

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 2

CX/FO 05/19/2 -Add.1

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FATS AND OILS

Nineteenth Session

London, United Kingdom, 21– 25 February 2005

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES

This document draws the attention of the participants to the Committee on Fats and Oils to the fact that the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) and the Committee on Labelling (CCFL) at its latest Session raised several issues that the CCFO should consider including those as to the provisions in the methods of analysis and labelling in the Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads, the Standard for Olive Oils. These subjects will be considered under each relevant agenda item in the 19th Session of CCFO.

COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

ENDORSEMENT OF METHODS OF ANALYSIS PROVISIONS IN CODEX STANDARDS¹

The report of the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Endorsement of Methods of Analysis was presented by its Chair, Dr Roger Wood (United Kingdom). The Committee endorsed the methods proposed from the Committee on Fats and Oils with the following amendments and comments.

1. The Observer from AOCS drew the attention of the Committee to the proposal from the Committee on Fats and Oils to delete the year of publication in the reference as this would simplify the updating and endorsement process. It was also noted that under ISO/IEC 17025: 1999, analysts were required to use the most updated version of methods of analysis. This proposal was supported by other observers, who indicated that when significant changes were made to a method, a new number was given to the method and this avoided any confusion.
2. Several delegations supported the inclusion of the year of publication in the method as this was an important reference for laboratories, especially for regulatory purposes. They expressed the view that it was not possible to endorse all future changes that might occur in a method without being informed of those changes, and that the list of methods should be reviewed regularly to ensure that all updates were taken into account. The Committee agreed to retain the year of publication at this stage and to consider this question further at its next session.

Fat Spreads and Blended Fat Spreads

3. The Committee noted that the level of 3% milk fat was the essential composition factor used to

¹ ALINORM 04/27/23, paras. 78-83

differentiate fat spreads from blended spreads. The Committee recalled that the CCFO had recommended to convert the butyric acid concentration into milk fat concentration and to report the range in which the milk fat concentration of a sample would lie, in the absence of a single agreed factor. Some delegations pointed out that the question of the factor should be clarified by the CCFO and that the method could not be fully endorsed until this was resolved. It was suggested that reference be made to the figure used by the World Customs Organization for fat spreads, but some delegations noted that an average figure established for customs purposes would not solve a problem of interpretation of analytical results.

4. The Committee agreed to endorse temporarily the methods proposed as Type I pending the definition of a conversion factor by the Committee on Fats and Oils.

Olive Oils and Olive-Pomace Oils

5. The Delegations of Italy and Morocco expressed their reservations on the inclusion of the ISO 15788-2: 2003 method for stigmastadienes as it had not been considered by the Committee on Fats and Oils and was not used in the framework of the International Olive Oil Council. **The Committee agreed to endorse temporarily this method and to forward it to the CCFO for consideration.** All other methods were endorsed as proposed, with the editorial corrections proposed by the Delegation of Spain.

Named Vegetable Oils

6. The Committee endorsed the revised list of methods proposed by the CCFO, including the deletion of several IUPAC methods that are not any longer available.

THE USE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS: SAMPLING PLANS, RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ANALYTICAL RESULTS, THE MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY, RECOVERY FACTORS AND PROVISIONS IN CODEX STANDARDS²

The Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling discussed the above document and decided to request comments on the current version, as amended during the session, and consider it at the next session of the Committee. It also agreed that the advice of Commodity Committees would be sought on this document (Appendix VII of ALINORM 04/27/23; **attached as Annex to this document**). The Committee on Fats and Oils is therefore invited to consider the document and to provide its comments to CCMAS.

COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING³

CONSIDERATION OF LABELLING PROVISIONS IN DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS

Draft Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Fat Spreads

7. The Delegation of Canada pointed out that the terms “blended spreads” and “blends” were not meaningful for consumers and proposed to refer to the type of fat in the name of the product, that would read “(naming the fat(s)) blended spreads” or “blended (naming the fat) spread”. As an alternative, the Delegation proposed to modify the sentence to read “Where consumers would be misled, the name of the product shall incorporate the name of the fats and oils”. The Delegation of Brazil proposed to retain the second paragraph of section 7.1 without square brackets in order to allow a reference to the name of fats and oils in a generic or a specific manner. **The Committee could not come to a conclusion on these proposals and agreed to return the section to the Committee on Fats and Oils for further consideration.**

8. The Committee agreed that the declaration of milk fat content should not be limited to blended spreads and amended section 7.3.2 to read “The milk fat content shall be indicated in a manner that is clear and not misleading to the consumer”.

9. The Committee endorsed the other sections as proposed in the Draft Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Fat Spreads.

² ALINNORM ALINORM 04/27/23, paras. 128-135 and Appendix VII

³ ALINORM 04/27/22, paras. 23-25

THE USE OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS: SAMPLING PLANS, RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ANALYTICAL RESULTS, THE MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY, RECOVERY FACTORS AND PROVISIONS IN CODEX STANDARDS

ISSUES INVOLVED

There are a number of analytical and sampling considerations which prevent the uniform implementation of legislative standards. In particular, different approaches may be taken regarding sampling procedures, the use of measurement uncertainty and recovery corrections.

At present there is no official guidance on how to interpret analytical results across the Codex Community. Significantly different decisions may be taken after analysis of the “same sample”. For example some countries use an “every-item-must-comply” sampling regime, others use an “average of a lot” regime, some deduct the measurement uncertainty associated with the result, others do not, some countries correct analytical results for recovery, others do not. This interpretation may also be affected by the number of significant figures included in any commodity specification.

It is essential analytical results are interpreted in the same way if there is to be equivalence across the Codex Community.

It is stressed that this is not an analysis or sampling problem as such but an administrative problem which has been highlighted as the result of recent activities in the analytical sector, most notably the development of International Guidelines on the Use of Recovery Factors when Reporting Analytical Results and various Guides prepared dealing with Measurement Uncertainty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that when a Codex Commodity Committee discusses and agrees on a commodity specification and the analytical methods concerned, it states the following information in the Codex Standard:

1. Sampling Plans

The appropriate sampling plan to control conformity of products with the specification. This should state:

- whether the specification applies to every item in a lot, to the average in a lot or the proportion non-conforming;
- the appropriate acceptable quality level to be used;
- the acceptance conditions of a lot controlled, in relation to the qualitative/quantitative characteristic determined on the sample.

2. Measurement Uncertainty

That an allowance is to be made for the measurement uncertainty when deciding whether or not an analytical result falls within the specification. This requirement may not apply in situations when a direct health hazard is concerned, such as for food pathogens.

3. Recovery

[Where relevant and appropriate the analytical results are to be reported on a recovery corrected basis and that the recovery should be quoted in any analytical report.]

4. Significant Figures

The units in which the results are to be expressed and the number of significant figures to be included in the reported result.