

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 13

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

#### *Twenty-seventh Session*

*International Conference Centre, Geneva, Switzerland, 28 June - 3 July 2004*

#### MATTERS ARISING FROM REPORTS OF CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES: Matters arising after 3 April 2004

#### CODEX COMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

##### *Proposals for a New Standard for Parmesan*

1. The 6<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee considered the possibility of elaborating a new individual standard for parmesan cheese. After extensive discussions, the Chairman indicated that there was insufficient agreement for the Committee to either propose new work on a standard for parmesan cheese or to reject the proposal for new work. Faced with the inability to resolve the issue, **the Committee agreed to seek guidance from the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) by preparing specific questions so that direction could be provided on application of criteria for agreeing new work in Codex commodity committees.** This would facilitate a definitive decision on the proposal for a new standard for parmesan. The Committee agreed to the following text in respect of specific questions to be asked of the CAC. (ALONORM 04/27/11 para 120-121)

*The majority of the CCMP members present at the 6th Session are of the opinion that the name "Parmesan" is and has been generic for quite some time. On the other hand the denomination "Parmigiano-Reggiano" is officially registered as a Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) by the European Community. The EC currently considers that there is an "indissoluble relationship" between the words "Parmigiano-Reggiano" and "Parmesan". Reference to EC legislation is preventing a decision on the establishment of a world wide standard for Parmesan Cheese by the CCMP. Further, the inability to reach a decision on this issue is hindering the work of the CCMP on this matter and might have important horizontal implications for work in other Codex Committees.*

##### **Two questions are addressed to the Commission:**

1. *To what extent, if any, should a PDO recognized in EC legislation for a product otherwise considered to be generic by the majority of the members present be grounds for rejecting elaboration of a Codex standard when in the opinion of the majority of members present existing criteria for acceptance of new work have been met?*

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.  
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

2. *Should aspects of intellectual property protection e.g. trademarks, certification marks, geographical indications (GI's) or PDO's be considered as legitimate criteria by Codex when deciding on acceptance of new work or adopting standards? If the answers to both questions are that these matters are not legitimate considerations for CCMMP, will the CAC request that the CCMMP begin new work on the promulgation of a standard for Parmesan Cheese?*

(ALINORM 04/27/11, paras 120-121)

### ***Time-bound decision-making***

2. The Committee requested clarification as to whether the five-year timeframe for review of the status of development of draft standards would apply equally to Committees meeting annually as well as biennially (ALINORM 04/27/11, para. 12).

## **CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

### ***Proposed Draft Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food***

3. The Committee agreed to seek the advice of the Commission to further clarify the need to revise the Code of Ethics and its intended scope, particularly with regard to whether it should focus solely on ethical aspects. The Committee agreed to return the Proposed Draft Revised Code, as amended at the session, for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the next (regular) session, with the understanding that it would be circulated for comments, subject to the advice of the Commission (ALINORM 04/27/33A para 77-78).

### ***Clarification of the Respective Roles of Members of the Executive Committee Elected on a Geographic Basis and of Coordinators***

4. The Committee recalled that the 26<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission decided that the Executive Committee should be enlarged by appointing the Coordinators as its Members. It also noted that the respective roles of the Coordinators and the other Members elected on a geographic basis might require clarification.

5. The Committee endorsed the proposal of the Codex Secretariat to send a Circular Letter, **with concurrence of the Commission**, to the governments, requesting their view as regard the way in which the Coordinator and the Member(s) elected by the Commission on a geographic basis should represent the interest of the Region within the Executive Committee. The comments received would be discussed at the forthcoming sessions of Coordinating Committees and the views of these Committees would then presented to the 28<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for further consideration (ALINORM 04/27/33A, para 121-122).

## **CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING**

### ***Country of Origin Labelling***

6. The Committee recalled that its last session had agreed not to continue work since there was no consensus and decided to report this outcome to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. However, the 26<sup>th</sup> Session of Commission did not approve this decision and asked the Committee to reconsider this issue and report back to the Commission as to whether the Committee should initiate new work.

7. After an extensive discussion, the Committee recognized that there was no consensus on the need for new work on country of origin labelling. Therefore, the Committee decided to report back to the 27<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission that the Committee had had an extensive discussion but the opinion of the Committee was divided between those delegations and observers who supported new work and those who opposed, in order to seek guidance from the Commission (ALINORM 04/27/22, paras. 110-116).

## **AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANIMAL FEEDING**

### ***Future Work on Animal Feeding***

8. The Task Force while noting that it completed the work on the Draft Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding, agreed that further work in the area of animal feed was needed and that specific project proposals for new work should be prepared and submitted to the Commission for consideration. The Task Force agreed to refer the above discussion to the Commission with the understanding that it would provide clarification on how to proceed in this regard. The Task Force noted the offer of the Government of Denmark to host a new Task Force depending on the decision of the Commission in this regard. (ALINORM 04/27/38 paras 35-36)

**MATTERS RELATED TO RISK ANALYSIS*****Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues***

9. Following the request of the Commission to develop or complete specific guidelines on risk analysis in their respective areas, the Committee on Pesticide Residues informs the Commission that it had agreed to redraft the document outlining the risk analysis policies used in establishing MRLs for pesticides for consideration by the next session, having regard to the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis and Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius* (ALINORM 04/27/24, paras 176 – 247).

***Codex Committee on General Principles***

10. The 20<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee considered the Proposed Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety and held a general discussion on 1) whether work should proceed on the development of risk analysis principles intended for governments; 2) whether the format of the document as basic principles should be retained; and 3) whether the principles applicable within Codex could be used as a basis for discussion. The Committee could not come to a conclusion and decided to return the Proposed Draft Working Principles to Step 3 for further comments, for consideration by a Working Group to be held in conjunction with the 21<sup>st</sup> session of the Committee in November 2004. The Committee would at its 22<sup>nd</sup> Session consider the Proposed Draft Working Principles at Step 4, together with all the comments received, taking into account the outcome of the Working Group (ALINORM 04/27/33A, paras. 37-43).

***Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products***

11. The Committee noted that its work related to the elaboration of world-wide standards on milk and milk products with hygienic provisions provided by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH). The Committee considered that matters related to risk analysis were adequately covered by the work of other Committees and any inputs related to risk management would be provided as appropriate (ALINORM 04/27/11, para. 8).