

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 4(b)

CX/PFV 08/24/5-Add.1
August 2008

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

24th Session

Arlington, VA (Washington DC metro area), U.S.A.,
15 – 20 September 2008

**PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXES SPECIFIC TO CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES (draft Codex
General Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables)**

Comments at Step 3 from Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba and Kenya

BRASIL

Brazil is disappointed that the Working Group had not considered the Brazilian comments sent in response to the CL 2007/22-PFV as they were only the endorsement of its previously accepted comments to the Part B of CL 2006/56-PFV.

The attached annex on palmitos draft standard circulated for comments on message CX 5/5.2 had all the accepted Brazilian comments – message Fw: CX 5/5.2 - /CCPFV/24: Working Group Canned Vegetables Sent: Monday, February 04, 2008 12:00 PM.

Brazil wants to express that besides frustration, this procedure also caused confusion among its private sector that have been putting in very long hours for a World-wide Codex Standard as stated on Part 3 of the Procedural Manual – “Uniform Procedure for the elaboration of Codex Standards and related texts”.

Nevertheless Brazil wants to highlight that relies the fact to the high workload of the Working Group, dealing with eight different and complex products.

Furthermore, according to Para. 13 of CX/PFV 08/24/2, to get the various annexes on track, Brazil would like to endorse that the Committee should consider the adoption of a structured and effective inter-session e-working mechanism.

Therefore Brazil wants to bring to the Committee the possibility of splitting this working group in two or more sub-coordinated working groups to deal with the very different eight products.

Brazil wants to remember that although not invited now for drafting the annex on palmitos, the current CODEX STANDARD FOR CANNED PALMITO - CODEX STAN 144-1985 -, was a fruit of the Brazilian collaboration, as Brazil is the main producer and consumer. The annual exports (2007) are about US\$ 13,765,135.00 and 2,846,902 Kg, less than 10% of national production.

The circulation of the annex on palmitos not considering the current Codex Standard, that works, without an evidence-based assessment is also a point to be raised during discussions.

Within the proposed values for the minimum drained weight and labeling, attained to the necessary comments on possible implications of the proposed draft standard for economic interest, as stated on Part 3 of the Procedural Manual, Brazil aims to forward again the proposed comments to the draft standard, sharing the experience of a country that has at least five different species of palmitos being marketed.

Draft Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables (general provisions).

In regard to the PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEX ON PALM (CX/PFV 08/24/5 ANNEXE V pp 18-19), Brazil still would like to share its knowledge in the product, aiming more clearness and certitude to the document.

Comments:

Section and sentence/paragraph	Type of change	Rationale	Proposed changes
Draft Annexe on Palm (Annexe V)	Clarification	<p>Current draft was issued without sufficiently detailed relevant information with particular regard to an evidence-based assessment to differentiate it from the current Standard.</p> <p>CODEX STAN 144-1985 is working without prejudice to trade and was not considered to drafting the current Annex.</p>	<p>Present an evidence-based assessment that supports current version of Annex V, showing all the benefits against the CODEX STAN 144-1985.</p> <p>Adopt CODEX STAN 144-1985 as Annex V, for discussion among Member Countries.</p>
Title	Clarification	<p>Although CODEX STAN 144-1985 refers to CODEX STANDARD FOR CANNED PALMITO the actual proposal changed the well known name of palmito to palm, without any justification.</p>	<p>Considers returning to the previous title Palmito with the original comment “(in some countries, canned hearts of palm)” leads to more certitude.</p>
3.1. Weights and Measures	Technical	<p>Brazil reinforces the necessity of altering this parameter as the width of palms from <i>Euterpe oleraceae</i>, largely processed in Brazil, is higher than 25 mm, turning impossible the achievement of the proposed values of 58 or 59% minimum drained weight.</p>	<p>Palm hearts – 50%</p> <p>Other styles – 52%</p>
		<p>Alternatively a change in mind from a style oriented reference to a container oriented reference may be more appropriate.</p> <p>For example containers up to 600 mL (0.5 Kg) can achieve at least 50% of minimum drained weight for all styles.</p> <p>Containers with capacity above 600 mL (0.5Kg) can achieve at least 60% of minimum drained weight.</p>	<p>Consider changing from a style oriented to a container oriented provision.</p>

Further comments on Labeling:

As stated during 23rd Session of CCPFV (ALINORM 07/30/27, Para. 105), Brazil would like to reinforce that the maintenance of the word “wild” does not reflect an actual quality criteria for the product.

Brazil considers that the change of the terminology “wild” from product definition to the labeling provision in the proposed draft may be deleterious for the advancement of the document.

Brazil reinforces that the distinction between wild and cultivated palms is a poor simplification that may be stated as a barrier to trade among other issues raised by other Delegations.

To make a parallel what if cheeses were standardized as only being from raw or pasteurized milk.

Bringing another example, Brazil developed and is increasingly adopting technology to obtain palm hearts from wild *Euterpe oleraceae* in multiple cuts, and palmitos may be obtained from *Euterpe edulis* cuts, also a wild palm, forbidden in Brazil due to environmental regulations. Although both are considered wild, the taste differs being the adoption of the terminology “wild” not an effective contribution to differentiate palmitos. There are also wild palm trees with bitter palmitos.

Section and sentence/paragraph	Type of change	Rationale	Proposed changes
4 LABELLING	Technical	To allow consumer attainment to preferred or better quality palms, Brazil proposes that the common name of the species used be declared on the label. Therefore consumers are allowed to choose and differentiate palmitos for taste that is what really matters when dealing with food, and not if obtained from a cultivated, managed or extractive origin.	Proposal: 4 LABELLING: [Palms designation should be composed of the word “Palmito” or “Palm” followed by the common name of the species.]

COSTA RICA

Costa Rica would like to thank the opportunity to submit our comments on this proposal, and wish to say the following,

About annex “proposed draft annex of palm” (annexe v) costa rica suggest eliminate the size grading table for heart palms in terms of their diameter, due to its lack of practical use by trade practices.

In the same annexe, on the labelling section, costa rica suggests to include the following sentence,

The name “palm hearts” may be complement by the word “cultivated” when cultivated palms are used.

CUBA

1st. question – SCOPE

Paragraph 8. There is an agreement to elaborate one General Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables that covers the individual standards for the mentioned vegetables.

Paragraph 9. We consider correct and flexible the used of the term “certain”, as it gives the possibility to incorporate it into future Committee work involving other similar vegetables into this General Standard.

Paragraph 10. We suggest not to add into the Agenda either the individual standards of Canned Bamboo Shoots or Canned Mushrooms in view of the restricted schedule and heavy workload, as this would hinder the current work development. This proposal could be part of future work, given the flexibility that already exists in the current wording of the scope.

2^a Question – Inclusion of a specific annex for dried beans

Paragraph 13. We agree with the statement.

Paragraph 14. We agree that the CCPFV should consider in its future sessions a revision of the existing standards for processed fruits and vegetables, e.g. dried fruits and vegetables, quick frozen fruits and vegetables, existing individual Codes of Practice, etc.

3^a Question – Approach to food additives in the General Standard for Certain Canned Vegetables vis-à-vis the Annexes and the General Standard for Food Additives.

It is necessary to review the food additive list, and it should be discussed by the CCPFV, so it could issue its comments based on their technological function, as well as a based technical reasoning.

4^a Question – In regard of the provisions for styles and sizing of the canned vegetables, it is true that these provisions do not have an impact on food safety, but it is necessary to respect the purposes of the Codex Alimentarius and therefore grant fair practices in the trading of this goods, so they should be maintained.

COMMENTS TO THE PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXES SPECIFIC TO CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES

ANNEX I – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXE ON ASPARAGUS

1.2.2 (1) Agree to include violet color

(2) 50 %

(3) 25 %

Regarding the size classification Table,

(2) From 6-8 mm

(3) From 8-10 mm

(4) Up to 10 mm

2.1.2 (4) 5 % in number

(6) 10 % in number

ANNEX II – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXE ON CARROTS

1.2 (5) (6) (7) (8) - We agree with the proposed limits.

2.1.2 (1) (3) (4) (6) – 15 %

(7) – 1 piece per 100 g of total content in the container.

3.1 (1) 56.5 %

ANNEX III – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXE ON GREEN BEANS OR WAX BEANS

1.2 (2) No less than 20 mm

Grading Requirements Table

(1) 10 %

(3) 8 %

(4) 8 %

2.1.2 Defects and Allowances – Agree with Proposal 2.

3.1 (1) (2) (3) – 50 % minimum

ANNEXES IV, V, VI – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEXE FOR GREEN PEAS, PALM AND MATURE PROCESSED PEAS.

We do not issue any comments regarding the above stated annexes.

ANNEX VII – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEX ON SWEET CORN

2.1.1 (a) It should be clarified the term “native” assigned to starch, if it regards to the natural corn starch stemming from the same processed corn or form a different one, if it is the natural corn starch, it should be differentiated from the modified starch admitted in the additives list.

(b) - 10 %

ANNEX VIII – PROPOSED DRAFT ANNEX ON BABY CORN OR YOUNG CORN

3.1 We agree with this proposal.

KENYA

Annex I

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES

CARROTS

Comment

1. We propose that this standard be given scope to guide members when giving their comments and to be consistent to codex manual procedure standard format.

Defects Definition

comments

Tolerances as a percentage of the drained product weight

1. We propose the number and the title table to be given.

2. In the table given we propose that number 7 below be retained without any changes and the bracket to be opened to read as follows.

(7) Foreign vegetal matter vegetal substance from the carrot or any other innocuous vegetal matter. 1 piece per 1000 g of total content in the container

3.kenya would like to introduced two grades in this table of which one is more superior than the other one, that is grade one and grade two.Therefore in this case the total amount of defects from (1) to (6) in the table shall not exceed 35% and 15% respectively.

Comment

Defects(3),(4) and (6) donot apply to diced,round,stips,double-sized diced; for these presentations the total amount of defects (1),(2), and (5) shall not exceed ~~[25%]~~~~[10%]~~ 20% and 10%respectively for both grade one and grade two of the drained products weight,the initial variance given was quite large.

3.1 MINIMUM DRAINED WEIGHT

comment

We propose that the table be given the title and number.

Styles	Minimum drained weight (%)
(1) Whole carrots	56.5 (average diameter>22 mm) [62.5] [56.5] (average diameter < 22 mm) <i>Kenya proposes to retain the figure at 62.5;carrot being dense more drain weight can be achieved.</i>
(2) Halves, Baby whole carrots	62.5
3) Lengthways portions	52.0
(4) Diced, double-size diced	62.5
(5) Strips	56.5
(6) Quarters, pieces, rounds	56.5
(7) Chunk or pieces	56.5
(8) Finger cuts	62.5

Annex II

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES GREEN BEANS OR WAX BEANS

(AT STEP 3)

1.2 STYLES

Green beans and wax beans come in the following shapes and sizes:

(1) Whole: whole pods of any length.

Comment

Kenya proposes to retain the unstirred phrase below

(2) Cut/broken: pieces cut widthways with respect to the longitudinal axis;[approximately uniform pieces of 20 mm] [no less than 20 mm] [at most 50 mm and at least 10 mm].

Grading Requirements for Beans (French Beans or Wax Beans

comments

1. We propose that the table to be given title and number.

2. We propose the maximum percentage as indicated under ‘kenya comments’.

Categories Grading Criterion

(mm)

Maximum percentage

(m/m of non conforming beans) **kenya comments**

(1) Extra small 6.5 [10%] ----	[8]
(2) Very small 8.0 [10%] -----	[8]
(3) Small 9.0 [15%][8%] -----	[10]
(4) Medium 10.5 [25%][8%] -----	[15]
(5) Large Out of grade	
(6) Not screened Not screened (*) Natural breakdown of the size beans (*)	

(*) Not screened: beans in the natural proportion of size after cleaning, without the removal or addition of screened beans.

ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS

2.1.2 Defects and Allowances

The following limitations of defects are expressed in percentages, and related to the drained weight of the product.

When tested in accordance with the appropriate sampling plan with an AQL of 6.5, canned beans shall be free of defects to the extent indicated below:

Proposal 1

We propose the following comments as follows:

Defects	<u>Kenya comments</u>
(1) Extra small French beans 2, 3, 3, 3, 1,	[8] [4]
(2) Very small French beans 3, 3, 3, 3, 3,	[10] [6]
(3) Small French beans 3, 3, 3, 3, 3,	[10] [8]
(4) Small wax beans 3, 3, 3, 3, 3,	[10] [8]
(5) Medium French beans 3, 3, 4, 4, 4,	[15] [10]
(6) Medium wax beans 3 3 4 4 4	[15] [10]
(7) Green beans 3 3 5 5 5 20	
(8) Wax beans 3 3 5 5 5 20	

3.1 MINIMUM DRAINED WEIGHT

We propose the following comments as indicated in number one and two below:

Styles Minimum drained weight (%)

- (1) Whole [50] [~~52~~]
- (2) Other presentations, except strips [~~54~~] [52]

Annex III

3. PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES ASPARAGUS (AT STEP 3)

1.1 PRODUCT DEFINITION

The name “asparagus” stands for the product prepared from the tender portions of peeled or unpeeled stems of varieties of asparagus complying with the characteristics of *Asparagus officinalis* L.

We propose the following comments as indicated below:

1.2 STYLES

1.2.1 Asparagus comes in the following shapes and sizes:

~~[Long shoots or long spears]~~ or ~~[asparagus]~~ or ~~[whole spears]~~: tip and adjoining part of the spear measuring at most 18 cm and at least 12 cm in length.

~~[Shoots or spears]~~ or ~~[short asparagus]~~ or [whole short spears]: tip and adjoining part of the spear measuring at most 12 cm and at least 7 cm in length.

Asparagus tips: upper extremity (bud) and adjoining part of spears measuring at most [10.5 cm] ~~[7 cm]~~ and at least ~~[4 cm]~~ [3 cm] in length.

Cut asparagus: spears cut widthways into sections measuring at most 7 cm and at least 2 cm in length.

Cut asparagus with tips: the percentage of tips shall be equal to or greater than [15%] ~~[20%]~~ of the drained weight. Cut asparagus without tips: the occasional presence of tips is allowed.

1.2.2 Asparagus are canned as follows in terms of their colour:

White asparagus: white, cream or yellowish spears; [no more than 20% in number of spears may have violet, green, light green or yellowish green tips].

White asparagus with violet or green tips: white, cream or yellowish white asparagus may have violet, green, light green or yellowish green tips, and these colours may also apply to the adjoining region, but no more than 25% in number of the units may present these colours over more than [20%] ~~[50%]~~ of their length.

Green asparagus: the units are green, light green or yellowish green; no more than 20% in number of the units may present a white, cream or yellowish white colour in the lower part of the spear over more than [20%] ~~[50%]~~ of their length.

Comment

We are pleased to comment on the text as follows:

1.Hollow asparagus

hollow units to the extent that they seriously impair the product aspect and fibrous, tough asparagus.

~~[10% or 5 % in number]~~for the defect (4) or ~~[15% in number for hollow asparagus, and 10% for fibrous asparagus]~~

Damaged asparagus by a colour defect, a mechanical lesion, a disease, or damaged by any other means to the extent that the aspect or the edibility of the product is seriously impaired.

~~[10%] ~~[15%]~~~~ in number Total of all the defects described in (3), (4), (5), (6), for the following types of presentation:

Annex IV

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES

GREEN PEAS

(AT STEP 3)

PRODUCT DEFINITION

The name “green peas” stands for the product prepared from immature (green) seeds of *Pisum sativum* L. peas, of the smooth, wrinkled varieties, or other types (crosses or hybrids of the wrinkled of round seeded varieties).

When the peas are of sweet green wrinkled varieties or hybrids having similar characteristics, the name is “sweet green peas”.

Defects Definition

We are happy to give our comment as follows:

Maximum Limits (based on the weight of drained peas)

(1) Blemished peas consisting of peas which are slightly stained or spotted. ~~[5% m/m] [3% m/m]~~, we propose the bracket to be opened.

(3) Pea fragments consisting of portions of peas; separated or individual cotyledons; crushed, partial, or broken cotyledons; and loose skins; but not including entire intact peas with skins detached.

~~[10% m/m]~~ [5% m/m], we propose the bracket to be opened.

(5) Extraneous plant material consisting of any vine or leaf or pod material from the pea plant, or other harmless plant material not purposely added as an ingredient.

0.5% m/m Total of the foregoing defects (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) ~~[12% m/m]~~ [10% m/m], we propose the bracket to be opened.

Annex V

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES

PALM

(AT STEP 3)

1.2

STYLES

Palm is presented in the following table:

Size Designations Criteria

comment

Thickness is measured *[at the median part](e.g shoots, tips etc) [the thickest part]* of the unit perpendicularly to the longitudinal axis. **This is to avoid over maturity of the product.**

2 ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS

2.1 QUALITY CRITERIA

2.1.1 Uniformity

(1) Length: the specifications laid down in Section 1.2 concerning the types of presentation of palm are met when:

comment

(b) The length of units is reasonably uniform. On the basis of the average of samples and subject to compliance with the provisions of Section 1.2, “reasonably uniform” means that the gap between the length of all the units and the predominant length does not exceed approximately $\pm [5] \pm [10]$ mm and the gap between the thickness of all the units and the predominant thickness does not exceed [5mm] ~~[10mm]~~.

comment

(2) Diameter: When a product is said to be, presented or sold as complying with the individual grade provisions laid down in Section 1.2 (table), the sampling unit or the container is considered as complying with the specified diameter for each individual size provided when no more than ~~[30%]~~ [20%] in number for products from cultivated palms, belong to the group (or groups) of adjacent sizes.

3.1 MINIMUM DRAINED WEIGHT

comment

Styles Minimum drained weight (%)

We propose to retain the figure as it is, 58.

Hearts, shoots (or palm), stems, palm tips [58]

Annex VI**PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES****MATURE PROCESSED PEAS**

1 DESCRIPTION

1.1 PRODUCT DEFINITION

The name “mature processed peas” stands for the product prepared using clean, sound, whole, threshed, and dried grains of the species *Pisum sativum L.*, which has undergone soaking, but excluding the macrosorum subvariety.

comment

(4) Foreign vegetal matter: any fragment of tendril, peduncle, leaf or pod and any other foreign matter. 0.5 m/m
The total of the defects (1), (2), (3) and (4) should not exceed [15% m/m] [~~20% m/m~~] by weight.

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES -SWEET CORN**(AT STEP 3)**

1.1 PRODUCT DEFINITION

The name “sweet corn” stands for the product prepared from clean and sound grains of sweet corn, of white or yellow colour, complying with the characteristics of *Zea mays saccharata L.* Whole grains packaged with or without a liquid packing media. Creamed corn: whole or partially whole cut kernels packed in a creamy component from the corn kernels, and other liquid or other ingredients, in accordance with the Section 2.1, so as to form a product of creamy consistency

2 ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS

2.1.1

comment**Other Permitted Ingredients**

We have no problem using native starch from cream corn so the closed bracket can be opened.

(a)[Native starch from creamed corn]

Defects Definition Tolerances m/m (%)**comment****we propose as follows:**

(1) Foreign vegetal matter [Fragments of cobs, awns(or silks), husks, foreign grains or a different variety of sweet corn.] OR [Fragments of cobs, husks, foreign grains or a different variety of sweet corn]~~[0.2]~~ [0.5] for both[0.1] [Awns(or silks)] [0.1] **This is a vegetable matter and it should cover Awns,silk,husks etc.**

comment

(4) Split grains or empty skins entirely open grains. [5] ~~[10]~~

3.1 MINIMUM DRAINED WEIGHT

Styles Minimum drained weight (%)

comment

We propose packing medium of 66 because vacuum packed absorbs more soluble solids in it.

With a liquid packing medium 66 ~~[64]~~ Vacuum packaged or without a liquid packing medium 67

Annex VIII**PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CERTAIN CANNED VEGETABLES BABY CORN OR YOUNG CORN****(AT STEP 3)****1.1 PRODUCT DEFINITION**

We would like to propose the name to be ‘canned baby corn’. The title of the standard states that the product is canned so it is important for that word ‘canned’ to be reflected in the name of the product and it will also be inconsistent with the General codex labelling standard.

The name “baby corn” or “~~young corn~~” stands for the product prepared from selected young corn cob without pollination of commercial varieties conforming to the characteristics of *Zea mays L.*, from which silk and husk are removed [OR canned vegetables for canned baby corn].

1.2**STYLES**

Baby corn comes in the following styles:

(1) Canned-baby corn in whole style may be designated according to size in the following manner.

comment

We would propose the following:

Cob Size Length (cm) Diameter (cm)

(1) Extra large 10 – 13 ~~>1.8~~ [1.8 - 2.5]

This is to control the over maturity of the baby corn.

ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS**Definition of Defects and Allowances****2.1.2.1 Cut Baby Corn**

Defects Maximum limits in drained weight

(sample size 1 kg)

(1) Over/under size 5%

(2) Discolour 5%

(3) Peel 5%

(4) Silk 20 cm of broken silks put together

comment

We propose that the total defects to be 15% for quality products and that means the individual defects mentioned above should not be increased above the maximum limits indicated above.

(5) **TOTAL DEFECTS without (4) ~~[20%]~~ [15%]**