

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 4(c)

CX/MMP 04/6/6 - Add 1
April 2004

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS**

Sixth Session

Auckland, New Zealand, 26 – 30 April 2004

PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR DAIRY SPREADS

COMMENTS AT STEP 3

Comments from: Argentina, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Mexico and United States

General

MEXICO

In this document, the important thing is to state whether to limit to just one classification (1) or whether all existing products fall into the second classification.

UNITED STATES

The U.S. supports the horizontal approach in the development of milk and milk product standards whenever possible. The Codex Alimentarius Commission's Procedural Manual recognizes this approach and only allows for deviations from horizontal standards when those deviations are fully justified and supported by available scientific evidence and other relevant information. This includes the food additive and contaminant provisions developed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants, the hygiene provisions developed by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, and the labeling provisions established by the Codex Committee on Food Labeling. The U.S. recommends that milk and milk product standards reference the work of these groups to identify additive, contaminant, hygiene and labeling provisions within the standards whenever possible rather than duplicate their work within milk and milk products standards.

The U.S. supports the identification of food additive classes in the standards and recommends that the standards not list additives individually, but rather defer to CCFAC to identify the specific additive provisions included within the classes provided in the standards.

The United States appreciates the work that the Drafting group has done in preparing the Proposed Draft Revised Standard for Dairy Spreads for the 6th session of the CCMMP.

The U.S. notes that the proposed draft standard for dairy spreads is inconsistent with the format and standard texts used in other Codex standards for milk and milk products. For example paragraph 6.2 of the Hygiene section deviates from the standard language used in other Codex milk and milk product standards and the scope contains information that is normally contained in the description.

Additionally, the U.S. finds the additive section very confusing. The table includes classes inconsistent with other Codex standards for milk products. For example, natural flavours are not considered a functional class by CCFAC. There also seems to be repeated functional classes with different additive listings. For example, there are 5 headings for acidity regulators for all products. None of which provide the same list of additives.

Considering the time it would take the Milk Committee to address the numerous inconsistencies in the proposed standard, the U.S. recommends that the proposed draft standard be referred back to a drafting group at Step 3 for alignment with the other Codex standards for milk and milk products. The U.S. also suggests that the drafting group provide additional background information on the comments provided to the drafting group and the technological basis for the recommendations made.

1 Scope

CANADA

To be consistent with the wording of the Scope from the “Proposed Draft Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads”, Canada suggests to add the following sentence to the scope, to differentiate between a dairy spread and a spread of blended dairy fats and vegetable fats: “This standard does not cover spreads made with a blend of dairy fat and other fats such as animal fat or vegetable oils.”

2 Description

ARGENTINA

We suggest removing the words “of value” of the description of the products. If the purpose of the words is to emphasize the importance that milk fat is preponderant raw material it would be more appropriate to retire them.

AUSTRALIA

1st sentence - we believe that the words "principally of the water-in-oil emulsion" and "exclusively" are not necessary and can be omitted.

2nd sentence - delete "However" at the beginning and start the sentence "Other substances necessary for their manufacture ..."

CANADA

Canada recommends to simplify this section by retaining the concept of the first sentence and removing the second sentence, which is described in Section 3. Therefore the description would read: “Dairy spreads are products in the form of a solid, malleable emulsion, principally of a water-in-milkfat type.”

3.2 Permitted Ingredients

ARGENTINA

We suggest deleting the square brackets of the fourth point. We are in agreement with the vitamin inclusion as ingredients for these products.

CANADA

Canada recommends to expand the permitted ingredients to include “other sweetening agents”, as a general category, rather than just sugar, to allow flexibility of the standard.

To clarify and simplify the reference to vitamins in this Section, Canada suggests that “Vitamins” be listed as the fourth ingredient and that the reference to the specific Codex document be moved to the asterisked phrase at the end of this Section and all square brackets be removed.

3.3 *Composition*

ARGENTINA

We are in agreement with the adoption of second option. We suggest determining that milk fat content be lower than 80% and higher than 10%.

AUSTRALIA

Australia does not support any of these options: the first option introduces unnecessary product categories, and the second option introduces an unnecessary limit on the ratio of milk fat and dry matter excluding salt.

CANADA

Canada recommends to simplify this section by just retaining the compositional requirement that dairy spreads must contain a milk fat content of less than 80% and not less than 10%. All references to naming options should only be covered under Section 7.1.

NEW ZEALAND

Using a mix of terms “half-fat butter”, “three-quarter-fat butter” and “Dairy spread X% milk-fat” is confusing and illogical given that “half-fat butter” and “three-quarter-fat butter” apply to very narrow fat ranges within the total range of composition. New Zealand does not, therefore, support Option One or Option Two – both of which allow for the use of all three terms – and suggests that the confusion can be resolved by allowing the choice of “Dairy spread X% milk-fat” or “X% milk-fat butter”.

New Zealand’s overriding position is set out above. Other comments on the detail of the paper:

The milk-fat ranges given to the terms “Three-quarter-fat butter” and “Half-fat butter” in section 3.3 are not consistent with the requirement stated under point 8.1, “The measured fat content shall not deviate by more than two percentage points from the declared fat content.” New Zealand proposes that there should be consistency between sections 3.3 and 8.1 with respect to fat ranges.

4 *Food Additives*

ARGENTINA

We propose changing values of the fat content in the table so that they are in agreement with the established values for the labeling of "reduced-fat products" (7.1.2. and 7.1.3.a) and "low-fat products" or "light" (7.31.2. and 7.1.3.b)

	Fat Content		
Additives Classes	62% to less than 80%	41% to less than 62%	10% to less than 41%

We suggest listing separated the gases: Carbon Dioxide (INS N° 290), Nitrogen (INS N° 941) and Nitrous Oxide (INS N° 942) and we propose incorporating them with function “Foaming Agents” allowing its use for all products indicated in the table.

7 *Labelling*

CANADA

Canada recommends the removal of text in 7(a) and 7(b) since this is not clearly understood and will be addressed under both Sections 7.1 and 7.2.

NEW ZEALAND

In clause (a) the term “sales description” is not defined.

In clause (b) the term “weight” should be changed to “mass” for consistency.

7.1 Name of the Food

ARGENTINA

7.1.3. We suggest including a paragraph (c) which establishes the obligatory to indicate in the label that the product is "salted", if the national legislation of the country in which the product is manufactured allows it:

"The term "salted" may be used for products in which sodium chloride has been used as ingredient, if the national legislation of the country in which the product was manufactured allows it".

AUSTRALIA

Australia supports sub-sections 7.2 and 7.3, but believes that all other parts of *Section 7. Labelling* should be modified to reflect concerns raised under sub-section 3.3. *Composition*.

CANADA

Canada recommends to replace the current wording under Section 7.1 (7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3) with the following:

"The name of the food shall be "Dairy spread X% milkfat". This name may be replaced by terms such as "three-quarter-fat butter" and "half-fat butter" or other suitable qualifiers, if the provisions of the Guidelines for the Use of Nutrition Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997) for labelling and composition for comparative claims are met.

NEW ZEALAND

Using a mix of terms "half-fat butter", "three-quarter-fat butter" and "Dairy spread X% milk-fat" is confusing and illogical given that "half-fat butter" and "three-quarter-fat butter" apply to very narrow fat ranges within the total range of composition. New Zealand does not, therefore, support Option One or Option Two – both of which allow for the use of all three terms – and suggests that the confusion can be resolved by allowing the choice of "Dairy spread X% milk-fat" or "X% milk-fat butter".

New Zealand's overriding position is set out above. Other comments on the detail of the paper:

7.2 Declaration of Milk Fat Content

CANADA

Canada recommends replacing this section with the more descriptive, consistent phrasing used in other milk and milk product standards "The milk fat content shall be declared in a manner found acceptable in the country of sale to the final consumer, either (i) as a percentage by mass or (ii) in grams per serving as quantified in the label."

8 Methods of Sampling and Analysis

NEW ZEALAND

The milk-fat ranges given to the terms "Three-quarter-fat butter" and "Half-fat butter" in section 3.3 are not consistent with the requirement stated under point 8.1, "The measured fat content shall not deviate by more than two percentage points from the declared fat content." New Zealand proposes that there should be consistency between sections 3.3 and 8.1 with respect to fat ranges.

CANADA

Canada believes that this sentence should be removed as it is not consistent with other standards.