

# 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/MMP 04/6/2  
April 2004

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

Sixth Session

Auckland, New Zealand, 26 – 30 April 2004

### MATTERS REFERRED AND/OR OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES

#### 1. GENERAL DECISIONS OF THE 26<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (30 June – 6 July 2003)

##### 1.1 AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURAL MANUAL<sup>1</sup>

###### *Clarification of Rule VI.4 (Voting and Procedures)*

1. The Commission amended Rule VI.4 on Voting and Procedures to include a reference to Rule X.2 related to the adoption or amendments of Codex standards by consensus.

###### *Membership of Regional Economic Integration Organizations*

2. The Commission amended the Rules on Membership to allow regional economic integration organizations to exercise rights of membership within the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies under specific conditions.

###### *Measures to Facilitate Consensus*

3. The Commission adopted the *Measures to Facilitate Consensus* for inclusion in the Procedural Manual as a general decision of the Commission.

###### *Principles for the Establishment of Methods of Analysis*

4. The Commission adopted the amendment to the *General Criteria for the Selection of Methods of Analysis using the Criteria Approach* and the new section addressing *Working Instructions for the Implementation of the Criteria Approach in Codex*.

##### 1.2 RISK ANALYSIS<sup>2</sup>

5. The Commission adopted the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius* and the definitions related to risk analysis.

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 15-31 and Appendices II and III.

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 146-147 and Appendix IV and Procedural Manual, 13<sup>th</sup> Edition

### **1.3 JOINT FAO/WHO EVALUATION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS AND OTHER FAO AND WHO WORK ON FOOD STANDARDS**

6. The Commission took several decisions concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation, enacting some immediately and requesting the Codex Committee on General Principles to draft the amendments to the Procedural Manual required implementing others. Some selected decisions are summarized below. Further details on this matter can be found in the report of the 26<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.<sup>3</sup>

#### **General Aspects**

##### ***Annual meetings of the Commission***

7. The Commission agreed to meet annually for the next two years, but that in future each session would consider the timing for the following session and the general nature of the agenda in order to achieve the appropriate balance between standards issues, general direction of work and policy matters, and taking into account the resources available for adequate participation.

##### ***Implementation of the Evaluation***

8. The Commission decided that the responsibility for following up and monitoring progress in the implementation of the recommendations from the Evaluation Report would be entrusted to the Executive Committee. Twice-yearly sessions of the Committee would be scheduled in order to absorb the additional workload.

##### ***Priorities for implementation***

9. The Commission decided that the priorities should be:

- (a) Processes for standards management, with due regard to the special needs of developing countries.
- (b) Functions and composition of the Executive Committee, including the participation of observers in the Executive Committee and Executive Committee procedures.
- (c) Review of the Committee structures and mandates (including Regional Committees).
- (d) Review of Rules and Procedures including guidelines for Codex Committees.

10. The Commission concluded that all four priorities were of equal importance, and that the ranking was made on the grounds of speed of potential progress.

#### **Review of Codex Committee Structure and Mandates of Codex Committees and Task Forces, including Regional Committees**

11. The Commission decided that all the Committees and Task Forces would be reviewed together bearing in mind the objective of reducing the number of meetings while also keeping them short and focused. The Commission endorsed the recommendation made by the Executive Committee concerning the selection of consultants that would be entrusted with the review,<sup>4</sup> and stressed the critical importance of transparency in the process.

#### **Improved Processes for Standards Management**

##### ***Critical review of proposals to undertake work and monitoring progress of standards development***

12. The Commission decided to endorse the critical review process, including the preparation of project documents for major standards as well as the closely related proposal to revise the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities in order to ensure the relevance of Codex standards at the international level.

---

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 149-183.

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 03/4, para. 23.

***Standards management responsibility***

13. The Commission decided that the Executive Committee be the body to undertake the critical review of new work. The Commission did not favour the replacement of the Executive Committee with an Executive Board.

***Time-bound decision-making***

14. The Commission decided that the body responsible for standards management (i.e. the Executive Committee) should review the status of development of draft standards at the end of a specified time-frame, normally not more than five years, and report its findings to the Commission. The time-frame could be less than five years, where this was appropriate or had been established during the critical review process for new work.

***Simplified procedures for standards development***

15. The Commission decided to retain the 8-Step process, with the existing mechanisms to accelerate the process when necessary.

***Use of facilitators and establishment of electronic and/or physical working groups***

16. The Commission agreed in principle to all three proposals but decided that the modalities would require clarification by the body responsible for reviewing the Procedural Manual. With respect to electronic working groups, the Commission noted that these were an avenue for exchanging views and not for decision making. Physical working groups should be ad hoc, open to all members, take account the problems of developing country participation and only be established where there is consensus in the Committee to do so and other strategies have been considered.

***Adoption of Standards***

17. The Commission decided that adoption of standards with a limited amendment should be allowed, provided that the draft standard had been forwarded to the Commission on the basis of consensus, based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

**Review of the Rules of Procedure and Other Procedural Matters*****Responsibility for the Procedural Review***

18. The Commission decided that the procedural review would be undertaken by the Codex Committee on General Principles, at special sessions and under a limited time-frame. The Commission agreed that the Committee would need clear instructions, terms of reference from the Commission and support from the Codex Secretariat.

***Amendment of the Codex Mandate***

19. The Commission decided that the current Codex Mandate as expressed in Article 1 of the Statutes of the Commission should be retained but that it might be discussed in the future.

***Criteria for the establishment of work priorities***

20. The Commission requested the Codex Committee on General Principles to redraft the *Criteria for Work Priorities* to reflect the current priorities of the Commission and in a manner that would provide explicit judgment tools for assessing work proposals against priorities.

#### **1.4 FAO/WHO TRUST FUND FOR PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN CODEX STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURES**

21. The Commission welcomed the progress made on the FAO/WHO Trust Fund for Participation of Developing Countries in Codex Standard Setting Procedures and expressed the hope that it would achieve the desirable threshold before the end of 2003, so that it would be operational by the time of the next Session of the Commission.<sup>5</sup>

#### **2. DECISIONS OF THE 53<sup>rd</sup> SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (4-6 February 2004)<sup>6</sup>**

##### *New work proposals*

22. The Executive Committee recommended that all Committees proposing new work should prepare a project document following the format proposed by the Committee on General Principles (ALINORM 04/27/33, Appendix III).

#### **3. DECISIONS OF THE 26<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OF THE 50<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

##### **3.1 CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 8<sup>7</sup>**

###### *Draft Revised Standard for Cream and Prepared Creams*

23. The Commission agreed that the term “physical separation” in the description of Cream (Section 2.1) was meant to distinguish from solvent/chemical extraction and it encompassed both mechanical and natural (gravity/sedimentation) separation methods and decided to add this interpretation as a footnote to the Standard.

24. With this interpretation and some minor editorial changes, the Commission adopted the draft revised Standard for Cream and Cream Products at Step 8, as proposed by the Committee on Milk and Milk Products.

###### *Draft Revised Standard for Fermented Milks*

25. The Commission noted that the labelling provisions for heat treated fermented milks specifically differentiated these products from yoghurt and other fermented milk products with living microorganisms. It further noted that the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling after a long discussion had endorsed the labelling provisions of the standard without any amendments. The Commission recognized that the labelling provisions allowed for certain flexibility in permitting the use of national legislation. In this regard, it noted that although there was a remote possibility that a country under its national legislation could allow the sale and distribution in its territory of a product called “heat treated yoghurt”, this standard would not allow such a product to enter into the international trade unless similarly allowed by the national legislation of the importing country.

26. In view of the above, the Commission adopted the revised draft Standard for Fermented Milks at Step 8, as proposed by the Committee on Milk and Milk Products with some minor editorial changes.

27. In addition, the **Commission recommended that the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products consider new work on Fermented Milk Drinks.**

28. The Commission noted that the **Committee on Milk and Milk Products in undertaking work on fermented milk drinks, would need to decide whether this should be taken up as an addition to the current standard or as a new standard.**

29. This subject will be considered under Agenda Item 8 “Other Business and Future Work”.

---

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 03/41, para. 189.

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 04/27/3, para. 3.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras 94-102, 141 and Appendix V.

***Draft Revised Standard for Whey Powders***

30. The Commission noted that the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had not endorsed the provision of benzoyl peroxide as its proposed use in the standard was scheduled for JECFA evaluation in 2004. In recognizing the historical importance of the use of this substance in whey powders, the Commission agreed to include the following footnote in Section 4 - Food Additives.

*“Benzoyl peroxide will be included in the standard subject to satisfactory evaluation by JECFA in 2004.”*

31. The Commission adopted the draft revised standard for Whey Powders at Step 8 as proposed by the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products with the above footnote and a few editorial changes, especially in the Spanish version.

***Proposed Draft Amendment to the Codex General Standard for Cheese: Appendix***

32. Recognizing that the presence of wheat gluten and wheat protein products in cheese coatings can adversely affect the health of celiac patients, the Commission agreed to add a reference to the Codex Standard for Wheat Protein Products including Wheat Gluten in relation to the ingredients of cheese coatings. For this purpose the Commission added the following footnote to the first bullet point of Section “Cheese coating”.

*“Wheat gluten or wheat protein products should not be used for technological reasons e.g. coating or processing aids for foods which are gluten-free by nature - Codex Standard for Wheat Protein Products including Wheat Gluten (CODEX STAN 163-1987, Rev. 1-2001).”*

33. The Commission adopted the proposed draft Amendment to the Codex General Standard for Cheese: Appendix at Steps 5 and 8, with the omission of Step 6 and 7, with the above addition.

**3.2 CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 5<sup>8</sup>*****Proposed Draft Amendments to Section 3.3 “Composition” of the Codex General Standard for Cheese***

34. The Executive Committee adopted at Step 5 and advanced to Step 6 the above text as proposed by the Committee.

***Proposed Draft Standards for Sweetened Condensed Milk with Vegetable Fat/Blend of Sweetened Condensed Milk with Vegetable Fat; Evaporated Skimmed Milk with Vegetable Fat/Blend of Evaporated Skimmed Milk with Vegetable Fat; and, Skimmed Milk Powder with Vegetable Fat/Blend of Skimmed Milk Powder with Vegetable Fat***

35. The Executive Committee noted that the 5<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products had submitted the above Standards for adoption at Step 5 and that subsequent to this adoption a drafting group of the Committee would significantly revise the Standards on the basis of comments submitted at Step 6. In consideration that proposed draft standards submitted for adoption at Step 5 should be in an advanced form of elaboration and that extensive redrafting should be avoided as much as possible after adoption at Step 5, the Executive Committee returned the proposed draft Standards to Step 3. The Executive Committee noted that this decision would still allow consideration of the standards for final adoption at Step 5/8 at the Commission session in 2005.

**3.3 PROPOSAL FOR NEW WORK<sup>9</sup>**

36. The Executive Committee approved the following proposals as new work for the Committee: Proposed Draft *Standard for Processed Cheese*, Proposed Draft *Model Export Certificate for Milk and Milk Product* and Proposed Draft *Revised Codex Standard for Whey Cheeses*.

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 03/3A, para. 71, 74 and Appendix II.

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 03/3A, para. 64 and Appendix III.

### 3.4 REVOCATION OF ADOPTED STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS<sup>10</sup>

37. The Commission revoked the *Codex Standard for Yoghurt (Yogurt) and Sweetened Yoghurt (Yogurt)* (CODEX STAN A-11(a)-1975) and *Codex Standard for Flavoured Yoghurt (Yogurt) and Products Heat-Treated after Fermentation* (CODEX STAN A-11(b)-1976).

### 3.5 OTHERS<sup>11</sup>

38. The Commission adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants to revise the footnote to the maximum level for lead in milk to read “a concentration factor applies to partially or wholly dehydrated milk”.

39. The Commission adopted the Draft Amendment to the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods: Class Names as proposed by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (i.e. Milk Protein: Milk products containing a minimum of 50% of milk protein (m/m) in dry matter - . Calculation of milk protein content : Kjeldahl nitrogen x 6.38).

## 4. DECISIONS OF CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

### 4.1 CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES AND CONTAMINANTS

#### 35<sup>th</sup> Session, 17-21 March 2003<sup>12</sup>

#### *Endorsement and/or Revision of Maximum Levels for Food Additives in Codex Standards*

40. The CCFAC endorsed the food additive provisions in the draft Revised Standard for Whey Powders. In discussing the food additive provisions of the draft Revised Codex Standard for Creams and Prepared Creams and the draft Revised Codex Standard for Fermented Milks, the CCFAC noted that the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products had decided to include a generic table based on food additive functional classes and food product categories in addition to the specific food additive listings in both Standards.

41. In this regard, it was noted that the specific food additive listings in the draft Revised Codex Standard for Cream and Prepared Creams had been previously endorsed<sup>13</sup> by the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the CCFAC and therefore, no further action was required. In regard to the draft revised Codex Standard for Fermented Milks, it was noted that the CCFAC had not endorsed the specific food additive listings in the Standard and therefore, the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products decided to remove these specific food additive listings from the Standard for the time being.

42. The Committee expressed general support for the generic table approach taken in the draft Revised Codex Standard for Fermented Milks and the Draft Revised Codex Standard for Creams and Prepared Creams in addition to the specific listing of food additives and their respective use levels in the Standards.

43. However, for the proper assessment of specific maximum levels, it was reaffirmed that information on the specific listing of food additives and their respective use levels was still required from Codex Commodity Committees in the endorsement process and in the context of the General Standard for Food Additives and that a co-ordination process was necessary.

---

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 03/41, para. 137 and Appendix VII.

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras 198 and 67.

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 03/12A, paras 30-33.

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 01/12A, para. 42.

**36<sup>th</sup> Session, 26-30 March 2004**<sup>14</sup>***Active chlorine***

44. The Committee agreed to request FAO and WHO to convene a Joint Expert Consultation to conduct a comprehensive risk assessment of use of active chlorine, taking into account both benefits and risks. It agreed that a Working Group would prepare clear terms of reference for the expert consultation for the aspects relevant to CCFAC for discussion at its next meeting. It was also agreed **to request relevant Committees**, including the Codex Committee on food Hygiene, **to consider safety/benefits issues relevant to uses of active chlorine within their respective purviews and ask those Committee to elaborate terms of reference for the expert consultation within their mandate and pose questions** so that the expert consultation is comprehensive.

45. This subject will be considered under Agenda item 8 “Other Business and Future Work”.

***Food Category System of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives***

46. The Committee forwarded the draft Food Category System of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8.

***Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead***

47. The Committee forwarded the draft Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead in foods to the Commission for final adoption at Step 8.

**4.2 CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE (36<sup>th</sup> Session, 29 March – 3 April 2004)**<sup>15</sup>

48. The Committee forwarded the Code of Hygienic Practice for Milk and Milk Product to the Commission for final adoption to Step 8. It also requested the Commission to revoke the Code of Hygienic Practice for Dried Milk (CAC/RCP 31-1983), which provisions were covered by the new Code.

**4.3 CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING (31<sup>st</sup> Session, 28 April – 2 May 2003)**<sup>16</sup>***Endorsement of Labelling Provisions in Codex Standards***

49. The Committee endorsed the labelling provisions in draft Standards for Whey Powders and Fermented Milks as proposed. It endorsed the labelling provisions and amended sections 7.1.2 and 7.2 to read “The milk fat content shall be declared *in accordance with national legislation...*” for clarification purposes in the draft Standard for Cream and Prepared Creams.

**4.4 CODEX COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING****24<sup>th</sup> Session, 18-22 November 2002**<sup>17</sup>***Endorsement of Methods of Analysis in Commodity Standards*****General issues**

50. The Committee confirmed that the methods proposed by Codex commodity and general committees for endorsement should correspond to provisions in Codex standards or standards in the elaboration procedure. The Committee agreed that in application of the procedure, the methods that did not correspond to a specific provision could not be considered for endorsement.

51. The Committee recalled that when equivalent methods exist, they should all be listed, and the organisations concerned were invited to provide the relevant references for inclusion in the list of methods.

---

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 04/27/12.

<sup>15</sup> ALINORM 04/27/13.

<sup>16</sup> ALINORM 03/22A, paras. 12, 13 and 19.

<sup>17</sup> ALINORM 03/23, paras 54-56, 59 and Appendix VI (part C).

52. The Committee recognized that all information on the validation of methods should be available and that methods should be fully traceable, as it was important to check that this information existed and was available to users, when deciding on the endorsement of methods.

#### Specific issues

53. **The Committee noted that there was no reply from the Committee on Milk and Milk Products to some earlier questions and did not endorse the methods concerned, pending further clarification from the Committee.** Method AOAC 947.05 was temporarily endorsed, pending clarification on the type of the method required. The other methods were endorsed and additional references to equivalent methods were added where necessary. The Committee endorsed the equivalent methods proposed as Type I for milk fat in dried matter for cottage cheese only, noting that other methods had been endorsed as Type I for individual cheeses.

54. This subject will be considered under Agenda Item 8 (a) “Methods of Analysis and Sampling for Milk and Milk Products”. The Status of Endorsement of Methods of Analysis and Sampling is attached as Appendix I.

#### 25<sup>th</sup> Session, 8-12 March 2004<sup>18</sup>

##### *The Use of Analytical Results: Sampling Plans, Relationship Between the Analytical Results, the Measurement Uncertainty, Recovery Factors and Provisions in Codex Standards*

55. It was proposed to forward the document to the Committee on General Principles for their endorsement and subsequent adoption by the Commission and inclusion in the Procedural Manual as guidance to the Codex Commodity Committees. However the Committee noted that although the document was substantively improved, several issues remained to be addressed and there was a need for further consideration therefore decided to request comments on the current version and consider it at the next session of the Committee. **It also agreed that the advice of Commodity Committee would be sought on this document.**

This subject will be considered under Agenda Item 8 “Other Business and Future Work”. The document “The Use of Analytical Results: Sampling Plans, Relationship Between the Analytical Results, the Measurement Uncertainty, Recovery Factors and Provisions in Codex Standards” is attached as Appendix II

#### **4.5 CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS**<sup>19</sup>

56. The Committee returned the proposed draft Revised Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Program for the Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods, including the Appendix on the Prevention and Control of Drug Residues in Milk and Milk Products to Step 2, for revision by a drafting group and further consideration at its 15<sup>th</sup> Session.

#### **5. OTHER MATTERS**

##### Codex Guidelines for the Preservation of Raw Milk by Use of the Lactoperoxidase System (CAC/GL 13-1991)

##### *Executive Committee (50<sup>th</sup> Session)*<sup>20</sup>

57. The Executive Committee noted the request of the Global Lactoperoxidase Group of Experts to provide a scientific and/or technical basis for restricting the use and application of lactoperoxidase in international trade and recalled that the Guidelines had been originally developed by the Committee on Food Hygiene.

---

<sup>18</sup> ALINORM 04/27/23, para. 135 and Appendix VII.

<sup>19</sup> ALINORM 03/31A, paras 71-72 and 85.

<sup>20</sup> ALNORM 03/3A, paras 86-88.



58. The Executive Committee agreed that this might be of particular interest to developing countries and invited Regional Coordinating Committees to ask the views of member countries on the use of that system, the relevance of the current Codex Guidelines and the need for their revision.

59. The Executive Committee recognized that all relevant health aspects of this complex issue should be considered in order to ensure that any revision of current provisions was based on risk analysis. The Executive Committee therefore agreed to ask the Committee on Food Hygiene to consider whether the provisions restricting the use of the lactoperoxidase system in international trade should be retained and whether the current Guidelines should be revised. The Executive Committee also noted that the initial evaluation by JECFA covered the process but that the chemicals used would require further evaluation, and agreed to ask JECFA to undertake a new risk assessment of the lactoperoxidase system, in order to ensure an updated scientific basis for further decision.

*Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (35<sup>th</sup> Session)*<sup>21</sup>

60. The Committee noted that this matter had been considered at the Regional Coordinating Committees<sup>22</sup> and despite the fact that the system was currently used in some countries, there was little support for its use for products intended for international trade.

61. Most delegations were of the view that this system should continue to be restricted to use in countries where appropriate refrigeration facilities were not available and did not support the use of the system for international trade purposes. In addition, the microbiological data were not clear in order to determine how effective this system was for the control of food borne pathogens and what the microbiological consequences would be of its long use.

62. The Committee concluded that the current restrictions excluding the use of the lactoperoxidase system for products intended for international trade should continue to be applied and therefore, there was no need for the revision of the existing Guidelines in the framework of Codex. In view of this decision, the Committee noted that a JECFA review was not requested.

*Codex Alimentarius Commission (26<sup>th</sup> Session)*<sup>23</sup>

63. The Commission recalled the request to examine the use of Lactoperoxidase system for the preservation of raw milk for products intended for international trade originating from the Committee on Milk and Milk Products and the request of an expert FAO group to examine amendments to the Guidelines. The Commission noted clarification provided by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene and **endorsed** its views as follows:

- the system should continue to be restricted to use in countries where appropriate refrigeration facilities were not available and not for international trade purposes;
- microbiological data were not clear in order to determine how effective this system was for the control of food borne pathogens and what the microbiological consequences would be of its long-term use;
- concluded that the current restrictions excluding the use of the lactoperoxidase system for products intended for international trade should continue to be applied;
- there was no need for the revision of the existing Guidelines and that a JECFA review was not needed.

64. The Commission also noted that future consideration of this matter would depend on the availability of adequate microbiological and chemical risk assessments of process.

---

<sup>21</sup> ALINORM 03/13A, paras 10-12.

<sup>22</sup> ALINORM 03/19 para. 8; ALINORM 03/32 paras 9-12; ALINORM 03/28 paras 13-17; and, ALINORM 03/36 paras 15-16.

<sup>23</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras 221-222.

***Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (36<sup>th</sup> Session)***<sup>24</sup>

65. The Delegation of Cuba informed the Committee that it was undertaking research on the use of lactoperoxidase system and that Cuba would provide the updated scientific information when available. In the light of the above, the Delegation reiterated their request to reconsider the exclusion of milk and milk products treated by using the lactoperoxidase system for international trade.

---

<sup>24</sup> ALINORM 04/27/13.

## STATUS OF ENDORSEMENT OF METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

## c. CODEX COMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

## 1. Methods of analysis referred back to CCMMP

COMMODITY	PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCIPLE	Note	Type	Status
Fermented milks	Lactic acid	IDF 150:1991 ISO 11869:1997	Potentiometry, titration to pH 8.30	CCMMP should indicate whether the IDF method determines total acidity or lactic acid as in the provision		NE
		AOAC 937.05 AOAC 947.05	Spectrophotometry (for lactic acid in milk & milk products)	CCMMP should clarify what type method is requested since there cannot be two type II methods.	II	TE
	Microorganisms constituting the starter culture	IDF 149A:1997 (Annex A)	Colony count at 25°C, 30°C, 37°C and 45°C according to the starter organism in question	CCMMP should clarify whether a collaborative study has been performed and the type of the method.		NE
Yoghurt	<i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i> & <i>Lactobacillus delbrueckii</i> subsp. <i>Bulgaricus</i> ≥ 10 <sup>7</sup> cfu/g	IDF 117B:1997 ISO 7889	Colony count at 37°C	Same question as above		NE
Yoghurt	<i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i> & <i>Lactobacillus delbrueckii</i> subsp. <i>bulgaricus</i> ≥ 10 <sup>7</sup> cfu/g	IDF 146:1991 ISO 9232	Test for identification	Same question as above		NE

## 2. Methods of analysis proposed for standards under elaboration (advanced to Step 5 or 8)

COMMODITY	PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCIPLE	Note	Type	Status
<b>Cream and Prepared Creams</b>	Milk protein	ISO 8968-1   IDF20-1:2001 AOAC 991.20	Titrimetry (Kjeldahl)		I	E
<b>Whey powders</b>	Milk protein	ISO 8968-1   IDF 20-1:2001 AOAC 991.20	Titrimetry (modified Kjeldahl)		I	E
	Water (not including water of crystallization of lactose)	IDF 26A:1993 AOAC 927.05	Gravimetry		I	E
<b>Fermented milks</b>	Protein	ISO 8968-1   IDF 20-1:2001 AOAC 991.20	Titrimetry (Kjeldahl)		I	E
	Milk fat	ISO 1211:1999 IDF 1D:1996 AOAC 905.02	Gravimetry		I	E

## 3. Amendments to methods of analysis in adopted standards

COMMODITY	PROVISION	METHOD	PRINCIPLE	Note	Type	Status
<b>Cottage cheese</b>	Milk fat in dry matter	IDF 126A:1988 ISO 8262-3:1987	Gravimetry (Weibull-Berntrop)		I	E
<b>Individual cheeses</b>	Dry matter (Total solids)	IDF 4A:1982 ISO 5534:1985 AOAC 926.08 applicable to all cheese	Gravimetry, drying at 102°C	CCMMP should clarify the difference in results with the previous method		NE

**ALINORM 04/27/23  
APPENDIX VII****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.