorsement of methods for inclusion in CXS 234*

or

• A request should be made for consideration by the Commodity Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes (CCCPL), currently adjourned *sine die*
And looking even further ahead to phase 3 in 2023-4?
Phase 3 Activities EWG – CPL 2023/24

• Resolve outstanding issues from:
  • Phase 1
  • Phase 2

• Finalize reporting
What will happen between now and the next CCMAS session?
Immediate Next Steps EWG – CPL 2022/23

- Request CCMAS input via Circular Letter
- Request additional EWG participant review of Appendix II
- Prepare and launch work assignments for methods in Appendix II