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 7 **CX/PFV 10/25/8Rev.**
June 2010

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES
25th Session
Bali, Indonesia,
25 – 29 October 2010

FOOD ADDITIVE PROVISIONS FOR PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES:
Additional provisions in selected adopted standards

Comments in reply to CL 2008/31-PFV : Part B from
Australia, Brazil, European Union and WPTC

AUSTRALIA

This work is progressed in Alinorm 09/32/27, Appendix VII, which invites comments justifying the technological need for a number of food additives in each of the above-named standards, with a view toward possible inclusion in the standards at a later stage.

General comments

Australia supports the recommendation of the 58th session of the Executive Committee, as enforced by the 28th session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, that "the GSFA should be the single authoritative reference point for food additives and this should be made clear in all commodity standards" (Alinorm 05/28/3A paragraph 56 [15]). To this end, development of food additive lists in commodity standards should be restricted as much as possible.

Therefore Australia recommends that the committee adheres to the recommended format for commodity standards as laid out in the Procedural Manual[1].

> *[Food additive] section should contain a general reference to the corresponding section of the General Standard for Food Additives which should take the following form:*
>
> > *"[Food Additive functional class] used in accordance with*
> >
> > *Tables 1 and 2 of the Codex General Standard of Food Additives in food category x.x.x.x [food category name] or listed in Table 3 of the General Standard for Food Additives are acceptable for use in foods conforming to this standard."*

Australia believes that the work of this committee would be more effective if it followed this format in recommending to the Codex Committee for Food Additives which functional classes of additives should be allowed for individual commodities. CCFA is recognised as the committee with the responsibility and scientific expertise to assess individual additives and their levels in line with its risk assessment principles and the Preamble of the GSFA.

Specific comments

If the committee is intent on assessing all additives in the relevant functional classes for possible inclusion in the standards at a later stage, notwithstanding guidance to the contrary from the Commission and as outlined in the Procedural Manual, Australia would like it to be noted that the technological need for a large proportion of these additives has already been justified in the process of their inclusion in the relevant commodity standards and/or the GSFA.

Australia suggests that the committee should accept the previous deliberations of Codex on these additive provisions, rather than repeating assessments already conducted.

BRAZIL

In regard to the Alinorm 09/32/27, especially its Annex VII, Brazil would like to share some general and specific comments:

PICKLED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Antioxidants

INS 315 – the food category for which the additive is permitted is not specified. The INS 315 is listed in GSFA Table 3 and, therefore, its use should be based on the GMP. However, the subcategory 04.2.2.7 is in the Table 3 Annex. It means that the use of INS 315 is not unrestricted for this food category and it would be possible only if provisions were included in tables 1 and 2. The INS 315 is not listed in these tables for the category 04.2.2.7.

Colours

Brazil doesn't support the use of artificial colours in fruit and vegetable products.

INS 127: Taking into account the ADI of 0.1 mg/kg b.w. for erythrosine, which indicates that the consumption of small daily portions of foods containing this colour can exceed the ADI, Brazil recommends to restrict the use of erythrosine to specific categories for which the consumption isn't so high and when the use of erythrosine can't be replaced by another colour. For example: the consumption of 1 portion (200 mL) of food from the category 01.1.2 containing 300 mg/kg of erythrosine is equivalent to the consumption of 1 mg/kg b.w. of this colour for adults with 60 kg, that is, 10 (ten) times the ADI. For a child with 30 kg, consume would be equal to 20 (twenty) times the ADI. Therefore, Brazil doesn't support the use of erythrosine in categories 04.2.2.3 and 04.2.2.7.

INS 150c and 161g: Brazil considers being necessary to set maximum levels to colours with numerical ADI, as caramel colour class III and canthaxanthin. Thus, we don't support the GMP level for INS 150c and 161g. Besides, the maximum level for canthaxanthin should be as lowest as possible, since this colour has a low ADI. Canthaxanthin is not listed in GSFA for food category 04.2.2.3.

The maximum levels for caramels (INS 150b and 150c) should be reduced to 50000, for consistency with the level proposed for other food categories. Higher levels may lead to over passing the ADI, particularly by children.

Firming Agents

INS 523: In 2006 JECFA reduced the PTWI for aluminum from all sources, specially from food additives, from 7 to 1mg/kg b.w./ week. CCFA has discussed new maximum limits for aluminum silicates, phosphates and sulphates. The aim is to reduce the use and/or the maximum limit for these additives, considering that the exposure to them is high and could surpass the PTWI, mainly by children. We suggest verifying the technological need for this substance.

In GSFA, INS 523 has a proposed limit of 500 mg/kg for food category 04.2.2.3 (step 3) and not 35 mg/kg (adopted). For food category 04.2.2.7, the actual step is 3 and not 6, with note 6.

In Brazil its use is not authorized in any food category.

Preservatives

INS 216: this additive and its sodium salt (INS 217) had its ADI removed by JECFA in 2007-2008 because it was considered not safe for human use. It was excluded from GSFA.

INS 220-228: Sulphites are allowed as preservative in Brazil for some fruit and vegetable products, for example: coconut milk (500 mg/kg); dry or dehydrated fruits (100 mg/kg); dry coconut (50 mg/kg); frozen fried potatoes (50 mg/kg); dehydrated vegetables (200 mg/kg); unpeeled cooked potatoes (100 mg/kg); **vegetable pulp and puree (onion, garlic, mushrooms, fungi, roots, tubers, pulses, nuts and seaweeds) (500 mg/kg)**; and **pickles (100 mg/kg)**. The maximum levels are expressed as SO_2.

INS 262ii has an ADI of 15 mg/kg b.w. and, therefore, there must be a maximum limit for its use in food.

Sequestrants

INS 334-337: The group ADI for tartrates is 30 mg/kg b.w. and, therefore, there must be a maximum limit for its use in food.

INS 450iii (footnote 11): "Sodium pyrophosphate" and "Tetrasodium diphosphate" are synonymous considering JECFA evaluation. INS 451iii does not exist (http://www.fao.org/ag/agn/jecfa-additives/specs/Monograph1/Additive-461.pdf).

INS 338-542 (phosphates): the GSFA maximum limit for food category 04.1.2.3 is 2200 mg/kg in step 3 (and not 1100 mg/kg in step 7). Provisions for 04.2.2.3 and 04.2.2.7 are in step 6 and not 7.

Sweeteners

Some maximum limits, steps and footnotes of the document do not correspond to those in GSFA (2009) for these food categories as listed in the table bellow. Brazil has done some comments related the technological needs for additives use.

INS	Substance	GSFA				
		Food Cat. No.	ML		Step	Comment
950	Acesulfame Potassium	04.1.2.3	200	mg/kg	~~6~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161 & 188**
		04.1.2.10	~~1000~~ **350**	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161 & 188**
		04.2.2.3	~~1000~~ **200**	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 144 & 188**
		04.2.2.7	1000	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 188** **In Brazil, the maximum limit is 350 mg/kg. The proposed limit of 1000mg/kg is much higher than those already adopted. Which is the technological justification?**
951	Aspartame	04.1.2.10	~~2000~~ **1000**	mg/kg	~~6~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161 & 191** **In Brazil, the maximum limit is 750mg/kg, which is enough to reach the technological purpose.**
		04.2.2.7	2500	mg/kg	~~6~~ **Adopted**	
954	Saccharin	04.2.2.7	~~500~~ **200**	mg/kg	~~6~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161**
961	Neotame	04.1.2.3	100	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161**
		04.1.2.10	65	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161**
		04.2.2.3	10	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 144**
		04.2.2.7	33	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	**Note 161**
962	Aspartame-Acesulfame Salt	04.1.2.3	450	mg/kg	3	Note 113 & 144
		04.2.2.3	~~460~~ **200**	mg/kg	~~3~~ **Adopted**	~~Note 119 & 144~~ **Note 113 & 161**
		04.2.2.7	2270	mg/kg	3	Note 113 **This sweetener is not yet authorized in Brazil.**

PRESERVED TOMATOES

The provisions steps are 6 and not 7.

CERTAIN CANNED CITRUS FRUITS

For phosphates, it is step 6 and not 7.

Anti-clouding agent

INS 461: the function classes thickener, emulsifier, stabilizer and bulking agent were evaluated by JECFA for this additive. The function anti-clouding agent was not considered in the toxicological evaluation and is not foreseen in GSFA. This function is also not in the functional classes/technological purposes list (CAC GL36-1989), which was revised in 2008 (alinorm 08/31/12, App.XII). Suggestion: as the GSFA makes no distinction between use provisions for different functions, the function class could be altered for emulsifier or stabilizer.

GSFA Table 3

The food categories 04.1.1, 04.2.1, 04.2.2.1 e 04.2.2.7 are in the Annex of Table 3. Therefore, the use of additives as GMP for these categories is not unrestricted. The use of additives listed in Table 3 in these foods is governed by the provisions in Tables 1 and 2.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union (EU) would like to submit the following comments on the food additive provisions in the above draft Codex standards:

GENERAL STATEMENT- REFERENCE TO TABLE 3 FOOD ADDITIVES

The EU would like to reiterate that Commodity Committees should evaluate the technological justification of the use of individual food additives, and list the additives that really achieve the desired effect in the respective food categories. Therefore, the EU would like to express its strong reservation for inclusion by default of the food additives listed in Table 3 of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives in Codex Commodity standards.

On the contrary, the Annex of Table 3 already contains products that have undergone basic physical treatments, like fruit and vegetable nectars, liquid egg products (through pasteurisation process), processed fish products that may need heat treatment at a latest stage, as well as fermented vegetables and smoked, dried, fermented fish and fish products. The EU is therefore of the opinion that the same approach should apply with the following categories of foodstuffs, namely processed tomato concentrates, preserved tomatoes, jam, jellies and marmalades, canned fruits and canned vegetables, that are widely consumed and for which similar treatment may occur and for which a very limited number of food additives is needed from a technological point of view.

---

1. Draft Codex standard for pickled fruit and vegetables

1.1 GENERAL COMMENT

The food products covered under the draft Codex Standard for pickled fruit and vegetables (Appendix VII) may correspond to different sub-categories of the GSFA, namely 04.2.2.7, 04.1.2.3, 04.1.2.10, 04.2.2.3.

It has to be reminded that the categories 04.2.2.3 (vegetables) and 04.1.2.3 (fruit in vinegar) do cover 'pickle products' that are not **fermented**. Therefore, the fermented vegetables defined by the present standard for pickled fruit and vegetables do not correspond to sub category 04.2.2.3 nor 04.1.2.3 of the GSFA.

However, fermented vegetables covered by this standard fall under the cat 04.2.2.7 of the GSFA. Bearing in mind the fact that this category is enshrined in the Annex of Table 3, food additives listed in Table 3 should therefore not be authorised in fermented vegetables defined by the standard for pickled fruits and vegetables.

With regard to the fermented fruits of the present standard, they fall under the category 04.12.10 of the GSFA for which the Table 3 food additives can be authorised. It is necessary to consider, on a case by case basis, the technological justifications to authorise such food additives in the fermented fruits covered by the present standard for pickled fruits and vegetables.

To sum up, it is important to treat separately these two categories of fermented products in terms of food additives needs.

As a general remark, the EU is of the opinion that great care should be taken during the integration of food additives provisions of the commodity standards into the GSFA and duly justified from a technological point of view. During this integration into the GSFA, it should be ensured that foodstuffs which are currently excluded from the scope of the Commodity Standard for pickled fruit and vegetables, like table olives, sauerkraut, pickled cucumber, cannot benefit from the food additives provisions of the Commodity resulting from the fact that these foodstuffs belong to one of the sub categories mentioned above.

1.2 SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Acidity regulators

With regard to fermented vegetables, the following food additives INS 297, INS 365, INS 355, INS 356 are not authorised in sub category 04.2.2.7.

With regard to fermented fruits, the following comments should be considered, as follows :

- Fumaric Acid (INS 297) and Sodium Fumarate (INS 365)

Although acknowledging that the JECFA has allocated an ADI "non specified" for Fumaric acid, this substance was allocated a low numerical ADI (6 mg/kg) by the European Scientific Committee for Food (SCF) in 1990. Therefore, the EU considers that the use of fumaric acid should be limited. The EU does not support the proposal for inclusion of Fumaric acid in pickled fruits and questions the technological need.

Sodium Fumarate is also allocated an ADI of 6 mg/kg by the SCF. For the same reason the EU does not support the inclusion of sodium Fumarate in the pickled fruits standard and questions the technological need.

- Adipic acid (INS 355) and its sodium and potassium salts (respectively INS 356 and INS 357)

Adipic acid and Adipates are allocated a numerical ADI of 5 mg/kg bw by the JECFA and therefore their use should be restricted to a limited number of applications.

The EU requests clarification on the technological need.

Antioxidants

- Erythorbic acid (INS 315) and sodium Erythorbate (INS 316)

With regard to fermented vegetables: these food additives are not authorised in sub category 04.2.2.7 on fermented vegetables.

With regard to fermented fruits:

In 1990, the JECFA allocated an ADI "non specified" However the SCF assigned in 1999 a numerical ADI (6 mg/kg bw) for Erythorbic acid and sodium Erythorbate.

In consequence, the EU is of the opinion that erythorbic acid and its sodium salt should be restricted to a limited number of applications in order to avoid an exceedance of the ADI.

Therefore, the EU does not support the inclusion of Erythorbic acid (INS 315) nor sodium Erythorbate (INS 316) in the pickled fruits and vegetables standard.

The EU requests clarification on the technological need.

- Lecithin (INS 322)

The primary technological function of lecithin is to act as an emulsifier, and only a secondary role as antioxidant.

Therefore it is important to clarify the technological purpose of lecithin in the products covered by the standard.

The role of emulsifier can be justified in case there is a sauce added to the vegetable, but in such a case, we are in presence of a compound foodstuff and the lecithin may be present in the final product (coming from the sauce) as a result of the carry over principle.

Colours

Only the following colours are authorised in the sub category 04.2.2.7, namely brilliant blue FCF (INS 133), beta carotene (160a(ii)), carotenoid (160a(i), a(iii),e,f)), chlorophills and chlorophyllins (141(i),(ii)), fast green FCF (143), grape skin extract (163(ii)), indigotine (132), ponceau 4R (124), riboflavins (101(i),(ii)), sunset yellow (110).

The EU does not support the inclusion of Curcumin (ADI : 1 ppm), Tartrazine (ADI : 7.5 ppm), Quinoline yellow (JECFA-ADI : 10 ppm; revised EFSA-ADI (2009): 0.5 ppm), Sunset yellow, Carmines (ADI : 5 ppm), Azorubine (ADI : 4 ppm), Amaranth (ADI : 0.5 ppm), Ponceau 4R, Erythrosine (ADI : 0.1 ppm), Allura Red AC (ADI : 7 ppm), Indigotine (ADI : 5 ppm), Brilliant Blue FCF (ADI : 12.5 ppm), Brilliant Black (ADI : 1 ppm), Brown HT (ADI : 1.5 ppm), carotenoids INS 160e and INS 160f, annatto extracts, Lutein, Canthaxanthin (ADI : 0.03 ppm), Iron oxides (ADI : 0.03 ppm) and Fast green in pickled fruits and vegetables, as the use of these colours could mislead the consumer.

As a general remark, EU is of the opinion that the use of colours in fermented vegetables should be strictly limited as these products are widely consumed in some countries. Apart the fact that their uses could be foreseen to mask bad quality of the products and mislead the consumers, they may also induce intake problem as their ADIs are low and the proposed uses sometimes very high.

In addition, EFSA has recently re-evaluated few colours and lowered the ADI for sunset yellow to 1 mg/kg bw (which is considerably lower than its previous ADI (2.5 mg/kg bw)). This ADI was made temporary pending the receipt of additional information found necessary for a full ADI. **EFSA also underlines the potential exceedence of the newly assigned temporary ADI both for adult and for children. Therefore the EU strongly opposes the authorisation of Sunset yellow in pickled fruits and vegetables.**

More over, EFSA has also assigned a very low ADI for Ponceau 4R (0.70 mg/kg) which is drastically lower than its previous ADI (4 mg/kg bw). **Therefore, the EU is of the opinion that ponceau 4R should be restricted to a limited number of applications, and strongly oppose the authorisation of Ponceau 4R in pickled fruits and vegetables.**

In light of the recent EFSA opinions on both Ponceau 4R and Sunset yellow, the EU suggests to request CCFA asking JECFA to re-evaluate as a priority these food additives. In addition, some of those colours have been assigned a very low numerical ADI, e.g. Curcumin (1 mg/kg), Amaranth (0.5 mg/kg), Brown HT (1.5 mg/kg), canthaxanthin (0.03 mg/kg), Erythrosine (0.1 mg/kg) and therefore their use should be strictly restricted.

Finally, the recent 31st CAC has taken into consideration the concern raised by many Codex Members during the 41st Codex Committee on Food Additives with regard to the extension of use of erythrosine into the General Standard of Food Additives (GSFA) due to its very low numerical ADI. These Codex Members requested that a refined exposure assessment is undertaken by JECFA.

Therefore, at this stage, the EU strongly oppose the proposal to add erythrosine to pickled fruits and vegetables due to its very low ADI of 0.5 mg/kg bw.

Firming Agents

- Aluminium Ammonium Sulphate (E 523)

As a general comment, EU would like to remind the recommendation from JECFA in 2006 to lower the Provisional Tolerable Weekly Intake (PTWI) for all food additives containing aluminium (from 7 mg/kg bw to 1 mg/kg bw) and the possible exceedance of the PTWI by some population groups, especially children. These conclusions have recently been confirmed by EFSA.

Therefore, the EU opposes the use of aluminium ammonium sulphate in pickled fruits and vegetables.

In addition it is also important to highlight that this food additive is not authorised in sub category 04.2.2.7 of the GSFA on fermented vegetables.

Flavour enhancers

- Disodium guanylate, 5' (INS 627), Disodium inosinate 5'(INS 631), Calcium and Disodium ribonucleotides, 5' (respectively INS 634 and INS 635)

With regard to fermented vegetables, these food additives are not permitted under sub category 04.2.2.7. The EU requests technological justifications for their use in pickled fruits and vegetables.

The EU would like to highlight that the following food additives INS 580, INS 968, INS 1101ii, INS 1101iii, and INS 1104 are not authorised in the EU.

Preservatives

With regard to fermented vegetables, only sulfites are authorised in sub category 04.2.2.7.

As a general remark, the EU questions the technological need of preservatives in pickled fruits and vegetables that have been undergone a heat treatment, a pasteurisation during the manufacturing process, or are preserved through natural fermentation or by acidulants, and which are stable at room temperature.

The EU suggests that a refinement should be undertaken in order to identify the foodstuffs falling down into the category "pickled fruit and vegetables" and for which preservatives are technologically justified.

The same rational is valid with regard to the use of propionic acid (INS 280), sodium propionate (INS 281), calcium propionate (INS 282) and potassium propionate (INS 283) in fermented fruits

- Hydroxybenzoates (INS 214, INS 216, INS 218)

EU requests clarification on the types of pickled fruits for which hydroxybenzoates are justified from a technological point of view.

- Sulphites

JECFA has flagged the potential exceedance of the ADI for sulphites. Some major contributors have been identified (69th JECFA meeting (2008)): dried fruits, sausages and non alcoholic beverages, wine, fruit juices and soft juices, processed potatoes and nuts, beer. However, JECFA underlined that these main contributors may differ from one country to another.

Bearing in mind the very low ADI of sulphites and the concerns raised by JECFA in term of potential exceedance of the ADI, the EU suggests to maintain the current Maximum limit of 100 ppm for sulphites in pickled fruits and vegetables.

Sequestrants

- Phosphates (INS 338, INS 339i-iii,INS 340i-iii,INS 341i-iii, INS 342i-ii, INS 343i-iii, INS 450i to vii, INS 451i-ii,INS 452i-v, INS 542)

With regard to fermented vegetables, these food additives are not authorised in sub category 04.2.2.7.

With regard to fermented fruits: the primary technological function of phosphates is to ensure water-retention. Their action as sequestrant should be demonstrated in pickled fruits. Therefore, the EU does not support the usage of phosphates in pickled fruit and vegetables. EU takes note that none of these food additives are authorised in these foodstuffs in the EU.

- Citric and fatty acid esters of glycerol (INS 472c); Diacetyltartaric and fatty esters of glycerol (INS 472e)

These food additives are normally used in foodstuffs which contain fats. The EU questions the technological need of such sequestrants in pickled fruit and vegetables.

Sweeteners

- Sorbitol and sorbitol syrup (INS 420), Maltitol and maltitol syrup (INS 965), Lactitol (INS 966), Xylitol (INS 967), Isomalt (INS 953), mannitol (E 421)

As a general remark the EU is very concerned about the high maximum limits that are proposed in the current draft standard. These food additives should only be used in the present standard for purposes other than “sweetener”, like humectant and flavour enhancer. Therefore, the proposed maximum limits should be lowered and limited in specific products after technological justification is provided.

- Intense sweeteners (INS 950, 951, 954, 957, 961, 962)

As a general remark, the EU considers that the proposed maximum limits of such food additives are very high in such processed food, bearing also in mind the fact that “sugar” does not constitute basic constituents of pickled vegetables, for instance. Therefore, the principle of replacing sugar with intense sweeteners should be carefully considered and well substantiated, on a case by case basis.

With regard to fermented vegetables, only the food additives INS 950 and INS 951 are authorised in the sub category 04.2.2.7 of the GSFA.

- Acesulfame potassium (INS 950)

The EU supports the usage of Acesulfame potassium, acting as a sweetener, in pickled fruits and vegetables but suggests to maintain the maximum limit of 200 mg/kg, as it is currently the case in STAN 260-2007 on pickled fruits and vegetables

- Aspartame (INS 951)

The EU supports the usage of Aspartame, acting as a sweetener, in pickled fruits and vegetables, but questions the technological justification of such high ML. EU suggests to set a maximum permitted level of 200 mg/kg (instead of 2000 or 2500 mg/kg as proposed) which seems sufficient to reach the objective.

- Saccharin (INS 954)

The EU supports the usage of Saccharin, acting as a sweetener, in pickled fruit and vegetables, but suggests maintaining the current maximum limit of 160 mg/kg.

- Thaumatin (INS 957)

The EU notes that this food additive is not currently permitted in such products by the EU legislation on food additives.

- Neotame (INS 961)

The EU agrees with the proposal.

- Aspartame-Acesulfame Salt (INS 962)

The EU supports the usage of Aspartame-Acesulfame Salt, acting as a sweetener, in pickled fruit and vegetables, but only at a maximum permitted level of 200 mg/kg (expressed as a acesulfame-K equivalent).

2. Draft Codex Standard for Processed Tomato concentrates

Acidity regulators:

As a general remark, the EU questions the technological need of Table 3 acidity regulators, as it seems that the citric acid (INS 330) and its salts present a real technological benefit and is currently used at worldwide level.

- Lactic acid (INS 270)

The EU does not support the use of this food additive bearing in mind that lactic acid may serve as an appropriate tool in order to determine the freshness of the product. Authorising this food additive would then bias the results of the relevant analytical tests.

- Acetic acid (INS 260) and Malic acid (INS 296) and their salts

These food additives, because of their specific organoleptic properties, may contribute to masking the unexpected flavours in tomatoes. Therefore the EU does not support the use of these food additives as this is not technologically justified.

- Fumaric acid (INS 297) and sodium Fumarate (INS 365)

These food additives are assigned a low numerical ADI and therefore their use should be restricted. The EU does not support their use in processed tomato-concentrates.

The EU notes that fumarate is not permitted under the EU legislation on food additives.

- Carbonates based-food additives (INS 170i, 500i, 500ii, 500iii, 501i, 501ii, 503ii, 504i, 504ii)

These food additives will contribute to increasing the pH to alkaline ranges which may then mask adverse effects during overcooking, in particular the formation of side products like hydroxyl methyl furfural during the cooking. The EU therefore does not support the use of these food additives.

3. Draft Codex Standard for Preserved tomatoes

Acidity regulators

The EU position is identical to the similar section related to the draft codex standard for processed tomato-concentrates.

- Phosphates

The EU does not support the use of phosphates in preserved tomatoes and questions the technological need to use these food additives which primarily function is to act as water retention and only secondarily as acidity regulator.

Firming agents

- Magnesium chloride (INS 511), Magnesium gluconate (INS 580), Calcium sulphate (INS 516), Calcium gluconate (INS 578), Calcium hydroxide (INS 526)

The EU requests clarification on the technological need of such food additives.

For instance, the MgCl is not appropriate as its use may induce some metallic or bitter “taste” in the product.

However, Calcium containing food additives are justified from the technological point of view in these products.

Modified starches

The modified starches may induce a modification of the texture and contribute to masking possible defects of the food. Therefore the EU is of the opinion that the modified starches may contribute to mislead the consumers and should not be permitted in preserved tomatoes.

4. Draft Codex Standard for certain canned citrus fruits

The EU would like to provide the following comments:

Acidity regulators

- Phosphates

The EU does not support the inclusion of any phosphates mentioned in the draft standard for canned citrus fruits and questions the technological need for such inclusion. The EU questions the technological need to use these food additives which function is primarily to act as water retention and only secondarily as acidity regulator.

- Tartrates (INS 334, INS 335i & INS 335ii, INS 336i and INS 336ii, 337)

The EU questions the technological need for using up to 1300 mg/kg (expressed as tartaric acid) of tartrates in canned citrus fruits.

- Methyl cellulose

The EU would like to obtain more clarification on the technological function of methyl cellulose when added to canned citrus fruits.

- Fumaric Acid (INS 297) and Sodium Fumarate (INS 365)

Fumaric acid is allocated a low numerical ADI by the SCF and its use is therefore restricted to a limited number of applications in the EU. The EU does not support the proposal for inclusion of Fumaric acid in canned citrus fruits.

Sodium Fumarate is also allocated a low numerical ADI (6 mg/kg) by the SCF. For the same reason the EU does not support the inclusion of sodium Fumarate in this standard. The EU notes that sodium fumarate is not permitted under the EU legislation on food additives.

Firming agents

- Magnesium chloride (INS 511), Magnesium gluconate (INS 580), Calcium sulphate (INS 516), Calcium gluconate (INS 578), Calcium hydroxide (INS 526)

The EU questions the technological need of magnesium containing food additives for such a use.

WORLD PROCESSING TOMATO COUNCIL

As a Non-Governmental Organisation with Observer Status, the World Processing Tomato Council (WPTC) as examined the text in reference and would like to present the following observations, in relation to processed tomato products for which standards were updated in 2007.

The Annex VII of the proposed horizontal standards (pp 71-73) includes a list of additives which is much more extensive than the lists approved in the Codex Standards for Tomato Concentrates (STAN 57) and Preserved Tomatoes (STAN 13).

The WPTC, with regards to the current processing techniques for tomatoes and in accordance with the principles mentioned in point 3.2 – “Justification on the use of additives” (page 67)- considers that these additions are absolutely unjustified and recommends that the STAN 13 and STAN 57 standards remain unchanged.

We would also like to reiterate that during the 23rd session of the CCPFV, the WPTC had already requested that calcium lactate be excluded from the list of allowed firming agents in STAN 57, because the presence of lactic acid is in itself a defect (point 3.2.2.2). Our observation was not accepted. If the list of authorized additives is to be amended, the only modification the WPTC would thus recommend is the elimination of calcium lactate as a firming agent. In no case would the WPTC support any additions to the list of approved additives.

The WPTC and its members remain available for further information on these comments.