

# 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 3**

**CX/FAC 02/2  
January 2002**

## **JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**

### **CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES AND CONTAMINANTS**

**Thirty-fourth Session**

**Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 11-15 March 2002**

### **MATTERS REFERRED BY THE 23<sup>RD</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES**

#### **REPORT ON THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME FOR 2000/01 AND 2002/03<sup>1</sup>**

1. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission endorsed the views of the Executive Committee that the opportunity existed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Codex, and also endorsed the request to the Secretariat to prepare a detailed budget for its existing programmes, identify changes in resources that were implied in the Strategic Framework, the draft Medium-Term Plan and the Chairperson's Action Plan, and to take such detailed programming into account in the preparation of future budgetary planning.

2. The Commission expressed its appreciation to FAO and WHO for the significant shifts in resources in their respective budgets towards the areas of food safety and consumer protection, in particular the support to the scientific expert bodies that advise Codex and the strengthening of Codex and food control-related activities in developing countries. It also expressed its appreciation to the Codex Secretariat for its professional and dedicated work.

#### **REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS<sup>2</sup>**

##### *OFFICE INTERNATIONALE DU VIN ET DE LA VIGNE (OIV)<sup>3</sup>*

3. The Representative of the OIV informed the Commission that a new international agreement had been signed that would reform and restructure that Organization. One of the objectives of the agreement would be to cooperate with other intergovernmental organizations in their standardization activities.

4. Some Delegations, referring to the agreement between FAO and the OIV of 1948 mentioned by the Representative, stated that it had been impossible to obtain a certified copy of the agreement and questioned the exclusion of provision concerning food additives in wine and related products from the mandate of the Commission and its Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants. The Commission requested clarification of this issue and confirmed that the establishment of limits and levels of use of food additives in food, including beverages, fell within its own mandate.

<sup>1</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 10-18

<sup>2</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 19-31

<sup>3</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 29-30

## **CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK, PROPOSED DRAFT MEDIUM-TERM PLAN 2003-2007 AND THE CHAIRPERSON'S ACTION PLAN<sup>4</sup>**

5. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission noted that the Chairperson's Action Plan, including the six desired outcomes contained therein (see below), was elaborated to assist in the implementation of the MTP. It was noted that the Action Plan would be incorporated into the Medium-Term Plan

### ***FURTHER STRENGTHENED SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT AND SCIENCE-BASED DECISION-MAKING<sup>5</sup>***

6. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission noted that recent changes had led to the improved identification and selection of experts and temporary advisors for expert groups and consultations and that detailed information on the selection process was contained on the websites of both organizations. It was noted that such experts were required to complete and attest to declarations of detailed interest in this regard to avoid conflict of interest.

7. The Commission welcomed these developments and a planning meeting in November 2001 which would examine, among other issues, increased coordination between the JECFA, JMPR, and the other expert groups devoted to microbiological contamination and biotechnology on matters including selection and establishment of a roster of experts for such bodies, including increased transparency in the process.

8. Several delegations, including The Netherlands speaking as the Member responsible for appointing the Chairperson of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, and observers expressed their concerns that current working arrangements for expert bodies, developed decades ago, increasingly did not meet the requirements of the Commission. They stressed that these structures needed to be reviewed urgently to keep pace with the needs and the expectations of Member countries, the Commission and the public.

9. The Commission **requested** FAO and WHO to circulate a letter of information on the improvements already made. It requested FAO and WHO to convene a consultation to review the status and procedures of the expert bodies and to develop recommendations for consideration by the Directors-General on additional ways to improve the quality, quantity and timeliness of scientific advice to the Commission. It was recommended that such a consultation include the Chairpersons of the relevant Codex Committees and appropriate outside experts drawn from the scientific community and all interested groups including those representing industry and consumers.

10. The Delegation of Egypt requested FAO and WHO to ensure that there would be adequate regional representation of experts and temporary advisors with a view to encouraging Member countries in all regions to adopt decisions developed on a scientific basis.

### ***STATUS OF THE DRAFT MEDIUM-TERM PLAN 2003-2007, DRAFT STRATEGIC STATEMENT AND CHAIRPERSON'S ACTION PLAN<sup>6</sup>***

11. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session (July 2001) of the Codex Alimentarius Commission adopted the draft Strategic Framework, including the Strategic Vision Statement. It agreed that the draft Medium-Term Plan should be revised by the Secretariat in the light of the Strategic Framework, the Commission's discussion and the written comments received, and should incorporate the elements of the Chairperson's Action Plan agreed to by the Commission. The Commission agreed that the activities envisaged in the Medium Term Plan should include cost estimates to determine whether the objectives could be achieved within available resources and that the revised draft Medium-Term-Plan be circulated for the inputs of the Codex Coordinating Committees, other Codex Committees, Member governments and international organizations for further consideration and finalization at the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.

12. The 49<sup>th</sup> Session (September 2001) of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission noted<sup>7</sup> that Circular Letter CL 2001/26-EXEC had been sent to Members of the Commission on

---

<sup>4</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 46-70

<sup>5</sup> Alinorm 01/41 paras 58-62

<sup>6</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 68-70

<sup>7</sup> Alinorm 03/3, paras. 37-41.

14 August 2001. Governments and interested international organizations had been being invited to comment on the revised Draft Medium-Term Plan and also to propose or suggest new activities. Following the deadline for comments (30 November 2001) the Revised Draft Medium-Term Plan will be up-dated and placed on the Codex Website. The Plan will be up-dated following each Codex Committee/Task Force session to include new proposals as they arise.

13. This Plan will then be submitted to the 50th Session of the Executive Committee (2002) for review and then to governments and interested international organizations for comments. Those Codex Committees (especially Regional Committees) that had not previously commented will also have to opportunity to contribute to the development of the Medium-Term Plan. The Revised Draft Medium-Term Plan together with the various proposals made by Codex Committees and other interested parties will be considered by the 51st Session of the Executive Committee and then submitted to the 25th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption.

### **RISK ANALYSIS POLICIES OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION<sup>8</sup>**

14. The Delegation of India recalled that its paper concerning uniform application of risk analysis in the elaboration of standards had been discussed in the Committee on General Principles<sup>9</sup> and should be considered further in relation to the working principles by all Codex Committees.

15. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission **confirmed** its initial mandate to the Committee on General Principles to complete the principles for risk analysis within Codex as a high priority, with a view to their adoption in 2003. It also agreed that the Committee should develop guidance to governments subsequently or in parallel, as appropriate in view of its programme of work.

16. In the view of several delegations, the Commission should not elaborate “standards and related texts” when data were insufficient, as Codex recommendations represented a reference at the international level and should be based on adequate scientific evidence. The situation was different at the national level, as governments had the possibility to take provisional measures to protect their population, as recognized under the SPS Agreement. Several other delegations indicated that precaution was already applied in Codex work, and that the Commission had adopted codes of practice and other recommendations when scientific data did not allow the establishment of a standard. In the view of these delegations, Codex should therefore make every effort to develop recommendations to protect consumers’ health even when scientific evidence was insufficient.

17. In view of the above discussion, the Chairperson proposed that the Commission should take the following position:

*“When there is evidence that a risk to human health exists but scientific data are insufficient or incomplete, the Commission should not proceed to elaborate a standard but should consider elaborating a related text, such as a code of practice, provided that such a text would be supported by the available scientific evidence.”*

18. The Commission also recommended that relevant Codex Committees should continue to develop and document the application of risk analysis in their work. It was agreed that the risk analysis policies developed by the Committees would be presented in a single document to the next session of the Commission.

---

<sup>8</sup> Alinorm 01/41 paras 71-85

<sup>9</sup> Alinorm 01/33A, paras. 76-83.

## CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURAL MANUAL OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION<sup>10</sup>

### *STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLE ON THE ROLE OF SCIENCE IN THE CODEX DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH OTHER FACTORS ARE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT: CRITERIA<sup>11</sup>*

19. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission amended and adopted *Criteria for the Consideration of Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principle* in the Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision Making Process and the Extent to Which Other Factors are Taken into Account (Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, Eleventh Edition).

### **DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 8 OR STEPS 5/8 OF THE NORMAL PROCEDURE OR AT STEP 5 OF THE ACCELERATED PROCEDURE**

20. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission adopted several draft texts submitted for approval by the CCFAC and other Codex Committees, as indicated in Appendix IV of ALINORM 01/41. The following paragraphs provide additional information concerning the discussions that took place on certain items or contain additional decisions taken by the Commission in regard to the adoption of certain texts:

#### *Milk and Milk Products*

##### *Draft Group Standard for Unripened Cheese Including Fresh Cheese*

21. The Commission noted (ALINORM 01/41, para. 106) the concern on use of the food additive, pimarin, in the standard. The representative of the JECFA clarified that at its recent meeting, the evaluation of this additive had resulted in the same recommendations.

22. The Commission **adopted** the Draft Group Standard with pimarin temporarily endorsed for surface/rind treatments only. The delegations of Switzerland, Spain, Germany and Egypt expressed their reservation on retaining pimarin in the standard.

##### *Proposed Draft Revised Standard for Edible Casein Products*

23. The Commission **deleted** the draft maximum level of Lead in accordance with its previous decisions concerning levels of Lead in milk and milk products and **adopted** the Draft Revised Standard at Steps 5 and 8 (ALINORM 01/41, para. 108).

#### *Food Additives and Contaminants*

##### *Codex General Standard for Food Additives: Draft Guidelines for the Development of Maximum Levels for the Use of Additives with Numerical Acceptable Daily Intakes (Annex A)*

24. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 111) the text as proposed.

##### *Codex General Standard for Food Additives: Proposed Draft and Draft Food Additive Provisions in Table 1*

25. In view of the recommendation of the 57<sup>th</sup> the JECFA meeting to establish a temporary ADI for Quillaia Extract, the Commission returned (ALINORM 01/41, para. 112) the provisions for the use of this additive to Step 7 for further consideration by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants. The use of Stannous Chloride in category 14.1.2.1 (Canned or bottled (pasteurized) fruit juice) was returned to Step 7 as the additive was not currently used in the manufacture of fruit juices.

26. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 113) the provisions for the use of EDTAs in category 14.2 (alcoholic beverages, including alcohol-free and low-alcoholic counterparts). It noted the

---

<sup>10</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 86-98

<sup>11</sup> Alinorm 01/41, paras. 93-98

views of those countries that had recommended the deletion of these provisions in order to align the standard with the standards of the OIV wine, but noted that the use of EDTAs was based on a thorough safety evaluation and was used in other countries not members of the OIV. The Commission proposed that these provisions be discussed further by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants.

27. The Commission noted (ALINORM 01/41, para. 114) that the use of Pimaricin in Category 1.6 (Cheese) at a level of 40 mg/kg was based on the qualification that it was used for surface treatment only and was equivalent to 2 mg/dm<sup>2</sup> surface application to a maximum depth of 5 mm. However, as the provisions for the use of Pimaricin in sliced, cut shredded and grated products in the Draft Group Standard for Unripened Cheese, including Fresh Cheese were only temporarily endorsed by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants pending reevaluation by the JECFA, the Commission **agreed** that the provision in the Codex General Standard for Food Additives should remain as temporarily endorsed.

28. The Commission **adopted** the other provisions as proposed at Step 8, with the omission of Steps 6 and 7 for some proposals as recommended by the Committee.

*Draft Maximum Level for Patulin in Apple Juice and Apple Juice Ingredients in Other Beverages*

29. The delegation of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Community, noted (ALINORM 01/41, para. 116) that recent exposure assessments indicated that although the lifetime exposure to patulin is below the PMTDI, the exposure of children to patulin through the consumption of apple juice was in the range of, or even exceeded, the PMTDI for a considerable period during childhood. Because of this concern, the EC had initiated a study to evaluate the dietary intake of patulin. It was noted that the results of the study were expected to become available in the beginning of 2002 and therefore, it was suggested that adoption of the draft maximum level be delayed. Many other delegations supported this view and also noted that the reduction of patulin in apple juice was easily achievable through Good Manufacturing Practice by the removal or trimming of affected apples.

30. Many other delegations supported (ALINORM 01/41, para. 117) the adoption of the draft maximum level as the JECFA had determined that the level was protective of both adults and children, and in the interest of setting limits for a contaminant which was a serious health concern. These delegations supported the recommendation of the Chairperson of the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants that, after adoption, the level should be reviewed further by the JECFA and the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants in light of new data that would be made available and reconsidered at the next session of the Commission. It was also noted that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants was in the process of elaborating a Code of Practice for the prevention of contamination by patulin that would help to address the reduction of contamination in apple juice through preventative measures at the production level.

31. As a consensus could not be reached, the Commission **returned** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 118) the draft maximum level to Step 6 for further consideration by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants. The delegations of Mexico and the United States objected to this decision, observing that the proposed level was responsive to public health needs.

*Draft Maximum Levels for Lead*

32. Several delegations were of the opinion that the reduction of the level for Lead in cocoa butter from 0.5 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg was not adequately justified and would create barriers to trade without any significant reduction of health risk. Other delegations were of the opinion that the lower levels were easily achievable with the application of good agricultural practices. As there was no consensus, the Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 119) the level of 0.1 mg/kg for lead in vegetable oils, excluding cocoa butter, with the understanding that the level did not apply to lead in cocoa butter. The Commission agreed that there was a need for getting reliable scientific data from Governments and other interested organizations in order to justify any level lower than 0.5 mg/kg in cocoa butter. The Delegation of Singapore stated that the burden of proof to justify a change in an existing standard laid with the parties requesting the change.

33. The Commission **adopted** the remaining levels for Lead at Step 8 as proposed by the Committee.

34. Several delegations felt that the level of 0.02 mg/kg for Lead in milk was too low, and that the footnote indicating “that for dairy products, an appropriate concentration factor should apply” did not

support the elaboration of a level of 0.1 mg/kg for milk fat. Other delegations felt that lower levels were necessary to protect sensitive individuals, and especially children, from a contaminant with severe public health implications. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 121) the levels for lead in milk (0.02 mg/kg) and milk fat (0.1 mg/kg) as proposed, and requested the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants to re-evaluate the levels.

35. The Delegation of India expressed its reservation at the fixing of these levels on the grounds that: (a) there was no JECFA evaluation; and (b) there was no IDF standard which was claimed to be the basis on which the level had been recommended. Similarly the Delegation stated that the level of Lead adopted for fruits was more stringent than the level evaluated as safe by the JECFA, and that the level was not based on global data.

36. The Representative of the OIV requested that special consideration be given to levels of Lead in wines that had been stored for long periods of time.

37. The Commission agreed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 124) that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants should develop a Code of Practice on the prevention and reduction of lead contamination in food and recommended that the FAO guidelines on lead-soldered cans could be useful in this regard.<sup>12</sup>

38. The Commission noted the request of Thailand to the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants for the Committee to give priority to the development of principles for exposure assessment of contaminants and toxins so as to provide advice to the JECFA.

*Draft Amendments to the Codex International Numbering System for Food Additives*

39. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 126) the changes as proposed.

*Draft Maximum Level for Aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> in Milk*

40. The delegation of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Community, objected to the level of 0.5 µg/kg because in the case of genotoxic carcinogens, exposure at any level might pose a health risk to consumers, in particular children, and that the level should therefore be as low as reasonably achievable. Other delegations supported the level of 0.5 µg/kg as proposed, especially in view of the determination of the JECFA that with worst-case assumptions, the additional risks for liver cancer predicted with the use of the proposed maximum levels of aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> of 0.05 and 0.5 µg/kg were very small.<sup>13</sup> The Delegation of Bolivia stated that if the lower level would be fixed, it would create unjustified barriers to trade without affecting the risks to consumers' health.

41. The Commission could not reach a consensus on this issue.

42. In view of the importance of establishing a level for the health protection of consumers, and in consideration that the higher level provided an adequate level of protection as determined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants, the Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 128) the maximum level of 0.5 µg/kg in milk. It was agreed that data supporting the lower level, if and when available, could be examined by the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants at a future meeting if necessary. The member states of the EU, as well as the delegations of Cyprus, Estonia, Ghana, Hungary, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Swaziland and Switzerland expressed their reservations on this decision. The Representative of Consumers International also expressed the concern of that organization at the decision taken.

<sup>12</sup> *Guidelines for Can Manufacturers and Food Canners*: FAO Food and Nutrition Paper No. 36, FAO, Rome, 1986.

<sup>13</sup> Report of the 56<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, February 2001, WHO Technical Report Series, WHO, Geneva (in press).

*Draft Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food With Chemicals*

43. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 130) the Draft Code with an amendment to paragraph 3 of the Introduction concerning the role of the Commission in notifying other international organizations of potential or actual food contamination problems.

44. The delegations of Malaysia, Thailand, Peru and The Philippines objected to the statement at the end of paragraph 4 that “When fishing waters or agricultural land become heavily polluted due to local emissions, it may be necessary to blacklist the areas concerned ....”. However, the Commission noted that this recommendation was under the control of local or national authorities only, and retained the sentence as proposed.

*Draft Maximum Level for Lead in Fruit Juices*

45. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 132) the draft maximum level as proposed.

*Draft Guideline Level for Cadmium in Cereals, Pulses and Legumes*

46. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 133) the level proposed as a *maximum* level.

*Draft Revision of the Codex Standard for Food Grade Salt: Packaging, Transportation and Storage*

47. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 134) the draft revision as proposed.

*Proposed Draft Amendments to the Codex General Standard for Food Additives: Annex to Table 3 (Food Categories or Individual Food Items Excluded from the General Conditions of Table 3)*

48. The Commission noted (ALINORM 01/41, para. 135) that the Annex to Table 3 was already contained in Volume 1A of the Codex Alimentarius (General Requirements), and that the 33rd Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants had only forwarded amendments to the existing Annex. However, in considering the proposed amendments, it noted that development of the Annex to Table 3 and that of the relevant provisions of Tables 1 and 2 should be coordinated and simultaneous. It also noted that food categories 6.4.1 (Fresh pastas and noodles and like products) and 6.4.2 (Pre-cooked or dried pastas and noodles and like products (only dried products) and other food categories were being further considered by the CCFAC. The Commission **adopted** all proposed revisions to the Annex to Table 3 at **Step 5 only**.

49. The Commission recalled that the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants should actively continue the work begun at its 33<sup>rd</sup> Session (March, 2001) on the linkages between the General Standard for Food Additives and the Codex Commodity standards including the adaptation of the food categorization system in the General Standard.

*Proposed Draft Codex Advisory Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives*

50. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 137) the proposed draft Codex Advisory Specifications at Steps 5 and 8 with the omission of Steps 6 and 7.

*Proposed Draft Revised Sampling Plan for Peanuts Intended for Further Processing*

51. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 138) the proposed draft revised Sampling Plan as proposed, with the understanding that paragraph 1 of the Introduction would be revised to indicate that the maximum level was 15 µg/kg for total aflatoxins.

*Proposed Draft Revisions to the Codex International Numbering System for Food Additives*

52. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 139) the draft revisions to the Codex International Numbering System as proposed at Step 5 of the Accelerated Procedure.

*Codex General Standard for Food Additives: Proposed Draft Amendments to Table 3 (Additives with an Acceptable Daily Intake of “Not Specified”)*

53. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 140) the proposed draft Amendments as proposed at Step 5 of the Accelerated Procedure.

***Processed Fruits and Vegetables***

*Draft Codex Standard for Canned Pears*

54. The Commission noted (ALINORM 01/41, para. 168) that colours were only allowed to be used in special holiday packs for canned pears intended for selling on special festivity occasions and that the labelling provisions of the Standard took adequately care of this particular case. Moreover, these additives had been evaluated as being safe for use in foods by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and was endorsed by the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants<sup>14</sup>. It was also noted that an international standard should be flexible enough to reflect manufacturing practices in the various regions of the world.

***Natural Mineral Water and Related Products***

*Amendment to the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters (CODEX STAN 108-1981, Rev. 1 1997)- Health Related Limits for Certain Substances*

55. The Delegation of China informed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 173) the Commission that many natural mineral waters present in several regions of China were naturally rich in Selenium in a range of concentrations from 0.01 mg/l to 0.05 mg/l and that Selenium was an essential nutrient to human life, whose upper level is 0.4 mg/l per day for an adult. While recognizing the WHO Guidelines on Drinking Water on Health Related Limits, the Delegation of China expressed its reservation on the proposed level of Selenium of 0.01 mg/l proposed in the Draft Standard.

56. Noting the concern expressed by China, the Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 174) the amendment at Step 8.

***Cocoa Products and Chocolate***

*Draft Revised Codex Standard for Cocoa Butter*

57. The Commission agreed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 177) to exclude the use of hexane as a processing aid in press cocoa butter as this was inconsistent with normal practice. Noting its earlier decision concerning the level of lead in Cocoa Butter, the Commission **adopted** the Draft Standard at Step 8 as amended.

*Draft Revised Codex Standard for Cocoa (Cacao) Mass (cocoa/chocolate liquor) and Cocoa Cake*

58. For consistency with the decision taken on the level of lead in Cocoa butter, the Commission agreed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 179) that there was a need for reliable scientific data from Governments and other interested organizations in order to justify any lower level than 2 mg/kg.

*Draft Revised Codex Standard for Cocoa Powders (Cocoas) and Dry Mixtures of Cocoa and Sugars*

59. The Observer of IOCCC underlined the need for clarification on levels of additives regarding the nature of final products. The Commission recalled that the Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate tried to establish a distinction between products that were intended for further use and those sold to the consumer directly. The Commission agreed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 181) to insert an additional mention to “final cocoa products” in enlarging provisions for the use of additives to all cases present in international food trade.

---

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 01/12A para. 42



60. Consistency with the decision taken on the level of lead in Cocoa Butter, the Commission agreed (ALINORM 01/41, para. 180) that there was also a need for getting reliable scientific data from Governments and other interested organizations in order to justify any lower level than 2 mg/kg in cocoa powders and dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars.

### ***METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING***

#### *General Codex Methods for the Detection of Irradiated Foods*

61. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 200) the five methods proposed as general Codex methods and encouraged the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling to give further consideration to validated methods that would be suitable for use in developing countries.

#### *General Codex Methods for Contaminants*

62. The Commission **adopted** (ALINORM 01/41, para. 201b ) the General Methods.

### **CONSIDERATION OF UNFINISHED MATTERS FROM THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION <sup>15</sup>**

63. The 49<sup>th</sup> (Extraordinary) Session of The Executive Committee of Codex Alimentarius Commission was conscious of the fact that several matters under discussion were expected to have been discussed by the plenary Commission, with the full participation of Members and observer organizations. It therefore agreed that decisions taken in relation to the unfinished business of the Commission would be based strictly on consensus and that where consensus was not possible there would be a full record of the differing points of view of the issues at hand.

### ***PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 5***

64. The Executive Committee considered the Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts that had been submitted to the Commission for adoption at Step 5 and advancement to Step 6, except those that had already been acted upon by the Commission.

#### ***Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CCFFV)***

65. The Executive Committee noted (ALINORM 03/3, para. 13) the concern expressed by the Representatives of Asia and Europe that the inclusion of bitter varieties of cassava in the Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Cassava could lead to excessive intake of cyanogenic glycosides and asked the Committee on Fresh Fruit and Vegetables to take this into account. It proposed that if bitter varieties were to be included in the Standard a level for cyanogenic glycosides would need to be proposed for endorsement by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants; this would need to be done on the basis of a JECFA evaluation.

#### ***Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC)***

##### *General Standard for Food Additives*

66. The technical comments provided by Brazil were forwarded to the Committee for consideration. The Executive Committee noted (ALINORM 03/3, para. 18) that the Committee would retain all of the data submitted for the establishment of maximum levels for the use of additives.

##### *Proposed Draft Revision for the Codex General Standard for Irradiated Foods*

67. The Representative for Europe drew attention to the reservation expressed by Member countries of that Region on the deletion of a specific dose limit; labelling provisions; and the lack of a clear statement that irradiation should not be used to substitute for good hygienic practices (ALINORM 03/3, para. 19).

##### *Proposed Draft Maximum Levels for Cadmium*

---

<sup>15</sup> Alinorm 03/3, paras 4-36

68. The Executive Committee noted (ALINORM 03/3, para. 20) the concerns expressed by the Representative of the South-West Pacific supported by the Representative of North America in relation to the proposed draft levels for crustacea and those of the Representative of Asia in regard to rice. The Executive Committee decided to return all of the proposed draft limits to Step 4 in view of the need to consider overall dietary intake data, in particular from staple foodstuffs.

### ***Proposals for New Work***

69. The Executive Committee considered (ALINORM 03/3, para. 21, Appendix III) proposals for new work under both the Accelerated Procedure and the normal Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, as follows:

<Extract from Appendix III, ALINORM 03/3>

---

## **PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK: ACCELERATED PROCEDURE**

---

(ALINORM 01/21, Part III, Addendum I)

<b>STANDARD AND RELATED TEXTS</b>	<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>REFERENCE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Proposed Amendment to the INS: Number 452 (iv) for Sodium Potassium Tripolyphosphate	CCFAC	ALINORM 01/12A, Appendix IX	Approved

---

## **PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK: NORMAL PROCEDURE**

---

(ALINORM 01/21, Part III and ALINORM 01/21, Part III, Addendum I)

<b>STANDARD AND RELATED TEXTS</b>	<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>REFERENCE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Proposed Draft Recommended International Code of Practice for Radiation Processing of Food	CCFAC	ALINORM 01/12A, para. 89	Approved
Proposed Draft Principles for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods	CCFAC	ALINORM 01/12A, paras. 122 and 126	Approved

## **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR INFANT FORMULA<sup>16</sup>**

70. At the 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Committee of Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses, the Committee expressed its concern on the large number of additives and levels of use proposed for infant formula and foods for infants and children in the Draft Sections of the General Standard, and asked the Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants to defer finalization of these levels until the CCNFSDU had carried out a thorough review of the current additives in the standards for foods for infants and children.

---

<sup>16</sup> Alinorm 03/26, paras. 63-69