

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of  
the United Nations



World Health  
Organization

E

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

Agenda Item 10

CX/CAC 11/34/10

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

34<sup>th</sup> Session

Geneva, Switzerland, 4-9 July 2011

#### MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMISSION BY CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

##### A. MATTERS RELATED TO REQUESTS FROM THE COMMISSION

###### Development of guidelines for traceability/product tracing

The 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission (2009) endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems to request FAO/WHO coordinating committees to discuss whether there was a need for further guidance on traceability/product tracing and to report back to the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.

###### Coordinating Committee for Europe

The Committee agreed that further guidance on traceability/product tracing would be useful, e.g. to address contamination issues, and suggested that this could be addressed in the framework of the Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems under consideration in the Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (REP 11/EURO, para. 27).

###### Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Committee agreed that the issue of traceability/product tracing had been sufficiently discussed in Codex and that the Principles for Traceability/Product Tracing as a Tool within a Food Inspection and Certification System (CAC/GL 60-2006) contained adequate guidance for countries and thus the discussion did not need to be reopened (REP11/LAC, para. 8).

###### Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific

The Committee agreed that, at present, there was no need for further guidance on traceability / product tracing (REP11/NASWP, para. 27).

###### Coordinating Committee for Africa

The Committee did not make specific recommendations on traceability (REP11/AFRICA, paras 8-12).

###### Coordinating Committee for Asia

The Committee agreed that there was no need for Codex to develop further guidance on traceability/product tracing but as countries in the region required assistance to improve their capacity to implement traceability/product tracing systems at country level, FAO and WHO might provide support as appropriate (REP 11/ASIA, para. 22).

###### Coordinating Committee for the Near East

The Committee agreed that there was a need for further Codex guidelines on implementation of traceability as this was an important tool for inspections. The usefulness to trace ingredients in case of hygiene problems was mentioned. It was mentioned that in CRD 13, the International Institute of Food Technologists (IFT)

provided information on core recommendations and recommended best practices for traceability (REP11/NEA, para. 12).

### **Review of existing Codex texts in relation to animal feeding**

The 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission agreed to refer the proposed reviews of existing Codex risk analysis principles as to their applicability to animal feed, to the relevant committees, i.e. CCGP, CCFA, CCCF, CCPR, CCRVDF and CCFICS for review. The following committees have met since the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission.

#### Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods

The Committee recognized that it would not be possible to finalise the revised text at the current session and agreed to circulate the proposed amendments to the *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the CCRVDF*, for comments and consideration at the next session (REP11/RVDF, paras 9-12).

#### Committee on Food Additives

The Committee agreed that the proposed amendments to the *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods* to address animal feed were not relevant to its work (REP11/FA, para. 14).

#### Committee on Contaminants in Foods

The Committee agreed to establish an electronic Working Group led by The Netherlands to examine whether it was necessary to further specify the applicability to feed in the *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives* and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods as well as the *Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemical* (REP 11/CF, paras 8-9).

#### Committee on Pesticide Residues

The Committee agreed that the applicability to animal feeding of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should be considered in the framework of the ongoing revision of the Risk Analysis Principles (REP11/PR, para.. 8).

### **Private Standards**

The 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission agreed to refer the matter of private standards to coordinating committees to conduct further analysis of the problems encountered with private standards and to make recommendations for follow up by the next session of the Commission. The following questions were addressed to all Coordinating Committees.

*Question 1: Have food producers/processors in your country experienced any problems in meeting private standards*

*Question 2: What are the financial implications of meeting private standards, especially implications for SMEs*

*Question 3: What measures have been taken to overcome/ease the problems in implementing private standards*

*Question 4: What should the CAC/ FAO/WHO do in the context of private standards*

The discussions held in the Coordinating Committees and replies to the questions may be found in the reports listed below.

Coordinating Committee for Asia, REP 11/ASIA, paras. 11-17

Coordinating Committee for Africa, REP 11/AFRICA, paras. 13-21.

Coordinating Committee for Europe, REP 11/EURO, paras. 14-23.

Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean, REP 11/LAC, paras.. 9-16.

Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific, REP 11/NASWP, paras 9-19.

Coordinating Committee for the Near East, REP 11/NEA, paras. 13-29.

## **New Options for Physical Working Groups**

### Coordinating Committee for Europe

The Committee agreed that to ensure openness, inclusiveness, transparency, working groups should remain open to all members and observers, that many working groups worked efficiently, including those with a large membership, and therefore the current Guidelines should remain unchanged. The Committee agreed that alternative arrangements to facilitate consensus could be applied without limiting participation, and it was always possible to consider further improvements (REP 11/EURO, paras. 28-33).

### Coordinating Committee for Asia

The Committee agreed that physical working groups should remain open to members and observers in accordance with the *Guidelines on Physical Working Groups* (REP 11/ASIA, paras. 35-38).

### Coordinating Committee for Africa

The Committee concluded that it did not support the options proposed to limit participation in working groups (REP 11/AFRICA, paras 33-34).

### Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific

The Coordinating Committee agreed that it was necessary to explore new ways to improve the efficiency of pWGs and not to focus solely on limiting participation; and that the matter deserved a more in depth discussion taking into account the experience of other committees (REP 11/NASWP, para. 45).

### Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Committee did not agree with additional options for physical working groups that restricted the possibility of each member country participating in such working groups and informed the Executive Committee accordingly (REP 11/LAC, para. 25).

### Coordinating Committee for the Near East

One delegation noted that the proposals were practical but that a transparent and fair mechanism for the selection of the representatives was necessary. They suggested holding regional workshops to prepare joint papers that would be conveyed to the physical working group meetings. Another delegation supported the proposal. (REP 11/NEA, paras 56-59).

## **Outcomes of the Codex Trust Fund Mid-Term Review**

The 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission agreed that coordinating committees would further consider the Mid-Term Review of the CTF. The following questions were addressed to all Coordinating Committees.

Question 1: Should there be a shift in emphasis from Objective 1 to Objectives 2 and 3<sup>1</sup>?

Question 2: If yes, what is the "niche" for the Codex Trust Fund?

Question 3: Should there be a mechanism to continue support for physical participation for those who need it most (including graduates who cannot sustain participation)?

Question 4: Should there be re-consideration of the criteria for allocation of support?

Question 5: Should the lifespan of the Codex Trust Fund be extended?

The discussions held in the Coordinating Committees and replies to the questions may be found in the reports listed below.

Coordinating Committee for Asia, REP 11/ASIA, paras 116-123.

Coordinating Committee for Europe, REP 11/EURO, paras. 52-61.

Coordinating Committee for Africa, REP 11/AFRICA, paras 43-50.

Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific, REP 11/NASWP, paras 52-58.

Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean, REP 11/LAC, paras. 76-93.

---

<sup>1</sup> CTF Objective 1: Widen participation in Codex; CTF Objective 2: Strengthening overall participation in Codex; CTF Objective 3: Enhance scientific /technical participation in Codex

Coordinating Committee for the Near East, REP 11/NEA, paras 95-107.

Note: The questions related to the Trust Fund will be discussed under Agenda Item 14a).

### **Revision of standards for meat products<sup>2</sup>**

The Committee on Food Additives agreed to continue work on a decision-tree approach for the alignment of the food additives provisions in commodity standards and the GSFA and prepare a proposal for the revision of the food additive provisions of the five standards for processed meat (REP11/FA, para. 49).

## **B. MATTERS REFERRED BY OTHER COMMITTEES**

### **Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables**

#### **Revision of the Codex Regional Standard for Chanterelles**

The Committee agreed that the Standard should be kept regional as chanterelles were mainly traded within Europe and the volume of trade did not require a global standard. The Committee therefore agreed that there was no need for a worldwide Codex Standard for Chanterelles (REP11/FFV, para. 13).

### **Committee on Fish and Fishery Products**

#### **Food additives provisions in the GSFA**

The Committee expressed its concern with the provisions forwarded for adoption by the CCFA on food colours carotene beta- (vegetable), 160a(ii) with Note 16: “for use in glaze, coatings or decorations for fruit, vegetables, meat or fish” in Food Category 9.1.1 “Fresh Fish”, as this may lead to cases where glazings with colours are used to falsify fresh fish and to mislead the consumer about the freshness of the fish and fishery products (REP 11/FFP, para. 166).

---

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 10/33/12 para. 162