



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES

Fifty-sixth Session

PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION TO THE CLASS NAMES AND THE INTERNATIONAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (INS) FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (CXG 36-1989)

(Prepared by the electronic working group chaired by Belgium)

Codex Members and Observers wishing to submit comments at Step 3 on the proposed changes and/or addition to the International Numbering System (INS) for Food Additives (Annex 1) should do so as instructed in CL 2026/19-FA available on the Codex webpage/Circular Letters 2026:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/>

INTRODUCTION

1. The International Numbering System for Food Additives (INS) is intended to be a harmonised naming system for food additives and an alternative to the use of the specific name, which may be lengthy. Inclusion in the INS does not imply approval by Codex for use as food additives. The list may include those additives that have not been evaluated by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) or are not included in the *General standard for food additives* (GSFA, CXS 192-1995). Since the INS is an open list, requests for the inclusion of new additives may be made by Codex Members or Observers (supported by members) with a suitable reference to a national food authority that has authorized such a use. Each year, an electronic working group prepares proposals for updating the *Class names and the international numbering system for food additives* (CXG 36-1989), based on the terms of reference and the replies of the yearly circular letter requesting proposals for amendments.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

2. The 55th session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA55), held from 24 to 28 March 2025, agreed to establish an electronic Working Group (EWG), chaired by Belgium, 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) undertake further consideration of nisin A (REP 25/FA para. 124).

PARTICIPATION AND METHODOLOGY

3. In April 2025, the Codex Secretariat issued CL 2025/30-FA inviting all Members and Observers were invited to submit requests for proposals for changes and/or additions to the INS list by 15 September 2025.

4. On 9 May 2025, the Codex Secretariat distributed a kick-off message containing an invitation to Members and Observers to express interest in participation in the EWG. The EWG undertook its work through the Codex online EWG platform, and the following Members and Observers registered to participate in the EWG: Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Iran, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tanzania, UK, USA, European Union, CCC, EUSFI, FDE, FIA, IACM, IADSA, ICGA, IFAC, NATCOL.

5. The EWG undertook two rounds of consultations. In the first round, the Chair posted the replies to the CL on the EWG platform and circulated a first draft to the EWG on the platform, for comments. Contributions were posted in the EWG by Australia, Brazil, Costa Rica, CCC, EUSFI, IFAC, NATCOL. Based on the response received

during the first round, the Chair prepared a second circular and posted it on the EWG platform for comments. Contributions were received from Australia, China and the European Union, and based on the comments received a final draft was prepared and submitted for consideration by CCFA56 .

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

A. Replies to the circular letter on addition and changes to INS

- **Addition of argon**

6. The European Union requests the addition of a new food additive named argon. The use of argon as a food additive has been authorised in the EU (E 938) since 1995 (Directive 95/2/EC) for use in all categories of foods. Argon acts as a packaging gas in modified atmosphere packaging for the protection of the food from oxidation and spoilage. The EU indicates that there is evidence that the compound has been or is capable of being used effectively for the proposed technological purpose. The EU has permitted such use taking into account the following scientific basis.

- The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently re-evaluated the safety of argon as a food additive ([Re-evaluation of argon \(E 938\) and helium \(E 939\) as food additives - - 2024 - EFSA Journal - Wiley Online Library](#))

- For Argon, the JECFA specification (INS 938) lists the functional class “packaging gas”
https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/jecfa_additives/docs/Monograph1/Additive-042.pdf

7. The EUMS propose that argon be included in CXG 36-1989 and that INS 938 be assigned to it with the proposed functional class and technological purpose as “packaging gas”.

8. During the EWG consultations, Australia and the European Union supported the proposal. No other comments were made.

- **Addition of helium**

9. The European Union requests the addition of a new food additive: helium. The use of helium as a food additive has been authorised in the EU (E 939) since 1995 (Directive 95/2/EC) for use in all categories of foods. Helium acts as a packaging gas in modified atmosphere packaging maintaining freshness of the food and protecting the food from oxidation and spoilage. The EU indicates that there is evidence that the compound has been or is capable of being used effectively for the technological purpose proposed. The EU has permitted such a use taking into account the following scientific basis:

- The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently re-evaluated the safety of helium as a food additive ([Re-evaluation of argon \(E 938\) and helium \(E 939\) as food additives - - 2024 - EFSA Journal - Wiley Online Library](#))

10. The EUMS propose that helium be included in CXG 36-1989 and that INS 939 be assigned to it, with the proposed functional class and technological purpose as “packaging gas”.

11. During the EWG consultations, Australia and the European Union supported the proposal. No other comments were made.

- **Addition of oxygen**

12. The European Union requests the addition of a new food additive: oxygen. The use of oxygen as a food additive has been authorised in the EU (E 948) since 1995 (Directive 95/2/EC) for use in all categories of foods. Oxygen acts as a packaging gas in modified atmosphere packaging maintaining freshness of the food. Oxygen also acts as a propellant in products like whipped cream or desserts expelling the food from a container and giving it a light, airy consistency. The EU indicates that there is evidence that the compound has been or is capable of being used effectively for the technological purpose proposed. The EU has permitted such use taking into account the following scientific basis:

- The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently re-evaluated the safety of Oxygen as a food additive ([Re-evaluation of oxygen \(E 948\) and hydrogen \(E 949\) as food additives - - 2025 - EFSA Journal - Wiley Online Library](#)).

- For Oxygen, the JECFA specification (INS 948) lists the functional class “packaging gas”.
https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/jecfa_additives/docs/Monograph1/Additive-301.pdf .

13. The EUMS propose that Oxygen is included in CXG 36-1989 and that INS 948 is assigned to it, and with the proposed functional classes and technological purposes are “packaging gas” and “propellant”.

14. During the EWG consultations, Australia and the European Union supported the proposal. No other comments were made.

- **Addition of monk fruit extract**

15. There were two proposals for the addition of monk fruit extract: one submitted by the Calorie Control Council and the other by Australia.

16. The Calorie Control Council requests the addition of a new food additive: Monk fruit extract. Monk fruit, also known as *Siraitia grosvenorii* or Luo Han Guo, is known for its intense sweetness, and its extracts are used in the food industry to exploit this property. The sweetness is due to the presence of non-caloric sweet compounds called mogrosides. Indeed, Mogroside V is identified as analytical marker compound in the extract proposed by this technical dossier. Compared to other sweeteners or sugars, Monk Fruit is one of the more potent sweeteners. Mogroside V is roughly 250 times sweeter than sucrose, and several other mogrosides such as mogroside VI, siamenoside, and mogroside IV are likewise highly potent sweeteners. From a stability point of view, studies indicate that monk fruit's sweetness remains stable across a range of temperatures and pH levels, making it versatile for food production, including baked goods, beverages, and processed foods. Their chemical stability during cooking or in acidic environments further enhances monk fruit's attractiveness as a sweetener. Like many high intensity sweeteners, monk fruit is anticipated to be used alone or in combination with other sweeteners to offer consumers and producers alike an alternative option when choosing a sweetener for sugar reduction. The sweetener is already permitted for use in a range of foods in a number of countries globally. For example, it is considered to be a GRAS sweetener in the USA and is permitted for use in table-top sweeteners in Canada. It is also approved as a food additive for use in a wide range of products in Australia, Canada (as table-top sweetener), China, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, Japan and the United States. Monk fruit extract was added to the JECFA Priority List (toxicological and safety evaluation and exposure assessment) during CCFA55.

17. Australia requests the addition of a new food additive: Monk fruit extract (luo han guo extract). Monk fruit extract was assessed by Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) under application [A1129 - Monk Fruit Extract as a Food Additive](#) in 2018. FSANZ's risk assessment concluded that there were no public health and safety issues associated with the proposed use of monk fruit extract as an intense sweetener. The assessment also concluded that its use as an intense sweetener was technologically justified. The FSANZ Approval Report noted monk fruit extract is permitted for use in, Canada, China, Japan and the United States. At CCFA 55, monk fruit extract was placed on the JECFA priority list for safety evaluation. Also, it is uncertain why the request did not include development of JECFA specifications. A monograph for monk fruit extract exists in the US Pharmacopeial Convention (2016) Food Chemicals Codex (10th edition). This is listed as a primary reference for specifications in Schedule 3 of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. It is permitted as an “intense sweetener” in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. Several national authorities have permitted such a use: (1) Monk fruit extract (luo han guo extract) has been granted permission in Australia and New Zealand as a food additive in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code, (2) In the United States of America, monk fruit extract is generally recognized as safe when used as a table top sweetener, general purpose sweetener in foods, flavor enhancer in foods (excluding meat and poultry products and infant formula) (GRN301, GRN359, GRN522, GRN556 and GRN706), (3) In China, luo han fruit tincture is included in the list of natural flavouring substances permitted in foods (GB2760-2024), (4) In Japan, luo han guo extract is included in the list of existing food additives from natural origin, (5) Health Canada has approved the use of monk fruit extract in tabletop sweeteners (Health Canada, 2013) at a maximum level of use of 0.8% calculated as mogroside V concentration in the final product (Health Canada, 2015). The food industry is currently using a substance for the technological purpose proposed. Please see link below for food industry products using Monk fruit extract (luo han guo extract) <https://www.woolworths.com.au/shop/search/products?searchTerm=Monk%20Fruit>

18. For assigning a number, it might be appropriate to choose a number following other sweeteners. The EWG Chair proposed INS 970.

19. The EWG had the following comments: The number INS 970 was supported by Australia, the European Union and CCC. There was agreement on the name “monk fruit extract” (Australia, European Union, CCC) Australia mentioned “luo han guo extract” as a possible synonym, if necessary. It was confirmed that sweetener is the only function (Australia, CCC), even if the priority list for JECFA also refers to flavour enhancer.

- **Addition of sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids**

20. Australia requests the addition of a new food additive: sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids. Sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids was assessed by FSANZ, under application A1180 Sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids, for use as a food additive (preservative) in non-alcoholic beverages in 2020. FSANZ's risk assessment concluded that Jelly mushroom glycolipids function as a preservative against common yeasts and moulds in non-alcoholic beverages; and that there are no public health and safety concerns from the use of jelly mushroom glycolipids at the proposed levels in the following non-alcoholic beverage categories: (1) 100 mg/kg for Fruit and vegetable juices and fruit and vegetable juice products; (2) 50 mg/kg for Water based flavoured drinks; (3) 20 mg/kg for Formulated Beverages; (4) 10 mg/kg for Coffee, coffee substitutes, tea, herbal infusions and similar products; (5) 100 mg/kg for non-alcoholic beer. A monograph for sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids for use as a food additive (preservative) exists in Schedule 3—43 of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. Glycolipids were submitted to CCFA53 for inclusion in the priority list of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA (Replies TO CL 2021/81-FA). Glycolipids are approved as a preservative in beverages in, Australia and New Zealand (A1180), Canada (NOM/ADM-0184) and the European Union (E 246). In the United States of America, glycolipids are generally recognized as safe when used as an antimicrobial agent in select non-alcoholic beverages (GRN 740). Sweet osmanthus ear glycolipids is used by the food industry in non-alcoholic beverages in Australia and New Zealand (e.g., Lo Bros UP energy drink and Elta Ego espresso martini (non-alcoholic)).

21. The preservative INS 246 glycolipids is already included in the CXG 36-1989. This additive was included following a request of the EU as discussed in CCFA54 in 2024. It seems to be the same additive. In the EU, E 246 glycolipids is defined as follows in Regulation 231/2012:

"The naturally occurring glycolipids are obtained by a fermentation process using the wild type strain MUCL 53181 of the fungus Dacryopinax spathularia (edible sweet osmanthus ear mushroom). Glucose is used as a carbon source. The solvent-free downstream process includes filtration and microfiltration to remove microbial cells, precipitation and washing with buffered water to purify. The product is pasteurized and spray-dried. The production process does not chemically modify the glycolipids or change their innate composition."

22. The EWG Chair suggested that no further action is needed.

23. There were no comments received from the EWG.

- **Addition of sodium hydrosulphite**

24. Australia requests the addition of a new food additive: sodium hydrosulphite. Sodium hydrosulphite (also called sodium dithionite) was assessed by Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) under Application [A1088 - Sodium Hydrosulphite as a Food Additive](#) (antioxidant) to be used for canned abalone in 2016. FSANZ concluded that the use of sodium hydrosulphite as a food additive in canned abalone is technologically justified and presents no identifiable public health and safety issues above those of the currently permitted sulphites in canned abalone. A monograph exists for sodium hydrosulfite in the Japanese Specifications and Standards for Food Additives (7th Edition, 2000) of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. It is permitted as an "antioxidant" in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code.

25. National authorities have permitted such a use: These include (1) **Australia and New Zealand** - Sodium hydrosulphite has been granted permission in Australia and New Zealand as a food additive in food class 9.4.1 of Schedule 15 (food additives) of the Code at an MPL of 1000 mg/kg for canned abalone (paua). (Sulphites (INS 220 221 222 223 224 225 228) are also permitted at 1000mg/kg). (2) **Canada** - The Canadian Food and Drug Regulations (C.R.C., c. 870) permit sodium dithionite as a class II preservative food additive to be added to a variety of foods as detailed in section B.16.100, Table XI, Part II. Sodium dithionite is listed in this Table as item S.8, where the permissions and maximum levels of use are for the same foods and at the same levels as listed for sulphurous acid (item S.10). Food category 11 in S.10 is crustaceans, where the maximum level of use is listed as in accordance with 'Good Manufacturing Practice'. Residues in the edible portion of the uncooked product not to exceed 100 ppm (mg/kg), calculated as sulphur dioxide'. There is also a specific regulation in the Food and Drug Regulations dealing with the food additive permissions for crustaceans (B.21.006.(o)) that allows crustaceans to contain sodium dithionite or other sulphites: potassium bisulphite, potassium metabisulphite, sodium bisulphite, sodium metabisulphite, sodium sulphite or sulphurous acid. Regulation B.01.010 allows that the permitted sulphites may be listed in the ingredients list by the common names sulphites or sulphiting agents'. This food additives list is the same as that listed above in regulation B.21.006.(o). The Canadian Food Inspection Agency references this same regulation (B.21.006.(o)) in the list of permitted additives in fish and fish products which includes sodium dithionite. (3) **Japan** - Japan's Specification and Standards for Food Additives (7th Edition, 2000)

permits sodium hydrosulfite, along with a number of other sulphites, as food additives to be added to a wide variety of foods with specific maximum limits determined as sulphur dioxide and with the technological function as a bleaching agent. Among the treated foods are frozen raw shelled crab and shelled prawn, both with a maximum limit of 0.1 g/kg (residue limit of SO₂) (equivalent to 100 mg/kg (ppm)). Japan's Specification and Standards for Food Additives (7th Edition, 2000) also contains a specific specification for sodium hydrosulfite. The same permissions for sodium hydrosulfite from Japan's Specification and Standards for Food Additives (7th Edition) are also listed in the later document 'Specifications and Standards for Foods, Food Additives, etc Under the Food Sanitation Act (Abstract) 2010' (produced by the Japan External Trade Organization, JETRO). (4) **Republic of Korea** - The Korean Food and Drug Administration regulates food additives via the Korean Food Additives Code, and the Code contains permissions for addition of sodium hydrosulfite to different types of foods as well as a specification for the substance. There is permission to use sodium hydrosulfite as a food additive for shrimp flesh to a permitted level of 0.1 g/kg (100 mg/kg).

26. New Zealand canned abalone (paua) producers treat native New Zealand abalone (paua) with sodium hydrosulphite to produce a light-coloured product. The FSANZ Application A1088 - Sodium hydrosulphite as a food additive - updated the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code to reflect what is common practice in the production of canned abalone in Australia and New Zealand.

27. For assigning a number, it might be appropriate to choose a number following other sulphites. The EWG Chair suggested INS 229. The question was raised whether to include both the functions of antioxidant and bleaching agent and whether the name should be sodium hydrosulphite or sodium dithionite or should both names be included? About how to identify the additive, the following can be cited from the Australian documents, on the difference and relationship with other sulphites: "Structural formula: Na₂S₂O₄" "During the processing of canned abalone, the hydrosulphite anion (S₂O₄²⁻) undergoes chemical decomposition to produce the same chemical species that result from use of the other approved sulphites, with the sulphite anion (SO₃²⁻) as the predominant form and a minor proportion as the bisulphite anion (HSO₃⁻)."

28. The EWG made the following comments:

- i. Addition in the INS list was supported by Australia, Brazil, European Union. In Brazil, it is permitted as a preservative for collagen and gelatin at maximum use level of 900 mg/kg, and maximum residual limit of 10 mg/kg as SO₂. The use as antioxidant was also approved, but it has not yet been incorporated in the legislation. Australia supported assigning the number INS 229.
- ii. The name sodium hydrosulphite was preferred (Australia, Brazil). Australia supports using sodium hydrosulphite only to provide clarity for industry users of the GSFA. Sodium hydrosulphite would also alert consumers sensitive to sulphites, whereas sodium dithionite may not, which potentially poses a food safety risk.
- iii. Although the request was originally only for the function of antioxidant, Australia notes that sodium hydrosulphite functions as a preservative, antioxidant, and bleaching agent, similar to other sulphiting agents already approved in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code for various food categories.

- **Addition of the functional class of "colour" to INS 460(i)**

29. NATCOL requests the addition of the functional class "colour" to INS 460(i) microcrystalline cellulose (cellulose gel) aiming to be used in food applications for the technological purpose of coloring. Microcrystalline cellulose (INS 460(i)) is a food additive currently listed in the INS list. Microcrystalline cellulose (MCC) is recognized for its technological purposes, which include use as an anticaking agent, bulking agent, carrier, glazing agent, coating agent, dispersing agent, emulsifier, foaming agent, stabilizer, texturizing agent, and thickener. Due to its cellulose-based composition, this additive is a natural highly scattering white material, making it suitable for use as a food colour additive. Many formulations require a whitening composition to achieve brightness, opacity, and a white appearance, which can be effectively provided by MCC. Examples of applications that could benefit from the use of this additive as a colour include: Confectionary: hard panned sweets, soft panned sweets, hard boiled candy and jelly gum; Milk-based products and plant-based dairy alternatives, incl. coffee creamer; Plant-based meat alternatives, specifically chicken or turkey type; Beverages, specifically powdered soft drinks; Bakery decorations and fillings like sprinkles, fondant, glazing, frosting; Savory food applications like soups, sauces and dressings. Key benefits of microcrystalline cellulose compared to approved colour additives: Unlike calcium carbonate, MCC does not alter the pH of food or beverage products, helping maintain formulation stability and taste integrity; easily disperses in edible liquid matrix; neutral odor and taste in food and beverage products; is very heat- and light-stable (e.g. tested under UHT conditions at 120 °C for some seconds). Pictures were provided by NATCOL, including also chewing gum.

30. The chair noted that the JECFA specifications of INS 460(i) describe the additive as a white or almost white free flowing powder that is insoluble in water.

31. The EWG Chair proposed agreeing to the addition of the functional class “colour”.

32. The GSFA includes INS 460(i) in table 3, but not with the function of colour. In certain cases, the use of such colour could mislead the consumer, e.g. make water look like milk without any nutritional similarity. Due to the potential impact on the GSFA, the EWG Chair proposed referring the use of INS 460(i) as a colour to the EWG on the GSFA for further consideration. Later, it was understood that this needs to be done before actually amending CXG 36-1989, as the latter would automatically result in consequential amendments of the GSFA.

33. The EWG had the following comments: Costa Rica and Australia support the proposal to add the functional class “colour” to INS 460(i), consistent with the additive’s known properties. NATCOL agrees to add the functional class of colour for INS 460(i) and to refer to the EWG on GSFA following the addition of the function of colour, without anticipating any additional concerns related to misleading consumers. Australia permits microcrystalline cellulose (INS 460) at a level of 5 000 mg/kg in the food class 1.1.1.1 ‘Liquid milk to which phytosterols, phytosterols or their esters have been added’, of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code. The EU accepts that the functional class “colour” is added to INS 460(i) microcrystalline cellulose (cellulose gel). Nevertheless, the EU would like to inform that while INS 460(i) is authorised in the EU for use as a food additive, it is not authorised for use as a colour.

- **Addition of nisin A as INS 234(i)**

34. EU Specialty Food Ingredients requests the addition of nisin A as INS 234(i) with the following rationale. Referring to CCFA55, EU Specialty Food Ingredients note that the presently assigned INS 234 nisin will only be covered by a Nisin A monograph specification. However, CCFA55 was informed that also Nisin Z might be in commerce, the safety data of which had not been submitted for safety evaluation by JECFA (see paragraph 122 of REP25/FA). Thus, EU Specialty Food Ingredients proposes to create a parent category and with the different types ninsins listed below it:

INS 234 NISIN

INS 234(i) NISIN A

35. EU Specialty Food Ingredients further proposes that any future safety evaluation by JECFA for Nisin Z (or others) could then be added, for example INS 234(ii) nisin Z. The advantage of this proposal is that the proposed name is labelling friendly as it does not require food manufacturers currently using nisin to change the name in a packaged foods ingredient list, and in addition allows the use of the more specific name nisin A in food labelling.

36. This proposal is further discussed under part B.

B. Further consideration of nisin A

37. CCFA55 discussed the inclusion of nisin A in the INS, noting that INS currently contains a single entry (INS 234) for nisin, and that FAO JECFA secretariat had clarified that both current and previous evaluations referred to nisin A only. Given that other forms of nisin might exist, CCFA55 agreed to further consider how nisin A and potentially other types of nisin should be handled in the INS. CCFA55 encouraged Members to respond to the CL if they wished to propose additional variants of nisin. Further consideration of nisin A was included in the scope of the work of the EWG on INS.

38. Nisin A is described by JECFA as a polypeptide with chemical formula $C_{143}H_{230}O_{37}N_{42}S_7$ (Nisin A), a formula weight of 3354.12 and a particular structural formula. Nisin A differs from nisin Z in a single amino acid residue at position 27, being histidine in nisin A and asparagine in nisin Z (EFSA 2006).

39. In reply to the CL, no requests were made for inclusion of other variants of nisin.

40. It is hence the question whether all authorized uses of nisin are authorized uses of nisin A only. Countries referring to Codex, only authorize nisin A in line with the JECFA specifications. The legal situation in other countries is as follows: Australia aligns with the JECFA specification for Nisin A. China has authorized both nisin A and nisin Z as food additives under the title of nisin (INS 234). In the EU, E-number 234 is assigned to “nisin”. Although only the name “nisin” is used, the existing EU specifications correspond to “nisin A”.

41. In case no other authorised uses would have been identified, then the proposal of JECFA to change the name of INS 234 from nisin to nisin A instead of adding a new line for INS 234(i) nisin A, should be discussed (option 1). In case other variants of nisin are legally authorized in countries, it would be a good idea to follow the proposal of EU Specialty Food Ingredients in paragraph 34 (option 2). In any case, no other specific nisin variants

can be included in INS as no requests were received as reply to the CL. It is a third option not to change INS and learn from the definition in the specifications what it is. Not all details need to be included in a name. The three options are outlined in the annex.

42. The EWG commented as follows: Australia supports either option 2 or option 3, noting that the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code references “Nisin 234” without including the suffix; China supports Option 2 as the most appropriate option and can also accept Option 3. From the listed options, the EU agrees that Option 2 is the most acceptable one. Therefore, the EU supports Option 2. EUSFI supports option 2 as label friendly, future-proof and innovation-friendly. IFAC supports option 2.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

43. CCFA56 is invited to:

- (i) consider the additions and deletions to the *Class Names and International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989) as presented in the annex; consider option 2 for nisin
- (ii) make the following consequential actions:
 - *Update the GSFA in relation to nisin or refer to the EWG on GSFA;*
 - *Refer the potential use of INS 460(i) as a colour to the EWG on GSFA in order to assess the impact and possible consequential amendments in GSFA before adding the function in CXG 36-1989; and*
 - *Update the List of Codex specifications for food additives (CXA 6):*
 - *add the INS number 938 for argon*
 - *add the INS number 939 for helium*
 - *add the INS number 948 for oxygen*
 - *for INS 234 nisin, change to refer to INS 234(i) nisin A*

PROPOSED CHANGES, DELETIONS AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE INS

(at Step 3)

The INS list is proposed to be updated for some food additives as listed in numerical order. The additions are highlighted with **bold/underlined font**. Deletions are highlighted in ~~**bold/strikethrough**~~.

INS No.	Name of food additive	Functional class	Technological purpose
<u>229</u>	<u>sodium hydrosulphite</u>	<u>Antioxidant</u>	<u>antioxidant</u>
		<u>Bleaching agent</u>	<u>bleaching agent</u>
		<u>Preservative</u>	<u>preservative</u>
460(i) ¹	Microcrystalline cellulose (cellulose gel)	Anticaking agent	<i>anticaking agent</i>
		Bulking agent	<i>bulking agent</i>
		Carrier	<i>carrier</i>
		<u>Colour</u>	<u>colour</u>
		Glazing agent	<i>coating agent</i>
			<i>glazing agent</i>
		Emulsifier	<i>dispersing agent</i>
			<i>emulsifier</i>
		Foaming agent	<i>foaming agent</i>
		Stabilizer	<i>stabilizer</i>
		Thickener	<i>texturizing agent</i>
			<i>thickener</i>
<u>938</u>	<u>Argon</u>	<u>Packaging gas</u>	<u>packaging gas</u>
<u>939</u>	<u>Helium</u>	<u>Packaging gas</u>	<u>packaging gas</u>
<u>948</u>	<u>Oxygen</u>	<u>Packaging gas</u>	<u>packaging gas</u>
		<u>Propellant</u>	<u>propellant</u>
<u>970</u>	<u>Monk fruit extract</u>	<u>Sweetener</u>	<u>sweetener</u>

Options for nisin:

Option 1: change of name of INS 234 from nisin to nisin A			
234	Nisin <u>A</u>	Preservative	<i>preservative</i>
Option 2 ² : add a line for 234(i) nisin A and keep the current line for INS 234 nisin but without class/purpose			
234	Nisin	<u>Preservative</u>	<u>preservative</u>
<u>234(i)</u>	<u>Nisin A</u>	<u>Preservative</u>	<u>preservative</u>
Option 3: no change in INS. It can be considered sufficient that the specifications define nisin as nisin A.			

¹ Subject to consideration of the impact assessment on GSFA and any related amendments concerning the use of this additive as a colour in the relevant food groups

² This is the preferred proposal of the EWG.