

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) held its fifty-fourth session in Chengdu, China, from 22 to 26 April 2024, at the kind invitation of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Dr Yongxiang Fan, Professor, Deputy Director, China National Centre for Food Safety Risk Assessment, chaired the session, which was attended by \*\* Member Countries, one Member Organization, \*\* Observer Organizations, FAO and WHO. A list of participants is contained in Appendix I.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Dr Cao Xuetao, Vice Minister, the National Health Commission, opened the meeting and extended a warm welcome to all participants. He emphasized the critical role of food safety in assuring public health globally and its impact on socio-economic development. Mr. Cao reiterated China's commitment, as a host country, towards the work of CCFA and further expressed readiness to collaborate with other Members in establishing Codex standards to promote fair practice in food trade and protect consumer health.
3. Dr Tareq Elhouby, Chairman of the National Food Safety Authority of Egypt, conveyed his gratitude for the work accomplished by Codex, particularly CCFA, in guiding food regulators worldwide, and expressed appreciation to the Government of the People's Republic of China for their leadership in hosting and supporting the activities of this committee.
4. Dr Markus Lipp and Mr Kim Petersen welcomed the delegates on behalf of FAO and WHO, respectively. Ms Lingping Zhang of the Codex Secretariat addressed the session.
5. Mr Steve Wearne, Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), also addressed the Committee via video message.

### Division of competence<sup>1</sup>

6. CCFA54 noted the division of competence between the European Union (EU) and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II, of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)<sup>2</sup>

7. CCFA54 adopted the provisional agenda as its agenda for the session.
8. CCFA54 agreed to establish two in-session working groups (IWGs) on the following topics, open to all Members and Observers and working in English only:
  - International Numbering System (INS) for food additives, to consider and prepare recommendations for the plenary on proposed draft revisions to the *International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989) (agenda item 6) (chaired by Belgium); and
  - Priority List of food additives proposed for evaluation by the FAO/WHO Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), to consider and prepare recommendations for the plenary on proposals for additions and changes to the Priority List (agenda item 7) (chaired by Kenya).

### MATTERS REFERRED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 2)<sup>3</sup>

9. CCFA54 noted that some matters were for information only.
10. A Member Organization emphasized the need for the timely submission of accurate, and comprehensive data on carotenoids and other food additives, as outlined in specific paragraphs of CAC46 report (See REP23/CAC paragraphs 60, 66 and 67), to ensure effective updates to the JECFA's exposure assessment. They further informed the Committee of their risk management decisions, in 2022, regarding the prohibition of ethylene oxide (EtO) for sterilizing food additives, specifying that no residues above 0.1 mg/kg were allowed in their region.
11. CCFA54 considered the matters for action, noted the views expressed and where appropriate took the respective decisions as highlighted in the paragraphs below:

---

<sup>1</sup> CRD01

<sup>2</sup> CX/FA 24/54/1; CRD29 (Burundi)

<sup>3</sup> CX/FA 24/54/2; CX/FA 24/54/2 Add.1; CX/FA 24/54/2 Add.2; CRD6 (EU, Japan, and Senegal); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD21 (India); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD29 (Brundi)

**Matters from the 11th session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Near East (CCNE11)**Alignment of the food additive provisions in the Regional Standards with the GSFA

12. A Member Organization called for further discussion of the appropriate Food Category (FC) for products conforming to the *Regional Standard for Mixed Zaatar* (Near East) (CXS 341R-2020) taking into account the composition of the products conforming to the standard. It was highlighted that the products conforming to CXS 341R-2020 consisted of, to a large extent (more than 50 %), sesame seed and other ingredients like grains and nuts, legumes, pomegranate, molasses, vegetable oil, and wheat bran, which were not herbs. FC 12.2.2 “Seasonings and condiments” might be more appropriate for the products under consideration.
13. CCFA54 agreed to refer the information submitted by CCNE11 to the alignment EWG established by CCFA54 for consideration.

**Matters from CCFA53**

14. CCFA54 considered the recommendations related to the draft provisions for riboflavins and carotene-related food additives in the *Standards for Pickled Cucumbers (cucumber pickles)* (CXS 115-1981); *Fermented Milks* (CXS 243-2003); *Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* (CXS 296-2009); *Regional Standards for Fermented Soybean Paste* (Asia) (CXS 298R-2009); and *Non-Fermented Soybean Products* (Asia) (322R-2015) in CX/FA 24/54/2 paragraph 24 and took the following decisions:

Carotene-related food additives

15. CCFA54 considered the recommendation to CCASIA on the proposed deletion of carotene-related food additives from CXS 322R-2015 while noting the following views.
16. A Member proposed for CCFA to request the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Asia (CCASIA) to provide technological justification and maximum use levels for carotenoids (INS 160a(i), 160a(iii), 160e, 160f) and carotenes, beta-, vegetable (INS 160a(ii)) in the *Regional Standard for Non-Fermented Soybean Products* (Asia) (CXS 322R-2015) as its alignment with GSFA had not yet been conducted.
17. A Member Organization highlighted that the aim for revising carotene-related food additives was to minimize exposure in line with the recent JECFA evaluations, and that it was within the mandate of CCFA to confirm the appropriate use level of food additives. While Commodity Committees and the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees were tasked with assessing technological justifications for products within their scope, the endorsement decision on any proposed food additive provisions was under the purview of CCFA.
18. The Codex Secretariat clarified that it was customary for CCFA to make recommendations to active Commodity Committees or the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees to consider revoking food additive provisions within their jurisdiction. In case CCFA followed this practice, then slight adjustments could be made, such as removing INS 160f from the list of carotenoid-related food additives and replacing it with 160a(iv).
19. CCFA54 agreed to propose the corresponding recommendation to CCASIA for their consideration.

Standard for Fermented Milk (CXS 243-2003)

20. CCFA54 noted that the food additive section in the *Standard for Fermented Milk* (CXS 243-2003) would be considered for alignment to the provisions in the GSFA under Agenda Item 4b and agreed to remove the revision to this standard under this agenda item.

**Conclusion**

21. CCFA54 agreed to:
  - i. forward all revisions to the food additives provisions to the *Standard for Pickled Cucumbers (Cucumber Pickles)* (CXS 115-1981); *Standard for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades* (CXS 296-2009) listed in CX/FA 24/54/2 Appendices I and II to CAC47 for adoption, (Appendix V, part \*);
  - ii. request CCASIA to:
    - a. confirm the acceptability of deleting riboflavin, synthetic (INS 101(i)) from the table to Section 4 of CXS 298R-2009, acknowledging its use as a Table 3 additive;
    - b. clarify if other individual additives in the group of RIBOFLAVINS are acceptable for use in foods conforming to CXS 298R-2009, or if there is reason to limit use to Riboflavin, synthetic (INS 101(i)); and
    - c. provide justification and maximum use levels of carotenoid-related food additives (INS 160a(i), 160a(iii), 160a(iv), INS 160a(ii) and INS 160e) in the table to Section 4 of CXS 322R-2015, acknowledging the CCFA’s risk management approach to beta-carotenes.

**Matters from the 28<sup>th</sup> session of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils (CCFO28)**

22. CCFA54 noted the responses from CCFO28, which indicated that there was no technological justification for the use of:
- chlorophylls (INS 140) in products conforming to the *Standard for Edible Fats and Oils not Covered by Individual Standards* (CXS 19-1981); and
  - paprika extract (INS 160c (ii)) in products conforming to the *Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads* (CXS 256-2007).
23. CCFA54 further noted that the *Standard for Dairy Fat Spreads* (CXS 253-2006) fell outside the purview of CCFO.
24. A Member Organization pointed out that prior to its alignment with the GSFA, the standard CXS 19-1981 did not allow the use of colours in vegetable oils covered by that standard, and this aspect was never reflected when aligning the GSFA provisions in the FC 02.1.2. (Vegetable oils and fats) and proposed to make corresponding correction.
25. CCFA54 agreed with the proposal by the Member Organization.

**Conclusion**

26. CCFA54 agreed to forward the responses from CCFO28:
- i. regarding the use of chlorophylls (INS 140) in CXS 19-1981, as well as the necessary corrections to reflect that no colours were permitted for use in vegetable oils conforming to CXS 19-1981, to the alignment EWG established by CCFA54 for consideration; and
  - ii. concerning the usage of paprika extract (INS 160c (ii)) in CXS 256-2007 and CXS 253-2007, to the GSFA EWG established by CCFA54 for consideration.

**MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO/WHO AND FROM THE 96TH AND 97TH MEETINGS OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (JECFA) RESPECTIVELY (Agenda item 3(a))<sup>4</sup>**

27. The WHO JECFA Secretariat presented CX/FA 24/54/3 and summarised the main conclusions of the scientific advice from the 96th and 97th JECFA meetings, with particular emphasis on aspartame (INS 951) and titanium dioxide (INS 171).
28. Members expressed their appreciation to JECFA for the work carried out.
29. A Member Organization highlighted the importance of a timely publication of the related JECFA reports and monographs in advance of the CCFA meetings. This would allow for a timely consideration of JECFA assessments based on all relevant information and facilitate discussions. It was also noted that this had been a recurring issue.

**Matters from the 96th JECFA meeting**Aspartame (INS 951)

30. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that aspartame (INS 951) had been evaluated by both JECFA and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) independently. JECFA had concluded to reaffirm the previously established ADI of 0-40 mg/kg body weight (bw).

Flavouring agents - Esters of aliphatic acyclic primary alcohols with branched-chain aliphatic acyclic acids and Hydroxy- and alkoxy-substituted benzyl derivatives

31. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that JECFA had evaluated:
- all six (06) substances in esters of aliphatic acyclic primary alcohols with branched-chain aliphatic acyclic acids as “no safety concern”; and
  - all nine (09) substances in hydroxy- and alkoxy-substituted benzyl derivatives as “no safety concern”.

---

<sup>4</sup> CX/FA 24/54/3; CX/FA 24/54/3 Add.1; CX/FA 24/54/3 Add.2; CRD07 (Canada, Kenya, Philippines, Senegal, the United States of America, JECFA); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD23 (IFT); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFOST)

**Matters from the 97th JECFA meeting**Titanium dioxide (TiO<sub>2</sub>) (INS 171)

32. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that JECFA had reaffirmed the previously established ADI “not specified” for titanium dioxide (INS 171).
33. The EU pointed out the limitations and some equivocal findings in the available evidence for genotoxicity and the lack of suitable testing methodologies for nanoparticles. In addition, the EU, referring to the latest scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, pointed out that titanium dioxide (INS 171) was not authorised for use in food in their region.

Aliphatic primary alcohols, aldehydes, carboxylic acids, acetals and esters containing additional oxygenated functional groups (4 substances)

34. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that JECFA had concluded the assessment of four (04) substances ((±)-6-Methoxy-2,6-dimethylheptanal (No. 2308), ethyl 5-formyloxydecanoate (No. 2309), mixture of ricinoleic acid, linoleic acid and oleic acid (No. 2310), ethyl 3-methyl-2-oxopentanoate (No. 2311)) in aliphatic primary alcohols, aldehydes, carboxylic acids, acetals and esters containing additional oxygenated functional groups as “no safety concern”.

Linear and branched-chain aliphatic, unsaturated and unconjugated alcohols, aldehydes, acids and related esters (12 substances)

35. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that JECFA had evaluated linear and branched-chain aliphatic, unsaturated and unconjugated alcohols, aldehydes, acids and related esters and concluded twelve (12) substances as “no safety concern” except 4,7-decadienal (mixture of isomers) (No. 2298).

Saturated aliphatic acyclic linear primary alcohols, aldehydes and acids (5 substances)

36. The WHO JECFA Secretariat reported that JECFA had concluded that there was no safety concerns on five (05) substances: pentadecanoic acid (No. 2300), tridecanal (No. 2301), tridecanoic acid (No. 2302), acetaldehyde di-isobutyl acetal (No. 2304), acetaldehyde ethyl isobutyl acetal (No. 2305)) in saturated aliphatic acyclic linear primary alcohols, aldehydes and acids were of “no safety concern”; and that the evaluation of flavouring agents 2299, 2303 and 2306 was not completed due to toxicological concerns.
37. In addition, JECFA concluded that the use of acetaldehyde (No. 80) as a flavouring agent needed to be re-evaluated as acetaldehyde was the structural analogue of flavouring agents Nos 2299, 2303 and 2306.

**Other issues**Azodicarbonamide (INS 927a)

38. The Codex Secretariat introduced CX/FA 24/54/3 Add.1 related to the deletion of azodicarbonamide (INS 927a).
39. A Member noted that the ADI for this substance had been withdrawn, yet neither the report on the WHO website (<https://apps.who.int/food-additives-contaminants-jecfa-database/Home/Chemical/538>) nor CCFA53 report had clearly indicated the rationale for the withdrawal and therefore requested for clarification on the procedure for the withdrawal of ADIs established by JECFA, as this would ensure better transparency should a similar action happened in the future.
40. The FAO JECFA Secretariat clarified that the establishment or the withdrawal of any health-based guidance values was exclusively within the purview of the risk assessment body, JECFA or in lieu of that the JECFA Secretariat, and recalled that the discussions on azodicarbonamide (INS 927a) in CCFA dated back to 2019. However, it had been the JECFA secretariat’s oversight that the discussion was not sufficiently captured in the report to ensure sufficient transparency of the decision-making process. The JECFA secretariat would ensure that in the future the relevant discussions would be captured accordingly.
41. The WHO JECFA Secretariat suggested a procedure for withdrawal of an ADI whose safety use was no longer supported by Members. For transparency purposes, it was proposed that CCFA include these food additives in the priority list of food additives for JECFA evaluation but with a note that if their use were no longer supported, all provisions would be removed. This would alert Members that JECFA may formally withdraw an ADI without a full safety assessment.
42. Based on the above discussion, the Codex Secretariat proposed a mechanism for withdrawal of ADIs, noting following elements:
  - CCFA will inform JECFA of safety concerns for a food additive and request re-evaluation (under the agenda for JECFA Priority list for evaluation).

- JECFA will review the data provided and decide whether to revise the ADI, including withdrawal. If no data has been submitted and there is no interest in using the substance, the JECFA Secretariat will address the issue.
- JECFA will inform the CCFA of its decision on the review of ADIs and the CCFA will discuss the appropriate risk management approach (under the agenda on matters of interest from FAO and WHO).

### Conclusion

43. CCFA54 agreed:
- i. to the summary of the final recommendations arising from the 96th and 97th JECFA meetings as contained in Appendix II.
  - ii. to forward to CAC47 for revocation of the provision for azodicarbonamide (INS 927a) from Tables 1 and 2 of the GSFA (Appendix VI, part \*); and
  - iii. with the proposed mechanism for the withdrawal of ADIs (See paragraph \*).

### PROPOSED DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR IDENTITY AND PURITY OF FOOD ADDITIVES ARISING FROM THE 96TH AND 97TH JECFA MEETINGS RESPECTIVELY (Agenda item 3(b))<sup>5</sup>

44. The FAO JECFA Secretariat informed CCFA54 of the main conclusions regarding the draft specifications for the identity and purity of food additives arising from the 96th and 97th JECFA meetings as summarized in CX/FA 24/54/4.
45. The FAO JECFA Secretariat noted that:
- the specifications were revised for six food additives and thirty-six flavouring agents from the following flavouring groups: esters of aliphatic acyclic primary alcohols with branched-chain aliphatic acyclic acids, structural class I, hydroxy- and alkoxy-substituted benzyl derivatives, structural class I, aliphatic primary alcohols, aldehydes, carboxylic acids, acetals and esters containing additional oxygenated functional groups, structural class I, linear and branched-chain aliphatic, unsaturated and unconjugated alcohols, aldehydes, acids and related esters, structural class I, and saturated aliphatic acyclic linear primary alcohols, aldehydes and acids
  - the specifications were withdrawn for the flavouring agent ethyl levulinate propyleneglycol ketal, JECFA No. 1973, as information to allow the completion of the safety review of the flavouring agent has not been provided to the Committee in a timely manner.
  - the specifications were established for three flavouring agents JECFA numbers 2303, 2306, 2299 of the saturated aliphatic acyclic linear primary alcohols, aldehydes and acids group were designated as Tentative due to their incomplete safety evaluation.
  - requests for corrections reported to the CCFA and JECFA Secretariat, were evaluated at the ninety-sixth and the ninety-seventh JECFA meetings and found to be necessary are in Annex 2 of CX/FA 24/54/4. Corrections will be made only in the online database for specifications.
46. The FAO JECFA Secretariat thanked all the experts that served during the JECFA 96th and 97th meetings for their work during the past year and their employers for facilitating their participation in the JECFA meetings.

### Conclusion

47. CCFA54 agreed to forward full specifications for food additives to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8 and make the consequential amendment to the *List of Codex Specifications for Food Additives* (CXA 6-2023) (Appendix III).

---

<sup>5</sup> CX/FA 24/54/4; CX/FA 24/54/4 Add.1 (Replied to CL 2024/19-FA of Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Iraq, Peru and United Arab Emirates); CRD08 (Kenya, Senegal); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD23 (IFT); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi)

## ENDORSEMENT AND/OR REVISION OF MAXIMUM LEVELS FOR FOOD ADDITIVES AND PROCESSING AIDS IN CODEX STANDARDS (Agenda item 4a)<sup>6</sup>

48. Canada, the Chair of the physical working group (PWG) held immediately prior to the plenary session, presented the report of the PWG on endorsement/alignment contained in CRD03, noting that the endorsement proposals included three standards put forward by the Codex Committee on Spices and Culinary Herbs (CCSCH) and the Codex Committee for Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV) and made two (2) recommendations.
49. CCFA54 considered the recommendations and took the following decisions:  
Recommendation 1 - Standard from CCSCH
50. CCFA54 endorsed the food additives provisions in the Standard for dried or dehydrated roots, rhizomes and bulbs – turmeric (Appendix IV).  
Recommendation 2 - Standards from CCPFV
51. CCFA54 endorsed the food additives provisions in the General Standard for Dried Fruits and the General Standard for Canned Mixed Fruits (Appendix IV).

## ALIGNMENT OF THE FOOD ADDITIVE PROVISIONS OF COMMODITY STANDARDS AND RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE GSFA (Agenda item 4b)<sup>7</sup>

52. Canada, the Chair of the PWG, introduced the report of the PWG (CRD03) and explained that the PWG had prepared nine (9) recommendations related to alignment of 12 commodity standards from the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products (CCMMP), CCPFV; CCASIA; FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and Caribbean (CCLAC); and CCNE.

### Discussion

53. CCFA54 considered the recommendations and took the following decisions:  
Recommendation 3 – Annatto extracts, bixin based (INS 160b(i)) in FC 01.2.1
54. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation to forward the provision for annatto extracts, bixin based (INS 160b(i)) in FC 01.2.1 of the GSFA to the electronic working group (EWG) of the GSFA established by CCFA54 for revocation (see paragraph \*\* under item 5).  
Recommendation 4 – CCMMP standards
55. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation on the amendments to:
- i. the food additives provisions in the following CCMMP Standards as a result of the alignment exercise: *Standards for Fermented Milks* (CXS 243-2003); *Cream and Prepared Creams* (CXS 288-1976) and correction of *General Standard for Cheese* (CXS 283-1978) (Appendix V, part \*); and
  - ii. Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the GSFA relating to the alignment of CXS 243-2003 and CXS 288-1976 (Appendix VI, part \*).

### Recommendation 5 – CCPFV standards

56. CCFA54 noted that no changes were necessary for the food additive provisions in the following CCPFV standards: *Standards for Processed Tomato Concentrates* (CXS 57-1981); *Table Olives* (CXS 66-1981); *Pickled Fruits and Vegetables* (CXS 260-2007); and *Quick Frozen Vegetables* (CXS 320-2015).
57. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation on the amendments to Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the GSFA relating to the alignment of CXS 57-1981, CXS 66-1981, CXS 260-2007 and CXS 320-2015 (Appendix VI, part \*)

### Recommendations 6 and 8 – Regional standards

58. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation:
- i. to consult with CCASIA on the following question:

<sup>6</sup> CX/FA 24/54/5; CRD03 (Report of the 54th CCFA's Physical Working Group on endorsement and alignment); CRD09 (Kenya); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD21 (India); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFOST)

<sup>7</sup> CX/FA 24/54/6; CRD03 (Report of the 54th CCFA's Physical Working Group on endorsement and alignment); CRD10 (Australia, Canada, Kenya, Senegal, Thailand, IDF); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFOST)

“For laver products covered by CXS 323R-2017, in addition to association with the GSFA food categories 04.2.2.2 and 04.2.2.8, could these products also be associated with one or more of the following processed vegetable food categories: 04.2.2.1; 04.2.2.3; 04.2.2.4; 04.2.2.5; 04.2.2.6; 04.2.2.7?”

- ii. for the following amendments to:
  - a. the food additives provisions in the *Regional Standards for Laver Products* (CXS 323R-2017); and *Yacon* (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXS 324R-2017) as a result of the alignment exercise (Appendix V, part \*); and
  - b. Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the GSFA relating to the alignment of the *Regional Standards for Harissa (Red Hot Pepper Paste)* (Near East) (CXS 308R-2011); *Tempe* (Asia) (CXS 313R-2013); *Date Paste* (Near East) (CXS 314R-2013); *Laver Products* (Asia) (CXS 323R-2017); and *Yacon* (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXS 324R-2017) (Appendix VI, part \*).

#### Recommendation 7 – Addition of XS Notes to GSFA

59. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation that “XS Notes” be added during alignment, even if their absence would not affect the current understanding of the food additive provisions.

#### Recommendations 9 - 10 - Table 3 Notes

60. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendations related to Table 3 Notes:
- i. That CCFA pause work on the Table 3 Notes to the GSFA until the functionality of the new GSFA database is better understood; and
  - ii. That the WG on alignment maintain a list of Table 3 additives that will subsequently be migrated from Tables 1 and 2 when the functionality of the GSFA database allows the incorporation of Table 3 Notes.
61. A Member Organisation recalled the discussion at the previous session of CCFA on the importance of making progress on the GSFA database and reiterated the need to make progress in this regard.

#### Recommendation 11 – Future workplan

62. The Codex Secretariat noted that according to the proposed workplan for the next EWG on alignment, the Regional Standards under the purview of CCASIA were scheduled for alignment with GSFA and that CCASIA had also agreed to establish an EWG to undertake a similar exercise. It was proposed that CCASIA Members should be encouraged to join this EWG with a view to ensure optimal resource utilisation.
63. CCFA54 endorsed the workplan on alignment as presented in Appendix XII and agreed to revise the workplan in the information document: Guidance to Commodity Committees on Alignment of Food Additive Provisions accordingly.

#### **Others**

64. The PWG Chair on alignment noted the need to capture changes to Notes of the GSFA associated to the food additives still in the Step process. These changes would be annexed to the report of the PWG (CRD03, Annex 5).

#### **Conclusion**

65. CCFA54 agreed to forward to CAC47 for adoption:
- i. the revised food-additive sections of
    - a. the two standards from CCMMP, i.e. the *Standards for Fermented Milks* (CXS 243-2003); and *Cream and Prepared Creams* (CXS 288-1976) (Appendix V, Part \*);
    - b. the two regional standards, i.e., *Regional Standards for Laver Products* (Asia) (CXS 323R-2017); and *Yacon* (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXS 324R-2017) (Appendix V, Part \*);
  - ii. editorial corrections to the *General Standard for Cheese* (CXS 283-1978) (Appendix V, Part \*)
  - iii. the revised provisions of the GSFA in relation to:
    - a. the alignment of two standards from CCMMP, i.e., CXS 243-2003 and CXS 288-1976 (Appendix VI, Part \*);
    - b. the alignment of four standards from CCPFV, i.e., *Standards for Processed Tomato Concentrates* (CXS 57-1981); *Table Olives* (CXS 66-1981); *Pickled Fruits and Vegetables* (CXS 260-2007); *Quick Frozen Vegetables* (CXS 320-2017) (Appendix VI, Part \*); and

- c. the alignment of five regional standards, i.e., *Regional Standards for Harissa (Red Hot Pepper Paste) (Near East) (308R-2011)*; *Tempe (Asia) (313R-2013)*, *Date Paste (Near East) (314R-2013)*; *Laver Products (Asia) (323R-2017)*; and *Yacon (Latin America and the Caribbean) (324R-2017) (Appendix VI, Part \*)*.
66. CCFA54 also agreed to establish an EWG on alignment, chaired by Canada and co-chaired by the USA and Japan, and working in English only, to:
- i. align the CCASIA regional standards: CXS 298R-2009; CXS 301R-2011; CXS 322R-2015; CXS 354R-2023; CXS 355R-2023;
  - ii. align the CCNE regional standards: CXS 257R-2007; CXS 258R-2007; CXS 259R-2007; CXS 341R-2020;
  - iii. align the following CCSCH standards: CXS 342-2021; CXS 343-2021; CXS 344-2021; CXS 345-2021; CXS 347-2019; CXS 351-2022; CXS 352-2022; CXS 353-2022;
  - iv. verify and update the provisions for colours in the GSFA FC 02.1.2 reflecting that colours were not permitted in vegetable oils covered by CXS 19-1981 prior to the alignment of the standard with the GSFA;
  - v. introduce the limited use of methacrylate copolymer, basic (BMC) (INS 1205) in fortified rice, by:
    - a. introducing a food additive section in the *Standard for Rice (CXS 198-1995)*, including an appropriate reference to certain carriers in FC 06.1 of the GSFA;
    - b. making consequential changes to the food additive provisions of FC 06.1, as necessary; and
  - vi. update the list of Table 3 additives that should be migrated from Tables 1 and 2 of the GSFA, following the Table 3 Notes approach.
67. CCFA54 noted that the report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFA55.
68. CCFA54 further agreed to hold a PWG, chaired by Canada and working in English only, to meet immediately prior to CCFA55 (half-day, preceding the session) to consider and prepare recommendations for the plenary on:
- i. the report of the endorsement and alignment EWG; and
  - ii. the endorsement of food additive provisions referred by Commodity Committees.

#### **GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (Agenda item 5)<sup>8</sup>**

69. CCFA54 noted that the PWG on the GSFA (PWG-GSFA), held immediately before the plenary session and chaired by the United States of America, had made recommendations on multiple issues, including 359 provisions in the Codex step procedure and/or already adopted, and discussed multiple proposed new and/or revised provisions. These matters related to agenda items 5(a) and 5(b).
70. CCFA54 considered PWG-GSFA recommendations 1–18 (as contained in CRD02) and took decisions as follows:

#### **GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (GSFA): REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON THE GSFA (Agenda item 5a)<sup>9</sup>**

##### **Draft and proposed draft provisions in FC 14.2 and its subcategories (CX/FA 24/54/7 Appendix 3)**

##### Recommendations 1 - 2

71. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendations regarding:
- i. the adoption at Step 8 and Step 5/8 of the draft provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 1 Part A; and
  - ii. the discontinuation of the draft and proposed draft provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 2 Part A.

##### Recommendation 3

<sup>8</sup> CRD02 (Report of the 54th CCFA's Physical Working Group on GSFA)

<sup>9</sup> CX/FA 24/54/7; CRD02 (Report of the 54rd CCFA's Physical Working Group on GSFA); CRD11 (Canada, El Salvador, Japan, Kenya, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Thailand, IACM, ICBA); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD18 (Indonesia); CRD22 (IFU); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFoST); CRD33 (Codex Secretariat)



72. CCFA54 noted that consensus had been achieved regarding the adoption of the following alternative Note for the horizontal approach to sweeteners and colours in FC 07.1 and its subcategories:

*“Some Codex members allow the use of additives with sweetener and colour functions in this FC while others limit this FC to products without these additives.”*

73. Chile, the EU, and the Russian Federation highlighted that they did not permit the use of sweeteners in products falling under FC 07.1 and its subcategories, in their respective territories.
74. CCFA53 endorsed the recommendation for the adoption at Step 8 or Step 5/8 of the draft provisions and the revision of adopted provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 1 Part B, with the deletion of the provision for aspartame (INS 951) in FC 07.1.

#### Recommendation 4

75. CCFA54 agreed with the recommendation for the EWG on GSFA to recirculate the adopted provision for aspartame (INS 951) in FC 07.1 for specific consideration of actual use level and application of the alternative Note (see paragraph **\*\***).

**All remaining draft and proposed draft provisions in the GSFA with the exception of colours not addressed in parts ii and iii, and provisions for which CCFA is awaiting guidance from other Codex Committees or JECFA (CX/FA 24/54/7 Appendix 5)**

#### Recommendations 5 - 6

76. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendations regarding:
- the adoption at Step 5/8 of the draft provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 1 Part C; and
  - the discontinuation of the draft and proposed draft provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 2 Part B.

#### Recommendation 7

77. CCFA54 agreed with the recommendation to request that the IWG on the Priority List of Substances Proposed for Evaluation by JECFA to consider adding propylene glycol (INS 1520) on the Priority List of Substances Proposed for Evaluation by JECFA, to consider an updated safety evaluation of the food additive including an updated exposure estimate inclusive of all uses of the additive as a carrier, including use in FC 14.1.4 as a carrier for flavours.
78. CCFA54 noted that the recommendation had already been considered by the IWG on Priority (see CRD05).

#### Recommendation 8

79. CCFA54 agreed with the recommendation to update and hold the provisions for propylene glycol (INS 1520) in FCs 14.1.4.1, 14.1.4.2, and 14.1.4.3 in the step process and to include Note 131 “For use as a flavour carrier only” as listed in CRD02 Annex 3 Part A.

#### **Provisions entered at Step 2 of the GSFA at CCFA53 (CX/FA 24/54/7 Appendix 4)**

#### Recommendation 9

80. CCFA54 recognized that the use of methacrylate copolymer, basic (BMC) (INS 1205) in CXS 198-1995 may be associated with nutrient fortification in rice and noted that the *Standard for Rice* (CXS 198-1995) did not contain the section on food additives which implies this standard may need to be amended to include the food additive provision.
81. A Member Organization requested clarification regarding the procedure for updating CXS 198-1995 by the Codex Secretariat.
82. The Codex Secretariat explained that updating CXS 198-1995 would follow a similar procedure to that used for the amendment of commodity standards due to alignment, i.e., such amendments would be included in the appendix to the report of CCFA54, and then circulated for comments prior to consideration by CAC47.
83. Another Member proposed that “only certain carriers” were acceptable for use in food complying with CXS 198-1995.
84. In view of the discussion above, CCFA54 agreed to revise the recommendation as follows:

*The WG recommends that if the provision for BMC (INS 1205) in FC 06.1 in CRD02 Annex 1 Part D is adopted, then, to introduce the limited use of BMC in fortified rice, it is requested that the EWG on Endorsement and Alignment:*

- introduce a food additive section in the *Standard for Rice* (CXS 198-1995), including an appropriate reference to certain carriers in FC 06.1 of the GSFA; and

- *make consequential changes to the food additive provisions of FC 06.1, as necessary.*

#### Recommendation 10

##### **Discussions**

##### *SORBATES (INS 200, 202, 203) in FC 01.6.1*

85. The PWG Chair clarified that, for transparency purposes, Note 561 regarding the provision for SORBATES (INS 200, 202, 203) in FC 01.6.1 was included as part of the alignment process during CCFA53. The PWG Chair reaffirmed that the existing provision in CRD02 Annex 1 Part D was indeed correct.

##### *Dimethyl dicarbonate (INS 242) in FCs 14.1.2 and 14.1.3*

86. Regarding the use of dimethyl dicarbonate (INS 242) in FCs 14.1.2 "Fruit and vegetable juices" and 14.1.3 "Fruit and vegetable nectars," one Member did not support these provisions due to concerns about the potential formation of significant amounts of methanol, which could pose health risks to consumers, and in their opinion, there was no technological necessity for using INS 242 in these food categories.

87. A Member Organization while not objecting to the PWG recommendation, noted they did not permit the use of dimethyl dicarbonate (INS 242) in FCs 14.1.2 and 14.1.3 within their region.

88. An Observer, referring to CRD22, expressed their disagreement with these proposed provisions.

89. The PWG Chair clarified that: i) JECFA had evaluated dimethyl dicarbonate (INS 242) for safety; ii) there was deliberation on its classification as a food additive or processing aid, with consensus favoring its categorization as a food additive based on labelling requirements that would ensure consumers' awareness; and iii) an XS247 was associated with these provisions, to exclude its use in products conforming to the *General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars (CXS 247-2005)*.

##### *Jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) in various FCs*

90. A Member did not support the inclusion of jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) in multiple FCs, and in their view, there was insufficient justification for its use, lack of established safe maximum levels, and inadequate specification for this food additive.

91. In response, the JECFA Secretariat confirmed that jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) was evaluated at the 89th JECFA meeting and the full specifications for this substance had been established.

92. The PWG Chair further clarified that:

- The technological justification for using colours in various food categories was well-established. Jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) was not the first colour proposed for these FCs, many of which already contained colours. Thus, the technological justification for the use of jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) in the proposed applications was considered adequate; and
- Regarding the use levels, the PWG maintained consistency with the use levels included in the exposure estimates provided by JECFA during its 89th session.

##### **Conclusion on recommendation 10**

93. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation regarding the adoption at Step 5/8 of the draft provisions and revised adopt provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 1 Part D, noting the following amendments:

- i. inserted RIBOFLAVINS (INS 101(i),(ii), (iii), (iv)) in FC 09.2.2; and
- ii. revised Note 602 as "Except for use as an antifoaming agent only in products conforming to the *Standards for Jams, Jellies and Marmalades (CXS 296-2009)* at a maximum level of 10 mg/kg."

#### Recommendation 11

94. CCFA54 agreed with the recommendation to discontinue work on the draft and proposed draft provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 2 Part C.

#### Recommendation 12

95. CCFA54 agreed to maintain the adopted provision for lauric arginate ethyl ester (INS 243) in FC 02.2.2, hold the provision at Step 3 and request guidance from CCFO on the technological justification for the use of INS 243 as a preservative in products conforming to the *Standard for Fat Spreads and Blended Spreads (CXS 256-2007)*.

Recommendation 13

96. CCFA54 agreed to forward to CAC47 for adoption the updated food additive section in the *Standard for Jams, Jellies, and Marmalades* (CXS 296-2009) as shown in CRD33. This included adding an entry for jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) to the list of colours, pending the adoption of the provision for jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) in FC 04.1.2.5 as outlined in CRD02 Annex 1 Part D (Appendix V, Part 5).

**Draft and proposed draft provisions for colours in FCs 07.0, 12.0, 13.0 and 15.0 and their subcategories as well as adopted provisions for colours with Note 161 in FCs 07.0, 12.0, 13.0 and 15.0 and their subcategories (CX/FA 24/54/7 Appendix 2)**

Recommendation 14

97. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendations to adopt at Step 8 or Step 5/8 the draft, and proposed draft provisions, respectively, and the revised adopted provisions outlined in CRD02 Annex 1 Part E as follows:
- i. revised the maximum use level for caramel II – sulfite caramel (INS150b) in FC 07.1.1.1 from 50,000 mg/kg to 15,000 mg/kg, and amended the associated Note App2A to read “For use in pumpernickel bread at 15,000 mg/kg and for use in malt bread at 3,000 mg/kg only”;
  - ii. revised the maximum use level for curcumin (INS 100(ii)) in FC 07.1.1.1 from 500 mg/kg to 200 mg/kg;
  - iii. revised the maximum use level for caramel II - sulfite caramel (INS150b) in FC 07.1.1.2 from 50,000 mg/kg to 15,000 mg/kg; and
  - iv. inserted the provisions for tartrazine (INS 102) in FCs 07.1.6 and 15.2 and paprika extract (INS 160c(ii)) in FC 12.6.3.

Recommendation 15

98. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation regarding the discontinuation of the draft, and the proposed draft provisions, respectively, contained in CRD02 Annex 2 Part D, with the following corrections:
- i. changed the Step for the provisions for annatto extracts, bixin-based (INS160b(i)) in FCs 07.2.1 and 07.2.2 from Step 5/8 to Step 2;
  - ii. removed the provision for paprika extract (INS 160c(ii)) in FC 12.6.3; and
  - iii. inserted provisions for tartrazine (INS 102) in FC 12.2.1 and synthetic zeaxanthin (INS 161h(i)) in FC 13.4.

Recommendation 16

99. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendations regarding the revocation of the adopted provisions listed in CRD02 Annex 4 Part A.

**GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (GSFA): PROPOSALS FOR NEW AND/OR REVISION OF FOOD ADDITIVE PROVISIONS (REPLIES TO CL 2023/46-FA) (Agenda Item 5b)<sup>10</sup>**

Recommendation 17

100. CCFA54 revised the recommendation to take into account the language in Section 1.2 in the preamble of the GSFA, as follows:

*The WG recommends that CCFA54 request the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) to appraise the technological need/justification of BMC in commodity standards under their purview in GSFA FCs 13.1, 13.2, and 13.3. These commodity standards include CXS 72-1981, CXS 156-1987, CXS 73-1981, CXS 74-1981, and the Codex Guideline CXG 95-2022.*

101. However, CCFA54 did not include the *General Principles for the Addition of Essential Nutrients to Foods* (CXG 9-1979) on the list of Codex texts requiring technological justification from CCNFSDU, noting that CXG 9-1979 was not a commodity standard but contained principles for addition of nutrients to foods only and this matter had already been extensively discussed in the PWG and seeking guidance from CCNFSDU in this regard was deemed not appropriate.

<sup>10</sup> CL 2023/46-FA; CX/FA 24/54/8 (Replies to CL 2023/46-FA of Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal, United Kingdom, FIVS, ISDI, OENOPPIA, and OIV); CRD02 (Report of the 54rd CCFA's Physical Working Group on GSFA); CRD12 (Canada, Kenya, Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD19 (Rwanda); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFoST)

Recommendation 18

102. CCFA54 agreed to include in the GSFA, at Step 2, the proposed new provisions contained in CRD02 Annex 5, and noted that these provisions would be circulated for comment by the EWG on the GSFA established by CCFA54.

**GENERAL CONCLUSION FOR AGENDA ITEM 5**

103. CCFA54 agreed to forward to CAC47:
- i. the draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA for adoption at Step 8, and Step 5/8, respectively, and revisions to adopted provisions (Appendix VI, Part \*)<sup>11</sup>;
  - ii. the food additive provisions of the GSFA for revocation (Appendix VII, Part \*)<sup>12</sup>
  - iii. the draft, and proposed draft food additive provisions, respectively, for discontinuation in the GSFA (Appendix VIII)<sup>13</sup>; and
  - iv. the proposed draft food additive provisions for inclusion in the GSFA, at Step 2 (Appendix IX)<sup>14</sup>.

**Others**

104. Colombia expressed their appreciation for the conclusions regarding the use of jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183), highlighting the significant benefits of its inclusion in the GSFA for indigenous communities in their country and the Latin American Region. Recognizing jagua (genipin-glycine) blue (INS 183) as a valuable resource and that its inclusion in the GSFA would open up new trade opportunities, drive biodiversity conservation and the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices.

**Work for CCFA54**EWG on the GSFA

105. CCFA54 agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by the USA and working in English only, to consider:
- i. replies from CCFO28 on the technological justification for the use of paprika extract (INS 160c (ii) in FC 02.2.2 of the GSFA;
  - ii. revocation of the adopted provision for annatto extracts, bixin based (INS 160b(i)) in FC 01.2.1;
  - iii. the adopted provision for aspartame (INS 951) in FC 07.1 for comment on the actual use level and application of the alternative Note;
  - iv. the draft, and proposed draft provisions, respectively, for colours in FCs 01.0 through to 08.0 and their subcategories as well as adopted provisions for colours with Note 161 in FCs 01.0 through to 08.0 and their subcategories with the exception of colours addressed in bullet points i and ii above; and
  - v. provisions entered at Step 2 of the GSFA contained in CRD02 Annex 5.
106. The report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFA55.

PWG on the GSFA

107. CCFA54 further agreed to hold a PWG, chaired by the USA and working in English only, to meet immediately prior to CCFA55 (1.5 days) to consider and prepare recommendations for the plenary on:
- i. the report of the EWG on the GSFA; and
  - ii. responses to the CL on proposals for new and/or revised provisions of the GSFA.

---

<sup>11</sup> Recommendations for adoption arising from agenda items 5a and 5b

<sup>12</sup> Recommendations for revocation arising from agenda item 5a

<sup>13</sup> Recommendations for discontinuation from agenda items 5a and 5b

<sup>14</sup> Recommendations related to agenda item 5b

**PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION TO THE CLASS NAMES AND THE INTERNATIONAL NUMBERING SYSTEM FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (CXG 36-1989) (Agenda item 6)<sup>15</sup>**

108. Belgium, Chair of the IWG on INS introduced the report (CRD04), and highlighted the broad recommendations the IWG had put forward in respect of: i) the proposed modifications to Sections 3 and 4 of the *Class Names and the International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG36-1989); ii) the requests to change INS number for gellan gum in the JECFA Specifications; iii) the proposed consequential changes to the GSFA due to revision of INS; and iv) the status of the function carrier for sodium ascorbate (INS 301) and the status of phycoyanin produced by bacteria for use as a blue colour.

**Discussion**

109. CCFA54 considered the recommendations and made the following decisions:

Recommendation 1.1

110. A Member requested clarification on: i) why alphabetical subscript “a” was applied to oat lecithin (INS 322a) instead of numeric subscript and whether this approach would be used in the future; and ii) whether INS 322a was included in the current specifications by JECFA.
111. A Member Organization clarified that: i) although oat lecithin shared similarities with lecithin (INS 322(i)) in origin, composition, and technological function, it differed significantly; ii) oat lecithin was a fractionated oil with high polar lipid content, produced through a unique process involving only water and ethanol extraction; and iii) in the EU, oat lecithin was classified separately from lecithin due to these distinctions and an alphabetical subscript “a” had been used.
112. The FAO representative pointed out that decisions about the need to establish a separate INS number for any given additive resided with CCFA. There were very many commercially available additives that differed in in the application and other aspects. Specifications for various additives can be established if so desired; however, it was CCFA’s prerogative to consider whether there was a need for separate specifications.

**Conclusion on recommendation 1.1**

113. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation to modify Sections 3 and 4 of CXG 36-1986 as follows:
- i. add glycolipids (INS 246), buffered vinegar (INS 267), oat lecithin (INS 322a), gellan (INS 418), low-acyl clarified gellan gum (INS 418(ii)), and carbomer (INS 1210) with change of INS for gellan gum from 418 to 418(i); and
  - ii. modify the respective functional class and technological purpose(s) for carob bean gum (INS 410), mannitol (INS 421), sodium sesquicarbonate (INS 500(iii)), calcium sulfate (INS 516), sodium thiosulfate (INS 539), and starch sodium octenyl succinate (INS 1450).

Recommendation 1.2

114. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation to request JECFA to revise the INS number for gellan gum in the JECFA specifications.

Recommendation 1.3

115. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation to consider the consequential changes to the GSFA by revising the INS number for gellan gum from INS 418 to INS 418(i)(Appendix VI, Part \*).
116. CCFA54 also agreed to the consequential amendments, proposed by the Codex Secretariat, to the *List of Codex Specifications for Food Additives* (CXA 6-2023) and to the food additive provisions of the *Standard for Aqueous Coconut Products – Coconut Milk and Coconut Cream* (CXS 240-2003) as indicated in CRD34. (Appendix V, Part \*).

Recommendation 2

117. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation not to include the function of carrier for sodium ascorbate (INS 301).

---

<sup>15</sup> CL 2024/23-FA; CX/FA 24/54/9; CX/FA 24/54/9 Add.1 (Replies to CL 2024/23-FA of Chile, European Union, Philippines, and IFAC); CRD04 (Report of the in-session Working Group on INS); CRD04 (EWG chair); CRD13 (Kenya); CRD19 (Rwanda); CRD23 (IFT), CRD25 (Egypt); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD27 (Nigeria); CRD28 (Ghana), CRD29 (Burundi), CRD31 (IUFOST), CRD34 (Codex Secretariat)

### Recommendation 3

118. While discussing phycocyanin, a Member questioned the need for national approval as a prerequisite to request assignment of an INS number. They sought clarification, noting that their country only allowed those substances for use as food additives if they have suitable provisions in the GSFA. They further noted that this substance has neither an INS number nor a provision in the GSFA and therefore it cannot be authorized for use as an additive in their country. Consequently, complying with the requirement of an existing national approval for this substance is not feasible.
119. The IWG Chair recalled that INS was a harmonised naming system and that the request for the inclusion of new additives might be made by Members that authorized the additive for use in that country as indicated in Principles for Changes/Additions to Section 3 of *Class Names and International Numbering System* (CXG 36-1989) attached as an annex of CL 2023/45-FA, because the evaluations and assessments for new additives relied heavily on the country that authorized it and there were no system for reviewing all documents for authorization.
120. The FAO representative was of the view that, in this case where country's authorization was impossible, CCFA needed to find a way forward to allow Members to put forward their request.
121. CCFA54 agreed with the Chairperson's proposal to keep the current new INS request process as included in the CL unchanged; however, this case should be considered on an exceptional basis and should be referred to the INS EWG established by CCFA54 for further consideration.

### **Final conclusion**

122. CCFA54 agreed to forward the proposals for revision of the *Class Names and International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989) to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix X).
123. CCFA54 also agreed to forward the consequential amendments to the following texts, due to the change of INS number for gellan gum to INS 418(i), to CAC47 for adoption:
- i. *Standard for Aqueous Coconut Products – Coconut Milk and Coconut Cream* (CXS 240-2003) (Appendix IV, Part **h**);
  - ii. GSFA (Appendix VI, Part \*); and
  - iii. *List of Codex Specifications for Food Additives* (CXA 6-2023).
124. CCFA54 further agreed to establish an EWG on INS, chaired by Belgium, co-chaired by Iran, working in English only, to consider:
- i. replies to a CL requesting proposals for change and/or addition to Section 3 of the *Class Names and International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989) and prepare a proposal for circulation for comments at Step 3;
  - ii. deleting azodicarbonamide (INS 927a); and
  - iii. assessing the information provided by Chile on phycocyanin produced by bacteria for use as a blue colour, including the authorization in other countries.
125. The report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFA55.

### **PROPOSALS FOR ADDITIONS AND CHANGES TO THE PRIORITY LIST OF SUBSTANCES PROPOSED FOR EVALUATION BY JECFA (REPLIES TO CL 2023/47-FA) (Agenda item 7)<sup>16</sup>**

126. Kenya, Chair of the IWG on priorities, introduced the report (CRD05), noting that in addition to the documents available for CCFA54, the preparation of the Priority List of Substances Proposed for Evaluation by JECFA (hereafter, the "Priority List") had also taken into account the calls for data for the 98th, 99th and 100th JECFA meetings.
127. Kenya highlighted the main topics discussed by the IWG that had led to the priority list proposed in CRD05, Annex 1 (Tables 1 and 2) and Annex 2 (Tables A, B and C).

---

<sup>16</sup> CL 2023/47-FA; CX/FA 24/54/10 (Replies to CL 2023/47-FA of Japan, Peru, AMFEP, CCC, DSM, EUSFI, FoodDrinkEurope, IACM, IFAC, IOFI, and NATCOL); CRD14 (China, Japan, Kenya, Peru, USP); CRD19 (Rwanda); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD30 (IWG working document prepared by IWG Chair of Priority list), CRD31 (IUFoST)

## Discussion

128. CCFA54 endorsed the recommendation to include substances in CRD05 (Annex 1 and 2) on the Priority List and made the following clarifications along with editorial corrections:

Ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304) and gellan gum, low-acyl clarified (INS 418 (ii))

129. CCFA54 noted a clarification that the requests for ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304) and gellan gum, low-acyl clarified (INS 418 (ii))<sup>17</sup> as described in the main body of CRD05 (5<sup>th</sup> paragraph) should be considered separately, based on requests from CCNFSDU43<sup>18</sup>. It was also pointed out that a safety evaluation for the low-acyl clarified gellan gum had already been conducted by JECFA87.

Ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304)

130. An Observer requested that a full safety evaluation for ascorbyl palmitate (INS304) should include all food uses under FC 13.0.
131. The WHO JECFA Secretariat clarified that JECFA would aim for a full assessment of ascorbyl palmitate. The current safety assessment is more than 50 years old and does not include an exposure assessment.
132. CCFA54 amended the general information for INS 304 to clarify that a full evaluation addressing consumption for infants under 12 weeks of age would be conducted.

Gellan gum, low-acyl clarified (INS 418 (ii))

133. CCFA54 noted the clarification that for gellan gum, low-acyl clarified (INS 418 (ii)) only specifications were requested for this food additive.

Sucroglycerides (INS 474)

134. The data availability of sucroglycerides (INS 474) was extended from December 2024 to December 2027 in order to align with the other two food additives (i.e sucrose esters of fatty acids (INS 473) and sucrose oligoesters type I and type II (INS 473a)) as these three food additives fall under the group header SUCROSE ESTERS and shared a group ADI (0-30 mg/kg, bw).

Steviol glycosides

135. CCFA54 amended the data availability for this substance to December 2024 and noted the request by an Observer to have for this substance considered for inclusion in the list for call for data in the upcoming JECFA meetings.

Others

136. The following editorial changes were made to Annex 1, Table 2 – list of substances used as processing aids proposed for evaluation by JECFA:
- revised No.18 Ribonuclease from *Penicillium citrinum* RP-4: Type of request as “safety assessment” and “establishment of specifications” and the name of data provider should be updated; and
  - revised No.19 Xylanase from *Bacillus licheniformis* expressed in *Bacillus licheniformis*: The data provider's information “to be determined in CCFA55”.

## Conclusion

137. CCFA54 agreed to:
- i. forward the amended Priority List of Substances Proposed for Evaluation by JECFA for endorsement by CAC47 (Appendix XI); and to FAO and WHO for follow-up; and
  - ii. request the Codex Secretariat to issue a CL requesting information and comments on the priority list of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA.

---

<sup>17</sup> The INS number was assigned under agenda item 6, pending adoption by CAC47

<sup>18</sup> CX/FA 23/53/2 Add.2

**DISCUSSION PAPER ON DIVERGENCE BETWEEN THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (GSFA), CODEX COMMODITY STANDARDS AND OTHER TEXTS – IDENTIFICATION OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES (Agenda item 8)<sup>19</sup>**

138. China, author of the discussion paper, speaking also on behalf of co-authors Canada and the EU, introduced the item, recalling that CCFA53 had agreed to prepare a discussion paper to identify the outstanding issues with respect to avoiding future divergence between the GSFA, commodity standards and other texts.
139. China highlighted that the working group had conducted an analysis of the current steps and documents and identified a number of challenges that contribute to divergency of food additives provisions in commodity standards and GSFA, including: the Procedural Manual (PM) which does not explicitly recognise the GSFA as a single source of food additives; the endorsement and alignment steps for food additives provisions were carried at different time; introduction of XS Notes in the GSFA at times does not take into account the existing commodity standards; development of commodity standards without fully adhering to the requirements of the PM when it comes to food additives. Based on this analysis three possible options on how to address the challenges as highlighted in CX/FA 24/54/11.

**Discussion**

140. CCFA54 held a brief discussion and reaffirmed the desire to prevent divergence in the future between the GSFA and commodity standards; and further reaffirmed that GSFA should be the primary source of information on food additives within Codex.
141. It was generally agreed that rather than focusing on the proposed three options as stated in the discussion paper, CCFA54 should consider the existing challenges in a broader manner with a focus on the following:
- The future when the ongoing work on formal alignment will be completed, noting that the valuable experience gained during the ongoing alignment activities would be important to address the potential gaps in the procedural manual including positioning the GSFA as a single source of food additives in Codex.
  - How to better manage the food additive provisions in both GSFA and commodity standards to through streamlining the relationship between the work of CCFA and that of Commodity Committees.
  - The Identification of processes that could enable endorsement and alignment/incorporation to be undertaken at the same time taking into account the need to conform to the PM and in particular paragraph 59.
142. CCFA54 also noted support from some Members to different options.
143. The Codex Secretariat called the attention of CCFA to the following mechanisms in the PM that could assist in addressing the challenge of divergence between food additives provisions in the commodity standards and the GSFA:
- The requirement for all food additive provisions in commodity standards to be endorsed by CCFA before publication of any commodity standard.
  - The format for codex commodity standards requires the section on food additives to make reference to the corresponding section of the GSFA and such a provision should take the following form i.e.  
“[Food additive functional class] used in accordance with Tables 1 and 2 of the *General Standard of Food Additives* in food category x.x.x.x [FC name] or listed in Table 3 of the GSFA are acceptable for use in foods conforming to this standard.”
144. The Codex Secretariat further noted that the above mechanisms in the PM could provide an opportunity for CCFA to ensure that divergency of food additives provisions in commodity standards and GSFA was significantly minimised.
145. The Chairperson encouraged CCFA not to limit itself to any specific options but rather to working together in a more inclusive manner and noted the need for further consultation.
146. Following a brief discussion, CCFA54 agreed that China with interested Members and Observers hold informal consultations on the issues outlined in the discussions paper and make workable proposals on the way forward to addressing the identified challenges leading to divergency of food additives provisions.
147. China presented the proposals from the informal consultation contained in CRD35, which were endorsed by CCFA54.

---

<sup>19</sup> CX/FA 24/54/11; CRD15 (Canada, Kenya, Senegal, Thailand); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD26 (Russian Federation); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFOST); CRD32 (Malaysia); CRD35 (China and interested Members)



148. The Chairperson reiterated that the main aim of the alignment exercise was to have a single reference for food additives within Codex, and that CCFA should focus on how best to minimise divergency/misalignment of food additives provisions between the GSFA and commodity standards and thus reduce the burden of alignment work.

### Conclusion

149. CCFA54 agreed to the following goals for the work on alignment:
- to strengthen the GSFA as the single reference for food additives;
  - to minimise the incorporation of specific food additive provisions in commodity standards as much as possible; and
  - to ensure that the alignment work is completed, with any future specific food additive provisions developed by Commodity/Regional Committees being incorporated into the GSFA.
150. CCFA54 agreed to request China as author, and Australia, Brazil, Canada, the EU, Senegal and the USA as co-authors, to:
- i. develop working practices, including consideration of a guidance document, for the endorsement and incorporation of food additive provisions considered by Regional/Commodity Committees in order to ensure that the necessary timely changes are made to the GSFA. These working practices would be in accordance with the PM.  
  
These working practices would include information on how Commodity Committees make proposals to the CCFA and how the CCFA will incorporate these into the GSFA.
  - ii. develop an engagement plan. The engagement plan would include how the CCFA interacts with the Commodity/Regional Committees.
151. The document including the working practices and the engagement plan should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFA55.
152. CCFA54 noted this might be a two-year period plan and it might be possible to establish an EWG on this matter by CCFA56 based on the discussions held during CCFA55.

### DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARD FOR YEAST (Agenda item 9)<sup>20</sup>

153. The Chairperson recalled the background to the development of the discussion paper, noting that at CCFA53 there was a general support for developing the project document further with a refined scope that focused on baker's yeast, and also taking into account the comments received at that session.
154. China, author of the discussion paper, on behalf of France, Japan, Türkiye, and the Confederation of European Yeast Producers (COFALEC), presented the discussion paper along with the project document and highlighted the changes made to the different sections in the project document, noting that the title and scope had been refined to focus on baker's yeast; the definition and classification for products divided into liquid, fresh and dry yeast according to their moisture content; and updated the data on global yeast import and export trade.
155. China further explained that the existing different national or regional standards for yeast have led to the creation of technical barriers to trade, and the development of a Codex standard would assist in reducing such barriers to trade arising from a multiplicity of national standards for yeast.
156. Members and Observers expressed appreciation to China and co-authors for preparing a revised discussion paper and the project document.

### General discussion

157. The EU and its Member states questioned how the standard would contribute to protecting consumer health and resolving food safety concerns as they were not aware of any food safety related concerns or trade related disputes on baker's yeast. They called for collaboration and information sharing between International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) and Codex to ensure harmonisation of standards when the new work started.

---

<sup>20</sup> CX/FA 24/54/12; CRD16 (Canada, Japan, Kenya, Morocco, Republic of Korea); CRD17 (South Africa); CRD20 (Cabo Verde); CRD21 (India); CRD24 (COFALEC); CRD25 (Egypt); CRD28 (Ghana); CRD29 (Burundi); CRD31 (IUFOST)

158. An Observer highlighted that ISO was in advanced stages of developing a global voluntary standard for fresh and dry bakers' yeast, and that most quality characteristics had been included in the document. They were not aware of any trade barriers and food safety issues related to yeast and therefore doubted the necessity for developing of a Codex standard as this would lead to unnecessary duplication of work. They called for the review of the proposal in light of the progress achieved in ISO standard.
159. In response to concerns raised , China explained the different nature of ISO and Codex standard on the aspect of membership, recognition under the treaties of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and differences of objectives.
160. The Codex secretariat encouraged the cooperation between ISO and Codex to avoid any inconsistencies, and added that both organizations differ in membership and their respective standards may differ in use.
161. In addressing the question regarding whether CCFA was the appropriate committee to undertake the task, China clarified that this responsibility was from CAC, and highlighted CCFA's history of developing commodity standards. For instance, CCFA had previously formulated standards such as the *Standard for Food Grade Salt* (CXS 53-1981).
162. After a general discussion, CCFA54 noted the general support for the proposed new work on baker's yeast; and then reviewed the project document section by section. CCFA54 agreed to amend the product definition by deleting the words "as example" which could be construed to mean that other species of yeast were covered by this standard.

### **Conclusion**

163. CCFA54 agreed to:
- i. submit to CAC47 the project document on the development of a standard for baker's yeast (Appendix XIII) for new work for approval; and
  - ii. establish an EWG chaired by China and co-chaired by France and Türkiye, working in English, to prepare, subject to the approval of the new work, a proposed draft standard for baker's yeast for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at its next session.
164. CCFA54 noted that the report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFA55.

### **OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda item 10)**

165. CCFA54 noted that no other business had been proposed.

### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda item 11)**

166. CCFA54 was informed that the fifty-fifth session would be held on 24-27 March 2025 with the final arrangements subject to confirmation by the host government in consultation with the Codex Secretariat.