



## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

### Fortieth Session

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, 15 - 18 May 2012

### Report of the Electronic Working Group on the Review of the Guidelines for the Production, Processing and Labelling of Organically Produced Food

This document includes the report of the electronic working group, including consideration of the structured work approach, use of ethylene for the ripening of fruit and expansion of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor for onions and potatoes

#### 1. BACKGROUND

1. The Codex Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL) held its 39<sup>th</sup> session on May 2011 and agreed to continue an electronic working group (eWG) to:

- Continue considering the structured work approach operating on a two-year cycle on the revision of the Guidelines for the Production, Processing and Labelling of Organically Produced Food and any proposals for amendment
- Review specific proposals for use of ethylene for the ripening of fruit (Annex 1)
- Provide further justification for the use of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor for potatoes and onions and to consider alternatives in more detail (Annex 2)

2. The United States agreed to chair the eWG for the 2010-12 review cycles.

#### 2. PARTICIPATION IN THE eWG

3. In August 2011, the United States, as chair of this eWG, invited all CCFL members to participate in the eWG on the review of the Guidelines on the Production, Processing and Labelling of Organically Produced Foods. Twenty-five countries and three member organizations expressed interest in participating in this eWG. A list of participants is provided in *Appendix II*.

4. The eWG established a deadline of September 30, 2011 for submission of additional data or research information in support of proposals to expand the use of ethylene for ripening of tropical fruit(s) and for ethylene for sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions. This was also the deadline for receipt of a proposal on refining work approach.

5. Only one submission from the European Union was received by the deadline. The European Union submitted a revised proposal to provide additional data for expanding the use of ethylene for sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions.

6. In October 2011, the United States distributed the proposal template to eWG members with instructions for submission of comments. Three comments were received on the revised proposal by the deadline.

7. In December 2011, the draft report was distributed to the eWG participants for a second round of comments. Eight comments were received on the draft report and were incorporated into the final report.

8. An updated timeline for the work of this eWG is provided in *Appendix IV*.

### 3. STRUCTURED WORK APPROACH

9. At the 39<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL, the delegation of Australia had proposed to refine the approach used by the eWG to review substances by making the template clearer in terms of process. They also suggested that the Committee consider the process used by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene as a model for conducting the work. The delegation agreed to prepare a specific proposal in this regard, for consideration by the eWG, with the objective to finalize the process and template by the next session of the Committee.

10. Australia clarified in their comments to the eWG that they supports the current template used to assess new substances for inclusion in Annex 2. Australia indicated that their suggestion at the 39<sup>th</sup> Session was to refine the approach on how to prioritize new work proposals rather than on how to assess individual substances.

11. In February 2012, Australia submitted a recommendation that the prioritization of the review substances should be based on the impact that they have on food safety and international trade. Specifically, Australia recommended that to prioritize the work, substances could be grouped or consolidated for review according to the type of food they are intended to be used in or the primary production process that they apply to. The process to review substances could include a risk assessment process to ensure food safety and consideration of organic principles against the criteria in Section 5 of the guidelines.

#### *Recommendation for a Structured Work Group Approach*

12. Members of the eWG continue to support the structured work group approach established at the 38<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL. Changes were made to the template on advice from the Committee and included in the eWG's report presented at the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFL. The template was modified in this report to include Australia's comments for refining the structured work approach with regard to the prioritization of future proposals (*Appendix I*). Members of the eWG have not had an opportunity to review Australia's proposed amendments to the template. Therefore, the eWG recommends a discussion of Australia's proposed amendments at the 40<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFL in order to finalize the template for consideration by the Committee.

### 4. Ethylene for Ripening of Fruit (Annex I)

13. At the 38<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL, the Committee established a working group, led by Ghana, with the term of reference to develop a justification regarding the use of ethylene for ripening of fruit and that could be differentiated by fruit categories. This would expand the current allowance for ethylene in Annex 1, C.82 of the *Guidelines*, which allows post-harvest ethylene use only for the ripening of kiwifruit and bananas.

14. At the 39<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL, the delegation of Ghana reported that the eWG did not obtain consensus on specific fruits or fruit categories to expand the use of ethylene for ripening of fruit (Agenda Item 5a). The Committee agreed that the structured approach for review of substances under Annex 2 would be appropriate to consider proposals and justifications for the ripening of tropical fruit with ethylene.

15. The Chair charged the eWG, led by the United States, with the review of additional information to consider the use of ethylene for ripening of tropical fruit(s). Members requesting further consideration of specific tropical fruits, or classes of tropical fruits, by the eWG were to submit relevant data and research information to the eWG for further consideration.

16. No proposals for the use of ethylene for ripening of fruit were received by the proposal deadline; therefore, a recommendation expanding the use of ethylene for other fruits is not included in this report.

### 5. Ethylene for Sprout Inhibition of Potatoes and Onions (Annex 2)

#### *Background*

17. At the 39<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL, the eWG reported that it had not made a final recommendation on the proposal submitted by the European Union requesting the use of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor for potatoes and onions (Agenda Item 5b). Additional information was requested by some member countries on whether alternatives practices or natural materials (e.g. plant oils) were available. The Committee agreed that further information on this issue was needed, and the eWG was charged to provide further justification for the use of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor and to consider alternatives in more detail. The European Union agreed to submit additional information for further consideration by the eWG. The report includes a summary of responses from eWG participants.

### Summary of Responses

18. The revised proposal from the European Union addressed questions raised about alternative practices or materials at the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling regarding the use of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor.

19. Three member countries (Australia, Brazil, and the United States) responded to the initial request for comments dated October 2011 on the revised proposal from the European Union. The comments were incorporated into a draft report which was distributed for a second round of comments. Eight member countries (Australia, Brazil, Chile, Hungary, Iran, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States) commented on the revised report. All comments were incorporated into the review template provided in *Appendix III*.

20. In the first round of comments, one member country acknowledged that although plant oils may not be registered in some countries as alternatives, the proposal did not address why these natural materials could not be registered in the future. The member noted that according to the evaluation criteria, substances of plant origin, such as plant oils, would be preferred over use of substances which are chemically synthesized, such as ethylene (Section 5.1(b)).

21. Based on an additional comment received in the first round, the eWG requested for the second round of comments that the following additional information may be needed to assess whether this substance sufficiently meets the Section 5.1 criteria. The eWG requested that eWG participants provide this additional information, if available to them.

- Supporting information or evidence which indicates that low levels of ethylene do inhibit sprouting.
- Supporting information or evidence to support the claim that by capturing ethylene rather than releasing it into the environment can be seen as reducing the ambient air pollution.
- Information that controlling the amount of light, coupled with dry ambient temperatures, provide ideal storage conditions and help reduce sprout formation in potatoes and onions.

22. One member indicated in the second round of comments that ethylene is produced by all higher plants and therefore omnipresent in nature. The member noted that exogenous ethylene produced by a chemical process suppressed sprout growth of both dormant and already sprouting onion bulbs by inhibiting leaf blade elongation. The commenter noted that in contrast to this growth-inhibiting effect, ethylene stimulated carbon dioxide production by the bulbs about 2-fold and that the duration of dormancy was not significantly affected by exogenous ethylene.

23. Some member countries noted the availability of alternative natural materials, such as plant oil, or the preference for selection of potato varieties with high dormancy. The proposal indicated that plant oils may not be registered in some countries but did not provide reasons on why these materials could not be registered for future use. The proposal indicated that selection of varieties with high dormancy may not be possible when varieties must be chosen with strong resistance to certain diseases, such as potato blight, or other characteristics suitable for organic production in the local environment.

24. In the second round comments, the eWG also requested that participants consider the two proposed conditions for use for ethylene given below.

TABLE 2: SUBSTANCES FOR PLANT PEST AND DISEASE CONTROL

Substance	Description; compositional requirements; conditions for use	
<b>IV. OTHER</b>		
[Ethylene]	Option 1:	[For sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions]
	Option 2:	[Need recognized by the certification body or authority for sprout inhibition of stored potatoes and onions where varieties that have long dormancy characteristics are not available, or these varieties are not suited to local growing conditions]

25. Participants were asked to indicate in their comments whether they supported Option 1, Option 2, or an alternative option.

26. Two member countries supported Option 1. One member noted that Option 2 creates unnecessary complexity and excessive regulation with regard to this substance, since ethylene used for this purpose has very low risks to organic integrity of the product. Another member commented that is not necessary to mention the other alternative uses in Option 2 and that the use would not create any human health risks

because the substance is “nature-identical” and that the use would not result in, or contribute to, harmful effects on the environment.

27. One member country supported Option 2 without further explanation.

28. One member country supported Option 2, but did not oppose Option 1. The member indicated that the use of ethylene for sprout inhibition in organic potatoes and onions may be appropriate when varieties with long dormancy characteristics are not available. The member noted that ethylene should not substitute for good production, handling and storage practices.

29. This commenter also suggested that, if supported, ethylene for sprout inhibition not be listed as a substance for plant pest and disease control (Annex 2, Table 2), but be appended to the current reference to ethylene for ripening (Annex 1, paragraph 82) or be listed as a processing aid (Annex 2, Table 4).

#### *Recommendation on Whether Additional Uses of Ethylene Should be Included in Annex 2*

30. Only a minority of the eWG members responded to the proposal with written comments. Of the eight member countries that submitted comments, the majority were supportive of expanding the allowance for ethylene in Annex 2, Table 2 of the Guidelines for Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods as outlined in the discussion paper CX/FL 10/38/17.

31. The majority of commenters supported the conditions proposed as either Option 1 or Option 2 for inclusion in Annex 2. However, the comments are inconclusive on which option should be recommended to the Committee for consideration. Each option received support from two members, however, one of the members that supported Option 2 did not object to Option 1. Given the low number of respondents, the eWG recommends a discussion at the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL to obtain consensus on which option (i.e., Option 1 or Option 2 listed above) should be recommended for consideration by the Committee.

## APPENDIX I: Proposed Redraft of Structured Work Approach

The following is an excerpt from CRD 15 of the 39<sup>th</sup> Session which defines the Structured Work Approach under review by the Committee. The following changes to the text suggested by Australia are in *italics*.

### Existing Difficulties with the Organic Review Process

- Specialized technical expertise is needed for the review for organic proposals. This expertise has traditionally not been provided at each session of CCFL by participating member countries.
- Proposals for new work have not been submitted in time for adequate review by technical experts prior to the Committee meetings.
- Proposals are often not complete and have not systematically addressed the criteria established in section 5.1 of the Guidelines.
- Annex 2 lists are indicative and do not necessarily require annual updating.
- Participation by members is limited; especially by developing countries.

### Recommended Approach

- A timely structured review process that conserves Committee resources.
- A two year cycle for proposals.
- The use for an Organic electronic working group (eWG) to evaluate the completeness of proposals and prioritization of suggested new work for the Committee.
- Development and use of a standard template for application and collection of comments.
- Chairpersonship of the eWG would rotate from country to country.

### Recommended Procedures for a Two Year Review Cycle for Proposals

- Year one: Proposals submitted to the Secretariat. The Committee will establish an eWG for submitted proposals.
- Proposals for new work should be submitted 60 days prior to the plenary, so that members might have ample time for review prior to the plenary.
- At the plenary in Year 1, the Committee would discuss basic sufficiency of the proposals. If the Committee reaches consensus that one or more proposals are sufficient, the Committee will establish a eWG and the proposals for new work under Annex 2 will go forward to the Commission for approval as a Step 1/3 document. If there is insufficient interest from members to undertake the work on a particular substance, the Member may submit the proposal for discussion again at the next cycle. The Committee could decide whether to have the eWG review substances that fall outside of Annex 2 at its discretion.
- *Substances will be grouped or consolidated for review according to the type of food that they are intended in or the primary production process that they apply to. The order of priority to review these substances should be based on the impact that they have on food safety and international trade. The review of a substance could include a risk assessment to ensure food safety and consideration of organic principles in Section 5 of the guidelines.*
  - ~~For addition of substances under Annex 2, a proposal for new work will go forward to the Commission for approval.~~
  - ~~Proposals other than Annex 2 will be referred to the eWG for a recommendation as to whether the Committee should undertake this new work.~~
- In between year one and two the eWG will undertake review of the assigned proposals and prepare a recommendation for presentation to the Committee in year two.
  - For Annex 2 revisions the eWG will review the information provided and provide a report as to whether the criteria in section 5.1 have been satisfied. The eWG may seek additional data as necessary for completion of proposals.
- Year two: The Committee discusses the recommendations of the eWG.
  - For Annex 2 revisions, if the Committee agrees to approve the proposals, they would advance to Step 5/8 document.
  - ~~Other proposals would proceed through the normal work process.~~
- If no proposals for new work come forward then the eWG would not be constituted.

## Appendix II: Electronic Working Group on the Review of the Guidelines for the Production, Processing and Labelling of Organically Produced Food

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Country/ Observer	Name	Affiliation and Contact Information
Argentina	Argentina Codex Contact Point	<a href="mailto:codex@minagri.gob.ar">codex@minagri.gob.ar</a> mailto:codex@minagri.gob.ar
Australia	Kate Slater Codex Australia  Ms. Angela O'Sullivan  Jayanti Gupta	Codex Australia Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry 18 Marcus Clarke Street Canberra City ACT G PO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: +61 2 6272 4542 Email: <a href="mailto:Codex.contact@daff.gov.au">Codex.contact@daff.gov.au</a>  Manager, International Food Standards Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Email: <a href="mailto:angela.o'sullivan@daff.gov.au">angela.o'sullivan@daff.gov.au</a>  Senior Policy Officer International Food Standards Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  Email: <a href="mailto:Jayanti.gupta@daff.gov.au">Jayanti.gupta@daff.gov.au</a>
Belgium	Marc Vermeulen	Director Foodchain and Protective Applications Organisation: Cefic - Brussels - Belgium e-mail: <a href="mailto:mve@cefic.be">mve@cefic.be</a>
Brazil	Roberto Guimarães Habib Mattar  Fatima Machado Braga	Federal Inspector Agroecology Coordination Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 152-B 70043-900 Brasília – DF, BRAZIL Tel: +55 61 3218 2453 Fax: +55 61 3223 5350 Email: <a href="mailto:roberto.mattar@agricultura.gov.br">roberto.mattar@agricultura.gov.br</a>  Specialist in Health Surveillance National Health Surveillance Agency Ministry of Health Email: <a href="mailto:fatima.braga@anvisa.gov.br">fatima.braga@anvisa.gov.br</a>
Canada	Elizabeth Corrigan	Regulatory Standards Officer, Organic Office, Agrifood Division Agrifood, Meat and Seafood Safety Directorate Floor 4, Room 145 1400 Merivale Road, Tower 1 Ottawa, On K1A 0Y9 Tel.: +1 (613) 773-6221 Fax : +1 (613) 228-6633 Email: <a href="mailto:elizabeth.corrigan@inspection.gc.ca">elizabeth.corrigan@inspection.gc.ca</a>
Chile	Roxana Vera  Ligia Morend	Profesional Subdepartamento de Negociaciones Internacionales Division Asuntos Internacionales Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Email: <a href="mailto:roxana.vera@sab.gob.cl">roxana.vera@sab.gob.cl</a>  Profesional Subdepartamento de Agricultura Organica

		Division Proteccion de Recursos Naturales Renovables Servicio Agricola y Ganadero Email: <a href="mailto:ligia.morend@sag.gob.cl">ligia.morend@sag.gob.cl</a>
Costa Rica	Luis Monge	Dole Fresh Fruit International, Ltd. Manager of Organics & Certifications. Email: <a href="mailto:luis.monge@dole.com">luis.monge@dole.com</a> Office Phone: +506 2287-2178 / 71 / 76. Office Fax: +506 2201-5750. Mobile +506 8306-9135 Costa Rica / +51 96 8700742 Intl' Website: <a href="http://www.doleorganic.com">www.doleorganic.com</a>
	Luis Brenes	Director AgriVita S.A. PO Box 124-7051 Oreamuno, Costa Rica Tel/Faxm (506) 2536-6565 Email: <a href="mailto:brenes.agrivita@gmail.com">brenes.agrivita@gmail.com</a>
Cuba	Miguel Aranguren Gonzalez	Email: <a href="mailto:miguel@citrovit.cu">miguel@citrovit.cu</a>
Denmark	Malene Kjer Andersen	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries The Danish Plant Directorate Skovbrynet 20, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby Phone: +45 4526 3855
	Robert Lind	Head of Section Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration Morkhoj Bygad 19 B DK-2860 Sobor Phone: +45 7227 6663 Email: <a href="mailto:rl@fvst.dk">rl@fvst.dk</a>
	Lisbeth Landstrom	Head of Section Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration Morkhoj Bygad 19 B DK-2860 Sobor Phone: +45 7227 6659 Email: <a href="mailto:lla@fvst.dk">lla@fvst.dk</a>
Egypt	Nagia Abd El Mohsen	Food Standard Specialist E-mail : <a href="mailto:moi@idsc.net.eg">moi@idsc.net.eg</a> Phone : 00202 22845531 Fax : 00202 22845504
European Union	Herman Van Boxem	EC Codex Contact Point European Commission Tel.: +32 - 2 - 295 01 21 <a href="mailto:herman.vanboxem@ec.europa.eu">herman.vanboxem@ec.europa.eu</a> E-mail: <a href="mailto:codex@ec.europa.eu">codex@ec.europa.eu</a>
Hungary	Mr. Attila Lucskai	Ministry of Rural Development Department of Food Chain Control Desk officer for organic farming and wild mushrooms email: <a href="mailto:attila.lucskai@vm.gov.hu">attila.lucskai@vm.gov.hu</a>
	Ms. Dorottya Vargha	Ministry of Rural Development Department of Food Chain Control EU correspondent of Food Chain Control email: <a href="mailto:dorottya.vargha@vm.gov.hu">dorottya.vargha@vm.gov.hu</a>
India	Dr. Dhir Singh	Assistant Director General (PFA) Food Safety and Standards Authority of India Ministry of Health and Family Welfare

		<p>Government of India          FDA Bhavan, Kotla Road          New Delhi-110002          E-mail: <a href="mailto:adgpfa@nic.in">adgpfa@nic.in</a>          Tel/Fax: +91-11-23237418</p> <p><a href="mailto:codex-india@nb.nic.in">codex-india@nb.nic.in</a></p>
Iran	<p>Mrs. Roya Noorbakhsh</p> <p>Mr. Kianfar Farhang Javid</p>	<p>Title: Secretary CCPR in Iran          Institute of Standard &amp; Industrial Research of Iran          Food &amp; Agriculture Research Department          Cell:0098-912-1902591          Email:<a href="mailto:roybakhsh@yahoo.com">roybakhsh@yahoo.com</a></p> <p>Head of the CCFL in Iran          cell:00989121899421          email:<a href="mailto:kianfarfarhangjavid@yahoo.com">kianfarfarhangjavid@yahoo.com</a></p>
Japan	Ms. Takako Yano	<p>Officer          Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division,          Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau,          Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries          1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8950, Japan          E-mail: <a href="mailto:takako_yano@nm.maff.go.jp">takako_yano@nm.maff.go.jp</a></p>
Mexico	Lidia P. Barrios Alvarado	<p>Jefa de Departamento de Diseño y          Gestión Regulatoria          Dirección General de Inocuidad Agroalimentaria,          Acuícola y Pesquera          Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127, Col. Del Carmen.          Del. Coyoacán, México, D.F. C.P. 04100.          Tel. +52 (55) 5090 3000 Ext. 51532          Email: <a href="mailto:lidia.barrios@senasica.gob.mx">lidia.barrios@senasica.gob.mx</a>  <a href="mailto:codexmex@economia.gob.mx">codexmex@economia.gob.mx</a></p>
New Zealand	Kirsten Todd	<p>Organics Advisor          Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry - Food Safety          Pastoral House          25 The Terrace          PO Box 2526          Wellington 6011          New Zealand          Phone: +64 4 8940109          Email: <a href="mailto:kirsten.todd@maf.govt.nz">kirsten.todd@maf.govt.nz</a></p>
Norway	Dr. Hanne Marit GRAN	<p>Senior Advisor          Section for Plants, Organic Production and GMs          Norwegian Food Safety Authority - Head Office          E-mail: <a href="mailto:hamgr@mattilsynet.no">hamgr@mattilsynet.no</a></p>
Philippines	<p>Lara G. Vivas</p> <p>Lielani Ramona Katimbag-Limpin</p>	<p>Bureau of Agriculture Fisheries and Product Standard          Department of Agriculture          Visayas Avenue, Quezon City          Tel: 632 9206131/4552858/4552856</p> <p>Organic Certification Center of the Philippines          #30 Scout Borromeo St. Brgy South Triangle          1103 Quezon City, Philippines          Telefax 632 441 4096          Email: <a href="mailto:info@occpphilis.org">info@occpphilis.org</a></p>
Slovak Republic	Ms Blanka Slosarova	<p>State Veterinary and Food Administration of the Slovak Republic,          E- mail:<a href="mailto:slosarova@svssr.sk">slosarova@svssr.sk</a>  <a href="tel:004212060257410">tel. 004212060257410.</a></p>

Switzerland	Barbara Steiner	Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG Mattenhofstrasse , 5 CH-3003 Berne SWITZERLAND Tel. +41 31 325 80 08 Fax +41 31 322 26 34 Email: <a href="mailto:barbara.steiner@blw.admin.ch">barbara.steiner@blw.admin.ch</a>
Thailand	Ing-Orn Panyakit	Senior Standard Officer National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS) Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives 50 Paholyothin Road, Jatujak, Bangkok, 10900 Thailand Phone: +66 2 5612277 ext 1426 Fax: +66 2 5613373 E-mail: <a href="mailto:codex@acfs.go.th">codex@acfs.go.th</a> ; <a href="mailto:p_ingorn@yahoo.co.th">p_ingorn@yahoo.co.th</a>
United Kingdom	Robin Fransella	Policy Advisor Organic Team Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs 8C Millbank c/o 17 Smith Square London SW1P 3JR UNITED KINGDOM Tel: +44 (0)207 238 6348 Email: <a href="mailto:Robin.fransella@defra.gsi.gov.uk">Robin.fransella@defra.gsi.gov.uk</a>
United States of America	Lisa Brines	Agricultural Marketing Specialist National Organic Program, Standards Division Agricultural Marketing Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 1400 Independence Ave SW, Stop 0268 Washington, DC 20250-0268 Tel: +1-202-720-3252 Email: <a href="mailto:Lisa.Brines@ams.usda.gov">Lisa.Brines@ams.usda.gov</a>
IFOAM	Otto Schmid	Head of Delegation Senior Researcher, Standards Officer Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Ackerstrasse CH-5070 Frick SWITZERLAND TEL.: +41 62 865 72 72 FAX: +41 62 865 72 73 E-MAIL: <a href="mailto:OTTO.SCHMID@FIBL.ORG">OTTO.SCHMID@FIBL.ORG</a>
IACFO	Natsuko Iino Kumasawa	IACFO Asia Regional Coordinator, country/organization, IACFO (International Association of Consumer Food Organizations) email address of their representative(s) <a href="mailto:natsuko@hpnew.com">natsuko@hpnew.com</a>
Wolf, DiMatteo + Associates	Katherine DiMatteo	Managing Partner and Senior Associate Wolf, DiMatteo + Associates  49 Race Street P.O. Box 458 New Castle, VA 42127  <a href="mailto:kdimatteo@organicspecialists.com">kdimatteo@organicspecialists.com</a> 413-624-5569

**APPENDIX III: ANNEX 2 PERMITTED SUBSTANCES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ORGANIC FOODS****Review of New Substances proposed for inclusion in Annex 2 – September 2011****A. Substance: ethylene****B. Use: Sprouting inhibition in potatoes and onions****C. Applicable specific criteria: b) substances used for the purpose of plant disease or pest and weed control****D. Submitted By: European Union (EU)**

<b>Assessment against Section 5.1 Criteria</b>	
<b>I. General Description of Substance</b>	
<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>EU</b>	Natural gas C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub> (CH <sub>2</sub> =CH <sub>2</sub> ) produced by all higher plants and therefore omnipresent in nature. The ethylene (identical to the naturally occurring ethylene) used for agricultural purposes is obtained through chemical processes.  Constant exposure of stored potatoes and onions to ethylene in low concentration inhibits sprouting.
<b>II. Section 5.1 General Criteria (all criteria in this section should be addressed)</b>	
<b>5.1.i) Is the substance consistent with the principles of organic production as outlined in the Guidelines?</b>	
<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>EU</b>	This use of ethylene is consistent with the principle of careful handling of products in order to maintain their quality during the storage and contributes to the economic and ecological sustainability of organic potato and onion production, while being consistent with the other principles of organic production.
<b>Brazil</b>	The use of low concentrations of ethylene as a sprout inhibitor for potatoes and onions is a useful alternative that meets the requirements for organic production.
<b>5.1.ii) Is use of the substance necessary/essential for its intended use?</b>	
<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>EU</b>	A longer marketing period is important for the economic sustainability of farms.
<b>Brazil</b>	We agree that a longer marketing period is important for the economic sustainability of farms. Furthermore, the use of ethylene replaces the cooling systems that are expensive and difficult to access for small organic farmers.
<b>United States</b>	Alternative natural substances used for sprout inhibition include plant oils (e.g. clove oil, caraway seed oil). Proposal indicates that alternatives may not be registered for this purpose in certain areas.
<b>5.1.iii) Does the manufacture, use and disposal of the substance result in, or contribute to, harmful effects on the environment?</b>	
<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>EU</b>	No. Ethylene is often considered a by-product in chemical engineering process

	manuals, and to the extent that it is captured rather than released into the environment can be seen as reducing the ambient air pollution.
--	---

**5.1.iv) Does the substance have the lowest negative impact on human or animal health and quality of life?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	No adverse effect known on human or animal health. No adverse effect on intrinsic food quality. Under conditions of prolonged storage, a higher external and internal quality can be maintained (absence of sprouts and wrinkles, composition of tubers).

**5.1.v) Are approved alternative available in sufficient quality or quantity?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	<p>Cold storage, use of varieties with high dormancy and/or caraway seed oil (for potatoes, where registered) may provide solutions in certain situations. However, both alternatives are not adequate for use in many situations.</p> <p><u>Cold storage</u></p> <p>Cold storage of potatoes increases reducing sugars. This leads to increased acrylamide when cooked (e.g. frying, baking, roasting).</p> <p>The Codex Code of Practice for reduction of acrylamide in food (CAC/RCP 67-2009) highlights that cold storage of potatoes at low temperatures is to be avoided and that alternatives should be determined to help reduce acrylamide in potato foods (whether processed foods, foods prepared in restaurants or at home). This Code of Practice was adopted by the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food and CAC in 2009. Alternatives to cold storage of potatoes are therefore needed.</p> <p><u>Caraway seed oil</u></p> <p>The experience with the use of this substance is rather limited. Its use is not registered in many countries and can therefore not be used by organic producers in these countries.</p> <p><u>Use of potato varieties with high dormancy</u></p> <p>The choice of varieties is very important in organic production. The potato variety chosen should ideally have a strong resistance against potato blight and other diseases and should also have characteristics that make it suitable for organic production in the local circumstances. While high dormancy is a positive characteristic of a variety, it is not always possible to choose a variety that possesses as well the other positive characteristics sought. Therefore in many situations a variety with high dormancy can not be chosen.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Alternatives are not sufficiently available. The use of ethylene for sprouting inhibition is a useful alternative that meets the requirements for organic production.</p>
Brazil	In the case of onions, there are strong indications that the use of cold storages (temperatures between -1 to 2°C) may suppress sprouting in bulbs up to six months, but it is dependent of the cultivar. However, the cooling systems are expensive and difficult to access for small organic farmers.
United States	It is unclear why natural plant oils (e.g. caraway seed oil, clove oil, etc.) cannot be registered for this purpose by the countries needing use. According to the criteria,

	substances of plant origin, such as plant oils, would be preferred over use of substances which are chemically synthesized, such as ethylene (Section 5.1(b)).
--	--

**Has the applicant adequately addressed the general criteria in section 5.1?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
Brazil	We understand that the justification presented by EU has adequately addressed the general criteria in section 5.1.

**IV. Section 5.1 Specific Criteria: b) substance used for the purpose of plant disease or pest and weed control**

**5.1.b)1) Is the substance essential for the control of a harmful organism or a particular disease for which other biological, physical or plant breeding alternatives and/or effective management practices are not available?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	This use of ethylene is not directly linked to the control of a pest or disease, but this use of ethylene can nevertheless be considered to be plant protection and therefore the same criteria should apply. Cold storage, use of varieties with high dormancy and/or caraway seed oil (for potatoes, where registered) may provide solutions in certain situations.
Australia	Australia is not confident this matter is about plant protection; rather it is more about post harvest storage treatment and marketing of potatoes and onions.

**5.1.b)2) Does its use take into account the potential harmful impact on the environment, the ecology (in particular non-target organisms) and the health of consumers, livestock and bees?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	Environmental fate, hazards and risks are assessed in detail during pesticide registration in the EU, and authorizations are accompanied by obligations for appropriate risk management.  Ethylene does not raise environmental or health concerns.  Theoretically, after release from the storage rooms, ethylene could affect the vegetation, but the quantities used are negligible in comparison to natural and industrial emissions.
Australia	Based on current practices (e.g. de-greening) ethylene gas does not pose any major contamination risk to the environment, local ecology, or health humans, terrestrial animals and insects.  Ethylene does not pose any major contamination risk to the environment, local ecology, or health of humans, terrestrial animals or insects. The use of ethylene is permitted under the Codex guideline for ripening of kiwifruit and bananas, and under the Australian Standard for Organic and Biodynamic Products (AS6000-2009) for the purpose of ripening and /or colouration (degreening). Australia believes the proposed usage pattern for ethylene is consistent with organic principles, however if there is strong support for option 1 Australia would be open to considering certain restrictions, such as limiting the time the treatment may be applied.

**5.1.b)3) Is the substance of plant, microbial or mineral origin? Has it undergone any of the following processes: physical (mechanical, thermal), enzymatic, microbial (composting, fermentation)?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	Ethylene is a natural gas produced by all higher plants. The ethylene (identical to the naturally occurring ethylene) used for agricultural purposes is obtained through decomposition of petroleum gases or by dehydration of alcohol.
Australia	Noted

**5.1.b)4) Is the substance chemically synthesized? Are there alternatives products available in their natural form? Do the conditions of use result in the presence of residues on edible parts of the product?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	The ethylene used is chemically produced and is identical to the naturally occurring ethylene. Ethylene does not result in the presence of residues in any part of the plant.
Australia	Noted

**5.1.b)5) Should the substance use be restricted to specific conditions, specific regions, or specific commodities?**

Member/ Observer	Answer
EU	It should be limited to sprouting inhibition in potatoes and onions.
Australia	Where varieties of potatoes and onions that have long dormancy characteristics are not available, or these varieties are not suited to local growing conditions, the inspection body may approved the use of ethylene gas to limit the sprouting of stored potatoes and/or onions.
Brazil	We agree that the use of ethylene should be limited to sprouting inhibition in potatoes and onions.

**Has the applicant adequately addressed the specific criteria in section b) substances used for the purpose of plant disease or pest and weed control**

Member/ Observer	Answer

**VI. General questions for all proposals**

**Is there any information needed to complete the review of the new substance? (Please include links to supporting research here)**

Member/ Observer	Answer
Australia	There are a few claims that did not include supporting information. For example, is there evidence to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– indicate that low levels of ethylene do inhibit sprouting?</li> <li>– support the claim that by capturing ethylene rather than releasing it into the environment can be seen as reducing the ambient air pollution air pollution?</li> </ul> <p>Does controlling the amount of light (unsubstantiated information from the Internet) coupled with dry ambient temperatures provide ideal storage conditions and help reduce sprout formation in potatoes and onions?</p>

	<p>The FAO suggests that using potato varieties with long <i>dormancy</i> periods and proper <i>curing</i> methods are options to control sprouting in potatoes and onions:-  <a href="http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/x5014e/X5014e0b.htm">www.fao.org/wairdocs/x5014e/X5014e0b.htm</a>  <a href="http://www.fao.org/docrep/X5415E/x5415e03.htm#3.3%20control%20of%20sprouting">www.fao.org/docrep/X5415E/x5415e03.htm#3.3%20control%20of%20sprouting</a></p>
<b>Iran</b>	<p>According to the organic guideline synthetic substances used in crop production must be used in a manner which does not contribute to contamination of crops, soil, or water and at the same time it should be the only method to prevent or control that particular phase of production.</p> <p>Even though longer shelf-life is one of the principle of organic production which is to maintain a sustainable socioeconomic status of community, there are some alternative method to prevent sprouting onions and potatoes such as good storage practices, improvement of storage condition, and use of potato varieties with high dormancy or some botanical substances like Caraway seed oil instead of using ethylene.</p>

#### Are any additional conditions of use needed?

<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>EU</b>	Yes: for sprouting inhibition in potatoes and onions. [Option 1]
<b>Australia</b>	<p>Yes: Need for ethylene recognised by the certification body or authority for sprout inhibition of stored potatoes and onions where varieties that have long dormancy characteristics are not available, or these varieties are not suited to local growing conditions. [Option 2].</p> <p>If there is strong support for option 1, Australia would be open to considering certain restrictions, such as limiting the time the treatment may be applied.</p>
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes: for sprouting inhibition in potatoes and onions. [Option 1]
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes, Option 2 - Need for ethylene recognised by the certification body or authority for sprout inhibition of stored potatoes and onions where varieties that have long dormancy characteristics are not available, or these varieties are not suited to local growing conditions.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	For sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions. [Option 1]

#### Would you support the addition of the new substance in Annex 2?

<b>Member/ Observer</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>EU</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	If supported, ethylene for sprout inhibition not be listed as a substance for plant pest and disease control (Annex 2, Table 2), but be appended to the current reference to ethylene for ripening (Annex 1, para 82) or be listed as a processing aid (Annex 2, Table 4).
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes, Option 1
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes, Option 2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes, Option 1

**APPENDIX IV: UPDATED Timeline**

Completed	Letter of invitation to join the eWG sent to member countries and observers
Completed	Deadline for submitting interest to participate in eWG
Completed	Deadline for additional data or research information to be submitted in support of proposals to expand the use of ethylene for ripening of tropical fruit(s) and/or for ethylene for sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions; Proposal on refining work approach to be submitted by Australia
Completed	Information sent to eWG members for consideration using structured work approach and review templates
Completed	Comments on proposals due
Completed	eWG Draft Report distributed to participants
Completed	Comments on eWG Draft Report due
March 9, 2012	eWG Final Report submitted to Codex Secretariat for distribution and consideration of the 40 <sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL May 15-18, 2012