

May 2008

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 7

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

#### *Thirty-first Session*

*International Conference Centre, Geneva, Switzerland, 30 June - 4 July 2008*

### AMENDMENTS TO THE CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS

**(Prepared by the Secretariat)**

#### INTRODUCTION

The Commission keeps under review the revision of Codex standards and related texts. The procedure for revision is, *mutatis mutandis*, that laid down for the elaboration of Codex standards, except that the Commission may decide to omit any other step or steps of that Procedure where, in its opinion, an amendment proposed by a Codex Committee is either of an editorial nature or of a substantive nature but consequential to provisions in similar standards adopted by the Commission at Step 8.<sup>1</sup>

Codex Standards and related texts have now been developed for 45 years. The oldest unrevised Codex text in force dates from 1969. Over the years a number of decisions have been taken by the Commission that horizontally affect many Codex texts. This document aims to inform the Commission on a number of editorial changes made by the Secretariat, consistently with the standing decisions of the Commission, when publishing revised Codex texts on the Codex website and in special publications. In some cases, where amendments would be more than editorial, the advice of the Commission is requested. Each case is marked "for information" or "for decision/referral" as appropriate. This document also addresses certain issues arising from the monitoring for linguistic and other consistency of proposed Codex standards for adoption<sup>2</sup> as well as the Codex Secretariat's ongoing review of all Codex standards and related texts elaborated by Codex subsidiary bodies that have been abolished or dissolved, or adjourned *sine die*<sup>3</sup>.

In accordance with the *Guide to the Procedure for the Amendment and Revision of Codex Standards and Related Texts*<sup>4</sup>, the Secretariat keeps under review all Codex standards and related texts elaborated by Codex subsidiary bodies that have been abolished or dissolved, or by Codex committees that have been adjourned *sine die*, and determines the need for any amendments, in particular those arising from decisions of the Commission. If the need for amendments of an editorial nature is identified then the Secretariat prepares proposed amendments for consideration and adoption by the Commission.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction of the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual.

<sup>2</sup> Part 2 of the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual.

<sup>3</sup> Part 5 of the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual.

<sup>4</sup> Part 5 of the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual.

The Commission has the final authority to determine whether a proposal made constitutes an amendment or a revision, and whether an amendment proposed is of an editorial or substantive nature. The Commission decides whether the amendment or revision of a standard is necessary.

In the case of an amendment of an editorial nature, it will be open to the Commission to adopt the amendment at Step 8 of the Uniform Procedure. In the case of an amendment proposed and agreed upon by a subsidiary body, it will also be open to the Commission to adopt the amendment at Step 5 of the Uniform Procedure. In other cases, if the Commission approves the proposal as new work, the approved new work will be referred for consideration to the appropriate subsidiary body, if such body is still in existence. If such body is not in existence, the Commission will determine how best to deal with the new work.

This document contains four parts:

**Part I:** Editorial amendments to adopted Codex Standards and related texts.

**Part II:** Editorial amendments to texts that are proposed for adoption by the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Commission.

**Part III:** Texts that could be considered for revision or revocation.

**Part IV:** Amendments to the section on contaminants of certain commodity standards and amendments to the General Standard for Contaminants in Foods (GSCTF).

## **PART I: EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO ADOPTED CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS**

### **1. Consequential amendments to decisions taken at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission - Use of the term advisory (for information)**

The 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission endorsed the recommendation that: ‘In view of the confusion created by the use of the term “advisory” and as the term cannot be defined satisfactorily and the SPS and TBT Agreements do not appear to distinguish between mandatory and advisory texts, its use within the Codex framework should be discouraged, as well as the use of the term “mandatory”’.<sup>5</sup>

References such as in the following example (taken from CAC/RCP 33-1985) usually found in a footnote 1, to the title, which do not appear in recently adopted Codex texts, have been/will be deleted:

“This Code of Hygienic Practice is to be regarded as advisory in nature and individual governments should decide what use they wish to make of the Code. The Commission has expressed the view that codes of practice dealing with specific categories of foods might provide useful checklists of requirements for national enforcement authorities.”

Texts concerned: CAC/GL 1, 17, 24, 29; CAC/RCP 1, 39, 40, 42; and CAC/MISC 3.

### **2. Consequential amendments to decisions taken at the 29<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission**

#### **2.1 Abolishing of the Acceptance Procedure**

At its 29<sup>th</sup> Session, the Secretariat informed the Commission that the amendment to the Statutes proposed by its 28<sup>th</sup> Session as a consequential amendment following the abolition of the Acceptance Procedure had been approved by the 33<sup>rd</sup> FAO Conference and the 59<sup>th</sup> World Health Assembly, thereby allowing the amendment to enter into force<sup>6</sup>.

##### **2.1.1 References to the acceptance procedure (for information)**

References such as in the following example (taken from CODEX STAN 107-1981) were/will be deleted:

“This Standard has been submitted to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and WHO for acceptance in accordance with the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius.”

Texts concerned: CODEX STAN 107, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202 and 203.

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 97/37, para. 171

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 06/29/41, para. 15

### 2.1.2 CODEX STAN 66-1981 (Table Olives) (*for decision/ referral*)

Footnote 2: “Governments, when accepting the standard, shall indicate the varieties of olives considered to be suitable.”

If the Commission agrees this text could be reformulated as follows: “The varieties of olives considered to be suitable should be indicated when the standard is used.”

### 2.1.3 CODEX STAN 169, 212 and A18 (*for decision/ referral*)

The first sentence of the standard reads: “The Annex to this standard contains provisions which are not intended to be applied within the meaning of the acceptance provisions of Section 4.A (I)(b) of the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius.”

If the Commission agrees, this text could be reformulated as in CODEX STAN 211: “The Appendix to this Standard is intended for voluntary application by commercial partners and not for application by governments.”

## 2.2 Reference to Codex Texts (*for information*)

The 29<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission recalled: “that the Committee on General Principles had proposed to delete the year of revision in the reference to Codex texts, as it was not applied consistently to all texts and created some confusion, and as the information on revision and amendments was available on the Codex website. The Commission agreed that all Codex texts would be referred to only by the reference number and year of adoption”<sup>7</sup>.

The reference will also be given in the header of all texts.

This amendment concerns most Codex Standards and related texts and its implementation continues.

## 2.3 Revision/ amendment history (*for information*)

Presently different ways are used in Codex standards and related texts to record information on the history of the standard (adoption, amendment, revision). This information is sometimes given under the title of the standard, sometimes in a footnote, sometimes preceding the main body of the text.

To bring these practices into harmony, the Secretariat has started to include this information in a footer to the first page, using the following elements:

Formerly ... (in case the name of a text has changed)

Adopted: ... (for the year of first adoption)

Revision(s): ... (to indicate a list of years when the text was revised)

Amendment(s): (to indicate a list of years when the text was amended)

For example for CAC/GL 38-2001: *Guidelines for Design, Production, Issuance and Use of Generic Official Certificates*:

Formerly *Guidelines for Generic Official Certificate Formats and the Production and Issuance of Certificates*.  
Adopted 2001. Revisions 2005, 2007.

The footer is only included if a text has been revised or amended.

This amendment concerns most Codex Standards and related texts and its implementation continues.

## 3. Other horizontal editorial amendments

### 3.1 References to Volume numbers in Codex Standards and related texts

Until 2001 Codex standards and related texts were published in volumes, which have since been discontinued for financial reasons. All texts are continuously published on the Codex website and yearly on CD ROM. Some Codex standards still make reference to volumes which may create confusion in the use of standards. In most cases the deletion or replacement is straightforward. In one case the Secretariat recommends discussion in the relevant Codex committee (see Section 3.1.2 below).

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 06/29/41, para. 187

### ***3.1.1 References to Volume 1, 1A or 1B (for information)***

These references have been/will be deleted when serving only as an additional reference, e.g. in CODEX STAN 171-1989 (Section 7. Labelling): “In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 1-1991, ~~Codex Alimentarius Volume 1A~~)...”

Texts concerned: CODEX STAN 16, 18, 19, 39, 40, 41, 42, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 66, 67, 69, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 99, 103, 104, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 159, 160, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 181, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 206, 210; CAC/GL 4; CAC/RCP 21 and 33

In CAC/RCP 40:

- Reference in 12.1 to be replaced with: “*Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Low and Acidified Low Acid Canned Foods*, CAC/RCP 23-1979.”
- Reference in 12.2 to be replaced with: “References for Tear-Down Evaluation of a Double Seam, CAC/RCP 23-1979, Appendix III.”
- Reference in 12.3 to be replaced with: “Guidelines for the Salvage of Canned Foods Exposed to Adverse Conditions, CAC/RCP 23-1979, Appendix IV.”
- Reference in 12.4 to be replaced with: “Guideline Procedures to Establish Microbiological Causes of Spoilage in Low-acid and Acidified Canned Foods, CAC/RCP 23-1979, Appendix V.”

### ***3.1.2 References to Volume 2 (for decision/referral)***

CODEX STAN 229-1993 contains a number of references to different sections of Volume 2, which are still valid because they have not been replaced with other texts and the texts in the volume have no separate identification number. The Secretariat is not in a position to make any specific proposal on this matter but the Commission may consider inviting the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to discuss the issue at its next session.

Texts concerned: CODEX STAN 229; CAC/GL 33 and 40

### ***3.1.3 References to Volume 13 (for information)***

These references were/will be replaced with an appropriate generic phrase, e.g. in CODEX STAN 171-1989 (Section 8. Methods of Analysis and Sampling): “See Codex Alimentarius Volume 13.” to be replaced with “See relevant Codex texts on methods of analysis and sampling.”

Texts concerned (change already done in special publications 2008): Codex Stan 16, 17, 18, 39, 40, 41, 42, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67, 69, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 99, 103, 104, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 191, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 212, 227, 240, 241, 242, A08(a), A08(b) and A08(c).

### ***3.2 Reference to CODEX STAN 233-1969 and CAC/RM 42-1977 (for information)***

References to CAC/RM 42-1977 or CODEX STAN 233-1969 (which were revoked in 2004) are still seen in many standards.

Two types of references need to be treated differently:

- (1) E.g. in CODEX STAN 3-1991 (Section 7.1 (i)):

“...shall be in accordance with the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Sampling Plans for Prepackaged Foods (1969) (AQL-6.5) (Ref. CAC/RM 42-1977).

To be replaced with:

“...shall be in accordance with an appropriate sampling plan with an AQL of 6.5.”

- (2) E.g. in CODEX STAN 3-1991 (Section 9(i) and (ii)):

“... does not exceed the acceptance number (c) of the appropriate sampling plan in the Sampling Plans for Prepackaged Foods (AQL - 6.5) (CAC/RM 42-1977)”

Or

In CODEX STAN 17-1981 (Section 3.4 and 7.1.3)

“... does not exceed the acceptance number (c) of the appropriate sampling plan in the Codex Sampling Plans for Prepackaged Foods (AQL 6.5) (CODEX STAN 233-1969)”

To be replaced with:

“...does not exceed the acceptance number c of an appropriate sampling plan with an AQL of 6.5.”

Texts concerned: CODEX STAN 3, 16, 17, 18, 41, 42, 52, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 69, 70, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 90, 95, 99, 103, 104, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 129, 132, 133, 140, 144, 145, 159, 166, 167, 189, 190, 191, 222, 236, 240, 242, 244.

### ***3.3 References to sections in CAC/RCP 1 (for information)***

References to Section 7.3 (Use of Water) of CAC/RCP 1 have been/will be replaced with a reference to Section 5.5.1 of the current version of CAC/RCP 1 taking into account the third revision of the Code in 1997..

Texts concerned: CAC/RCP 21, 22, 23, 33 and 40

### ***3.4 References to versions of the Procedural Manual (for information)***

References to the Procedural Manual in some instances contained the version number. This number has been/will be deleted.

Texts concerned: CAC/GL 3, 44 and 63; CAC/RCP 54 and 58

### ***3.5 Harmonisation of Numbering of Standards (for decision/referral)***

Codex C-standards were recently revised and renumbered by the Codex Secretariat in order to harmonise the numbering system. Unless the Commission decides otherwise, the same renumbering would be done for the current A-Standards: A01, A02, A03, A04, A07, A08(a), A08(b), A08(c), A09, A15 and A18.

### ***3.6 Reference to WHO Drinking Water Guidelines (for information)***

Replace “*International Standards of Drinking Water*” (WHO).” with “*Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality* (WHO)” as the International Standards have been/will be replaced with these Guidelines.

Texts concerned: CAC/RCP 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 23, 33 and 52.

## **4. Additional editorial amendments to specific Codex texts**

### ***4.1 CAC/RCP 33-1985: Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for the Collecting, Processing and Marketing of Natural Mineral Waters (for information)***

Section 2.1.1: Delete “European” as the standard became worldwide.

### ***4.2 Codex Stan 73-1981: Standard for Canned Baby Foods (for information)***

Section 8, Fill of Container, contains the reference: “(see Method 31, Methods of Analysis for Foods for Infants and Children, Codex Alimentarius Volume 13)”

The reference is wrong. The reference to the appropriate methods is included in CODEX STAN 234-1999 thus reference should be made to this standard: “(see CODEX STAN 234-1999)”.

### ***4.3 CAC/GL 44-2003: Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived From Modern Biotechnology (for decision/referral)***

#### ***4.3.1 Amendment to footnote 6***

Following the relevant discussion in the Codex *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology<sup>8</sup> and pending the adoption by the present session of the Commission of the “Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Animals” (see ALINORM 08/31/5) the Commission is **invited** to consider including a reference to this guideline in footnote 6 of CAC/GL 44-2003.

---

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 08/31/34, para 34

#### 4.3.2 Amendment to footnote 9

Footnote 9 of CAC/GL 44-2003 reads: “It is recognised that there are other applications of product tracing. These applications should be consistent with the provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements. The application of product tracing to the areas covered by both Agreements is under consideration within Codex on the basis of decisions of 49<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee.”

As the Commission at its 29<sup>th</sup> Session adopted the Principles for Traceability/Product tracing elaborated by CCFICS, it could be considered to amend the last sentence in footnote 9 of CAC/GL 44-2003 to read:

“The application of product tracing to the areas covered by both Agreements was considered by the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems, see CAC/GL 60-2006: *Principles for Traceability/Product Tracing as a Tool within a Food Inspection and Certification System.*”

#### **4.4 CAC/GL 63-2007: Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (for information)**

Footnote 4, Text in brackets should contain the reference at the end “, see Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual.”

#### **4.5 CAC/RCP 54-2004: Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding (for information)**

##### 4.5.1 Amendment to footnote 6

Present footnote 6 of CAC/RCP 54-2004 reads: “As appropriate, the definition of Traceability/Product Tracing adopted by the 27<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission applies (ALINORM 04/27/41, Appendix II).”

As this definition is now contained in the Procedural Manual, this has been amended to read: “As appropriate, the definition of Traceability/Product Tracing contained in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission applies.”

##### 4.5.2 Amendment to footnote 7

Present footnote 7 of CAC/RCP 54-2004 reads: “Development of detailed measures on traceability/product tracing should await the conclusion of discussions on traceability/product tracing in the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS).”

As the Commission adopted the principles for traceability/product tracing, this has been amended to read: “Development of detailed measures on traceability/product tracing should take into account CAC/GL 60-2006: *Principles for Traceability/Product Tracing as a Tool within a Food Inspection and Certification System.*”

##### 4.5.3 Amendment to footnote 15

Present footnote 15 of CAC/RCP 54-2004 reads: “At the time of drafting a Code of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products was being developed by the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products. Aquaculture producers should refer to relevant sections of that Code for additional information”

As the Commission adopted the section on aquaculture of the Code of Practice for Fish and Fish Products, this has been amended to read: “Aquaculture producers should refer to relevant sections of CAC/RCP 52-2003: *Code of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products* for additional information.”

#### **4.6 CAC/RCP 58-2004: Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat (for information)**

In footnote 3, the reference to “Proposed Draft Working Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (CX/FH 05/37/6).” should be replaced with “CAC/GL 63-2007: *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management.*”

In footnote 25 delete the words “(under revision)”.

#### **4.7 CODEX STAN 150-1984: Standard for Food Grade Salt (for referral)**

In the Appendix, “Section 4 Definitions” reads:

“The terms used in this sampling method refer to those in the “Instructions on Codex Sampling Procedures” (CX/MAS 1-1987).”

CX/MAS 1-1987 was prepared by the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) as instructions to other committees, it was sent to the Commission but it was not actually adopted by the Commission in 1987. It was used in practice as recommendation from CCMAS to other committees. The reference was included in CODEX STAN 150-1987 when the sampling plan for salt was endorsed by CCMAS in 1988.

As this cannot be changed editorially, the Commission may wish to invite the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and CCMAS to decide how to refer to definitions in the section or whether the section is needed.

#### **4.8 CAC/GL 45-2003: Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant DNA-Plants (for information)**

Following the relevant discussion in the Codex *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology<sup>9</sup> and pending the adoption by the present session of the Commission of new annexes 2 and 3 respectively to the above guideline (see ALINORM 08/31/5), the following consequential amendments will be made to the above guideline:

- The existing annex on Assessment of Possible Allergenicity becomes Annex 1.  
New Annex 2: "Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Plants Modified for Nutritional or Health Benefits".  
New Annex 3: "Food Safety Assessment in Situations of Low-level Presence of Recombinant-DNA Plant Material in Food".
- In paragraph 41 and footnote 4, replace the words "the annex" with "Annex 1".
- Add the following sentence to paragraph 48:  
"A detailed presentation of issues to be considered can be found in Annex 2 to this document"

#### **4.9 CODEX STAN A-1-1971: Standard for Butter (for information)**

Pending adoption by the present session of the Commission of the revision of the Food Category System (see ALINORM 08/31/5), the reference to the food category of the GSFA in the food additive section of the above standard will be revised consequentially.

#### **4.10 CODEX STAN 192-1995: General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) (for information)**

Pending adoption by the present session of the Commission of the revision of the Food Category System (see ALINORM 08/31/5), the reference to the food category related to butter in Table 3 of the GSFA will be revised consequentially.

## **PART II: EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO TEXTS PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT THE 31<sup>ST</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMISSION**

### **1. Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Powdered Formulae for Infants and Young Children at Step 5/8 (for decision)**

Throughout the document amend "*Enterobacter sakazakii*" to read "*Enterobacter sakazakii* (*Cronobacter* species)".

The justification is a change in the nomenclature as can be seen from the taxonomic note below.

*Taxonomic note on Enterobacter sakazakii (Cronobacter species)*<sup>10</sup>

*Enterobacter sakazakii* was defined as a species in 1980 by Farmer *et al*, however it was commented in that paper that these organisms were thought to represent multiple species. DNA-DNA hybridization gave no

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 08/31/34, para 76

<sup>10</sup> Adapted from the following article to be published in the International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology (IJSEM): Iversen C, Mullane N, Barbara McCardell, *et al* (2008). "Cronobacter gen. nov., a new genus to accommodate the biogroups of *Enterobacter sakazakii*, and proposal of *Cronobacter sakazakii* gen. nov. comb. nov., *C. malonaticus* sp. nov., *C. turicensis* sp. nov., *C. muytjensii* sp. nov., *C. dublinensis* sp. nov., *Cronobacter* genomospecies 1, and of three subspecies, *C. dublinensis* sp. nov. subsp. *dublinensis* subsp. nov., *C. dublinensis* sp. nov. subsp. *lausannensis* subsp. nov., and *C. dublinensis* sp. nov. subsp. *lactaridi* subsp. nov."

clear generic assignment for *the organism* which was placed in *Enterobacter* as at that time it appeared phenotypically and genotypically closest to *E. cloacae* than to other type strains.

Since 1980 sixteen biogroups of *E. sakazakii* have been described and recently independent molecular methods (including f-AFLP, automated ribotyping, full-length 16S rRNA gene sequencing and DNA-DNA hybridization) were employed to clarify the taxonomic relationship of *E. sakazakii* strains.

These studies showed that *E. sakazakii* was actually comprised of at least 6 species and, using multi-dimensional scaling analysis of sequence data, these form a distinct group of Enterobacteriaceae. Also, as these organisms are a microbiological hazard occurring in the infant food chain with historic high morbidity and mortality in neonates it was important that classification of the species was not detrimental to health protection measures already in place.

Naming all the new species as different *Enterobacter* may have caused some of them to be overlooked and as yet there is no data that shows that any one of these species is not a risk to neonatal health; clinical isolates occur in all the named species. Therefore it was proposed that *E. sakazakii* be alternatively classified as 5 species, 1 genomospecies, and 3 subspecies in a new genus, *Cronobacter* gen. nov., within the *Enterobacteriaceae*.

The creation of a new genus simplifies the inclusion of these potentially pathogenic organisms in legislation (the proposed genus *Cronobacter* being synonymous with *Enterobacter sakazakii*) and current identification schemes developed for *E. sakazakii* remain applicable for the *Cronobacter* genus. Importantly it is necessary to be aware of the existence of multiple species within this organism group to accurately interpret isolation and identification test, especially where these are based on molecular methods. To ensure the clarification of the nomenclature then it may be a good idea to initially use both terms together as in “*Enterobacter sakazakii* (*Cronobacter* species)”.

### **PART III: TEXTS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR REVISION OR REVOCATION (for decision/referral)**

Concerning the following texts, the Commission is invited to examine whether they are still valid and are used by Codex members and to decide whether action should be taken in light of the problems identified by the Secretariat. The revisions eventually necessary would go beyond editorial changes that the Codex Secretariat could propose at this stage.

#### *CAC/RCP 7-1974: System for the Description of Carcasses of Bovine and Porcine Species*

This old text contains many photos (providing visual description of various aspects of meat and carcasses; the originals of these photos have been lost and do not exist in the archive of the Secretariat). It is therefore not possible to reproduce this document in a usable format.

*CODEX STAN 88-1981: Corned Beef*

*CODEX STAN 89-1981: Luncheon Meat*

*CODEX STAN 96-1981: Cooked Cured Ham*

*CODEX STAN 97-1981: Cooked Cured Pork Shoulder*

*CODEX STAN 98-1981: Cooked Cured Chopped Meat*

*(All revised in 1991)*

The sections on additives, contaminants, hygiene, labelling and methods of analysis would need to be updated if these texts are considered still valid and are to be maintained.

#### *CAC/GL 15-1991: Use of Non-Meat Protein Products in Processed Meat and Poultry Products*

The text contains references to texts that no longer exist (e.g. Code of Principle concerning Milk and Milk Products) and would need to be updated if it is to be maintained.

If the Commission decide to maintain these texts while updating them, a suitable subsidiary body should be identified to undertake the work. Otherwise it is also up to the Commission to revoke some or all of these texts. The Commission may also wish to decide that a Circular Letter be sent to invite government comments on the use and validity of these texts before taking further decision.



**PART IV: AMENDMENTS TO THE SECTION ON CONTAMINANTS OF CERTAIN COMMODITY STANDARDS/ AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS (GSCTF) (for decision/referral)**

**1. Amendments to the Section on Contaminants in Certain Commodity Standards**

Following the decision of the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission<sup>11</sup>, individual contaminant provisions need to be replaced with the general statement referring to the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, as contained in the Procedural Manual (see also the proposal in ALINORM 08/31/4, Annex III).

**1.1 Standards in which no reference to veterinary drug residues is needed**

Named Vegetable Oils (*CODEX STAN 210-1999*)  
Canned Fruit Cocktail (*CODEX STAN 78-1981*)  
Canned Mangoes (*CODEX STAN 159-1987*)  
Canned Pineapple (*CODEX STAN 42-1981*)  
Canned Raspberries (*CODEX STAN 60-1981*)  
Canned Strawberries (*CODEX STAN 62-1981*)  
Canned Tropical Fruit Salad (*CODEX STAN 99-1981*)  
Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies (*CODEX STAN 79-1981*)  
Mango Chutney (*CODEX STAN 160-1987*)  
Table Olives (*CODEX STAN 66-1981*)  
Canned Asparagus (*CODEX STAN 56-1981*)  
Canned Carrots (*CODEX STAN 116-1981*)  
Canned Green Beans and Canned Wax Beans (*Codex Stan 16-1981*)  
Canned Green Peas (*CODEX STAN 58-1981*)  
Canned Mature Processed Peas (*Codex Stan 81-1981*)  
Canned Mushrooms (*CODEX STAN 55-1981*)  
Canned Palmito (*CODEX STAN 144-1985*)  
Canned Sweet Corn (*CODEX STAN 18-1981*)  
Pickled Cucumbers (Cucumber Pickles) (*CODEX STAN 115-1981*)  
Certain Canned Citrus Fruits (*CODEX STAN 254-2007*)  
Food Grade Salt (*CODEX STAN 150-1985*)

In all Standards above, the text of the section “Contaminants” could be replaced with the following text:

“The products covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (CODEX STAN 193-1995) and the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Commission.”

**1.2 Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils (*CODEX STAN 33-1981*)**

In the above standard, replace the section “Contaminants” with the following text:

“The products covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (CODEX STAN 193-1995) and the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Commission.

Additionally, the following applies:

Maximum content of each halogenated solvent: 0.1 mg/kg.  
Maximum content of the sum of all halogenated solvents: 0.2 mg/kg.”

**1.3 Standards in which a reference to veterinary drug residues is needed**

Edible Fats and Oils not Covered by Individual Standards (*CODEX STAN 19-1981*)  
Named Animal Fats (*CODEX STAN 211 – 1999*)  
Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads (*CODEX STAN 256-2007*)  
Cooked Cured Chopped Meat (*CODEX STAN 98-1981*)\*  
Cooked Cured Ham (*CODEX STAN 96-1981*)\*  
Cooked Cured Pork Shoulder (*CODEX STAN 97-1981*)\*

---

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 07/30/REP para. 38 and Appendix III

Corned Beef (*CODEX STAN 88-1981*)\*

Luncheon Meat (*CODEX STAN 89-1981*)\*

In the above standards, the section “Contaminants” could be replaced with the following text:

“The products covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (*CODEX STAN 193-1995*) and the maximum residue limits for pesticides and veterinary drugs established by the Commission.”

\*If they are to be maintained in the Codex Alimentarius (See Part III of this document).

## 2. Amendments to the GSCTF

### 2.1 Justification

*CODEX STAN 32-1981*(Margarine) and *CODEX STAN 135-1981*(Minarine) were superseded by *CODEX STAN 256-2007* (Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads);

*CODEX STAN 15-1981* (Canned Grapefruit) and *CODEX STAN 68-1981* (Canned Mandarin Orange) have been superseded by *CODEX STAN 254-2007* (Certain Canned Citrus Fruits); and

*CODEX STAN 13-1981* (Standard for Preserved Tomatoes), *CODEX STAN 57-1981* (Processed Tomato Concentrates) and *CODEX STAN 145-1985* (Canned Chestnuts and Canned Chestnut Puree) have been revoked or superseded by other standards.

The Commission is **invited** to amend Schedule I of the GSCTF as in 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 below.

### 2.2 Table for Arsenic

Delete the rows for “Margarine” and “Minarine”.

Insert a new row with the following description:

Name: “Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads”  
 Level mg/kg: “0.1”  
 Type: “ML”  
 Reference: “CS 256-2007”

### 2.3 Table for Lead

Delete the rows for “Canned Grapefruit”, “Canned Mandarin Oranges”, “Margarine” and “Minarine”

In the rows for “Canned tomatoes” and “Processed tomato concentrates”, delete the references “CS 13-1981”and “CS 57-1981”respectively.

Insert two new rows with the following descriptions:

Name: “Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads”  
 Level mg/kg: “0.1”  
 Type: “ML”  
 Reference: “CS 256-2007”  
 Name: “Certain Canned Citrus Fruits”  
 Level mg/kg: “1”  
 Type: “ML”  
 Reference: “CS 254-2007”

### 2.4 Table for Tin

Delete the rows for “Canned Grapefruit” and “Canned Mandarin Oranges”.

In the rows for “Canned tomatoes”, “Processed tomato concentrates” and “Canned chestnuts and chestnut purée”, delete the references “CS 13-1981”, “CS 57-1981” and CS 145-1985 respectively.

Insert a new row with the following description:

Name: “Certain Canned Citrus Fruits”  
 Level mg/kg: “250”  
 Type: “ML”  
 Reference: “CS 254-2007”