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Agenda Item: 1 Adoption of the Agenda

_U.S. Position_
- At this point, the United States has no plans to offer amendments to the Agenda.

Agenda Item 2: Report by the Chairperson on the 68th Session of the Executive Committee (REP 13/EXEC)

Background:
- This report will be issued at the completion of the 68th Session of the Executive Committee which will be held June 25 – June 28, 2013, the week prior to the Commission meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Reports of FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees and Appointment of Regional Coordinators
Agenda Item 4: Proposed Amendments to the Procedural Manual

CCMAS: Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling

Proposed Amendment to the Guidelines for Establishing Numeric Values for Method Criteria and/or Assessing Methods for Compliance Thereof in the Procedural Manual REP 13/MAS, paras. 9, Appendix IV

Background:
- In reviewing the flowchart, used to describe the establishment of method criteria, CCFFP noted an inconsistency between the text and the flowchart. The error in the flowchart led to some confusion, so CCFFP asked for clarification.
- The text and flowchart were reviewed during the 34th session of CCMAS.
- The error was noted and the correction was adopted by CCMAS.
- From REP13/MA:
  - 9. The Committee clarified that methods should meet both the LOD and LOQ and agreed to propose correction of the Procedural Manual accordingly (Appendix IV).

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports the correction and amendment to the Procedural Manual.

Position of Other Delegations:
- There were no objections to the correction of the flowchart.

CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

Principles and Guidance for the application of the proportionality concept to estimation of maximum residue limits for pesticides (REP13/PR, para. 98, Appendix VIII)

Background:
- The Committee agreed to forward the Principles and Guidance for the application of proportionality to estimate MRLs to the 36th (2013) Session of the Commission for adoption and inclusion in the Procedural Manual as an Appendix to the Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the CCPR.
- As agreed upon by the CCPR during the 43rd (2011) Session, the 2011 JMPR applied the concept of proportionality to estimate MRLs when the residue data according to GAP were not sufficient for a recommendation of a MRL. JMPR recommended MRLs for five compounds for five commodities applying proportionality.
- The U.S. Delegation, as well as several other delegations, strongly supported the JMPR’s use of proportionality, as MRLs would not have otherwise been recommended in those five cases.
The U.S. Delegation further noted that use of the concept in appropriate cases is a useful tool for JMPR to recommend additional MRLs for minor uses. However, several other delegations noted that further guidance and criteria should be developed surrounding the concept of proportionality, and therefore did not support moving forward those MRLs recommended by the JMPR based on the concept. Therefore, the Committee established an electronic working group (eWG) to develop further principles and guidelines on when and how to apply the concept of proportionality and requested that the 2012 JMPR continue to provide examples and comparisons using the concept. In 2012, JMPR applied the concept of proportionality to estimate MRLs for an additional eight compounds and 17 commodities.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the addition of the Principles and Guidance for the application of proportionality to estimate MRLs in the Procedural Manual as an Appendix to the Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the CCPR.
- The United States participated in this workgroup and provided statistical analysis to support this effort. Further, 18 MRLs for 10 compounds were forwarded to Step 8 or Step 5/8 where JMPR applied the proportionality principle. These MRLs would not have been recommended otherwise.

**Position of Other Key Delegations:**
- Overall there was general support for the Principles and Guidance for the application of proportionality to estimate MRLs.
- There was a discussion during the meeting for the need to have a certain number of residue field trials at GAP. It was clarified that 100% scaled data could be used for larger data sets and at least 50% of trials at GAP may be requested on a case-by-case basis for smaller data sets. Once this language was added there was general agreement for the adoption of these principles.

**CCFFP: Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products**

*Proposed Draft Revision of the Procedure for the Inclusion of Additional Species in Standards for Fish and Fishery Products (for inclusion in Section II: Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts: Guidelines for the Inclusion of Specific Provision in Codex Standards and Related Texts) (REP 13/FFP para. 83, Appendix VI)*

**Background:**
- The CCFFP has been discussing the Revision of the Procedure for the Inclusion of Additional Species for several sessions. Work on the procedure was taken up upon the CCFFP’s conclusion to allow Clupea benticki into the sardine standard several years ago. The procedure was previously very general offering minimal detail on how the CCFFP should deal with proposals to include additional species.
Although the Committee made recent modifications to simplify and increase flexibility from previous drafts, the revised procedure includes prescriptive detail that is much more extensive than the previously adopted procedure.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States does not oppose adoption of the document.
- The United States has not taken a strong position on this issue because of the belief that the originally adopted procedure was adequate and because of concerns that elaboration would result in an overly complex procedure that could pose a barrier to trade.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The U.S. Delegation is not aware of any outstanding issues, potential challenges or opposition to the Revised Procedure.
- Extensive work has been done on the procedure to address some of the concerns about its potential for overly burdensome requirements. Delegations appear to be in general agreement over the resulting procedure.
- Morocco and France have been especially supportive of its advancement. Their interest in this issue stems from the history of the inclusion of sardine species in that standard.
- Chile was previously hesitant to support the procedure because of the sardine issue, but once that issue was resolved, they have now been actively participating and worked to develop the latest revision with France.
- It has also been agreed that the procedure would not apply retroactively to species already included in standards, which has further alleviated concerns.
Agenda Item 5: Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 8 of the Procedure (including those submitted at Step 5 with a recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7 and at Step 5 of the Accelerated Procedures)

Part 1 – Standards and related texts submitted for adoption at Step 8, and Step 5/8 of the Accelerated Procedure

CCFFV: Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

Draft Standard for Avocado

Draft provisions for uniformity rules and other size related provisions (sections 5.1 – and uniformity and 6.2 – commercial identification) in the draft Standard for Avocado (Rep13/FFV, para. 42, Appendix II)

Background:
- The revision of the Codex Standard for Avocado (CODEX STAN 197-1995) was undertaken to broaden its coverage to include more varieties traded internationally e.g., small-sized Hass and other and hybrids of Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan/ (Florida) varieties, and to take into account the revised UNECE Standard for Avocado. The revision also encompassed the inclusion of tolerances for decay and internal breakdown. Therefore relevant sections of the Standard were revised.
  - **Issue 1:** Maturity Requirement- Dry Matter content: Deletion of a fixed Dry Matter Content for Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties.
  - **Comment:** Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan/ (Florida) avocado and their hybrids: Dry matter content varies and has not been scientifically validated as consistent within their geo-climatic production zones. Hence, setting a threshold limit would be detrimental to trade.
  - **Issue 2:** Provisions Concerning Quality Tolerances – Allowances of tolerances for decay and/or internal breakdown.
  - **Comment:** The inclusion of provisions for decay and internal breakdown in the quality tolerances for fresh fruits and vegetables is important. Fruits and vegetables are perishable produce subject to senescence, long distance transportation and storage, which might result into certain degree of decay and internal breakdown in the produce. The absence of this tolerance in the standard results in inconsistent allowances by importing countries and is most commonly interpreted as none is allowed. The standard sets the maximum, below which should not lead to the rejection of the lot. The tolerances are for decay for Class I and Class II avocados.
o **Issue 3**: Draft Provisions for Uniformity Rules and Other Size-Related Provisions (sections 5.1 – uniformity and 6.2.4 – commercial identification) for adoption at Step 8 (Para. 42 and Appendix II);

o **Comment**: These provisions reflect the various methods used by the industry.

**U.S. Position:**

- The United States supports the adoption of the new texts and the adoption of the Codex Standard for Avocados at Step 8.

**Draft Standard for Pomegranate (REP 13/FFV para. 53 and Appendix III)**

and

**Proposed Draft provisions for sizing and uniformity rules (section 3 and 5.1) (Draft Standard for Pomegranate) REP 13/FFV para. 53 and Appendix III**

**Background:**

- This standard was proposed by the Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Codex Regional Committee for the Near East at the 14th CCFFV Session. At the 17th CCFFV Session there was no consensus on the sizing requirement (Section 3) and Uniformity rules (section 5.1); both sections were assigned to an electronic Working group led by the United States for resolution.

- **Section 3 Sizing**—

  - **Comment**: The Working group proposal on Sizing was accepted and adopted by the plenary session “sizing was optional and if sized, size could be determined by count, diameter or weight, or in accordance with current trading practices in order to take into account different practices in trade”. The Committee however agreed size codes should only serve as a guide.

- **U.S. Position:**

  - The United States supports the adoption of Section 3 on Sizing and Section 5.1 on Uniformity requirements for both reflect international trading practices.

**CCEURO: Codex Committee on Europe**

**Proposed Draft Revised Regional Standard for Chanterelles (REP 13/EURO para. 48, Appendix III)**

**Background:**

- Revision of the draft regional standard for chanterelles had been discussed at the 27th (2008) CCEuro session and was approved by the subsequent CAC as new work.

- The Committee agreed to include the following species under (1) the Definition of Produce and (2) under Section 1.2 *Genus Cratellus: Craterellus lutescens*; common name: Yellow Foot; and commercial type: Winter Chanterelle.
The Committee supported the revised text and noted that it was harmonised with the UNECE Standard for Chanterelles.

The Committee agreed to forward the Proposed Draft Standard to the 2013 session of the Commission for adoption.

CCFH: Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products

Draft Standard for Smoked Fish, Smoke-Flavoured Fish and Smoke-Dried Fish (REP 13/FFP para. 40, Appendix III)

Background:
- This document has been in development for over 10 years and was nearly finalized at the CCFFP 32nd (2013) Session. The CCFFP held an in-session working group to discuss the additive provisions and after review by the CCFFP of the working group report, the CCFFP agreed to advance the draft Standard to Step 8, but to return the additive section to Step 6 for further consideration.
- The Committee noted that there was no technological justification for two proposed color additives, and that one color additive had a newly reduced ADI that may be exceeded. There was also a discussion about the benefits and risks of sodium nitrite. It was decided to continue the discussion of these additives at Step 6 as well as propose to the CCFA that they insert notes identifying the additives listed in the GSFA under food category 09.25 that are not allowed in products covered by the Smoked Fish Standard.
- The United States contributed significantly to the development and discussion of this Standard, including through a novel proposal and adoption of a table/annex that provides “examples of combinations of product attributes that minimize the likelihood of Clostridium botulinum toxin formation.”

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports adoption of the document with continued work at Step 6 on the additive section.

Position of Other Delegations:
- This standard has been fully discussed for several years by all delegations and as noted, further consideration will only be given to the food additive section of the Standard. The U.S. Delegation is not aware of any outstanding issues or potential challenges to the sections of the document under review at Step 8.

Draft Standard for Live Abalone and for Raw Fresh Chilled or Frozen Abalone for Direct Consumption or for Further Processing (REP 13/FFP para. 83, Appendix IV)

Background:
- All sections of this Standard were discussed and finalized at the CCFFP 32nd (2013) Session with unanimous agreement.
- Discussions on items including sampling, labeling, additives and biotoxins were held and concluded. It was determined that additives are not permitted in any product covered by the Standard. It was additionally concluded that diarrhetic
shellfish poison (DSP) can accumulate in abalone meat and it was therefore agreed to remove the provision that the biotoxin hazard does not apply to abalone that have the viscera and epithelium removed.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the document.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The U.S. Delegation is not aware of any outstanding issues or potential challenges to the document under review.

**Proposed Draft Amendment to the Standard for Quick Frozen Fish Sticks (REP 13/FFP para. 108, Appendix V) – Step 5/8**

**Background:**
- South Africa presented a revised study at the CCFFP 32nd (2013) Session of the percentage of nitrogen in S. Atlantic hake and the CCFFP agreed to two nitrogen factors, 2.46 for fillet and 2.38 for mince, to reflect the two different raw materials used.
- The United States questioned the methodology used to determine the percentage nitrogen in S. Atlantic Hake, and questioned the validity of the different percentages nitrogen listed for different fish species in the Standard.
- The Committee acknowledged the differences and the need to periodically review the factors and recommended that a discussion paper be developed to review the usefulness of nitrogen factors as well as the list of existing factors. Work on the discussion paper, to be presented at the next session of the CCFFP, will be led by the United States and the United Kingdom with the help of New Zealand and other interested members and observers.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the amendment and will contribute to the discussion paper in order to make recommendations regarding the application and usefulness of nitrogen factors overall.
- The AOAC Scrape Method is preferred by the United States and is the “official Codex method” for the percentage breading provision in the Standard. The chemical Nitrogen Method, preferred by the UK, is presented in the Standard in such a manner that it may lead countries to believe that they must determine percentage nitrogen for their fish species in order to be evaluated under the Standard. In general, the United States believes that determining percentage of nitrogen in fish species is costly and prone to error.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The U.K. appears to still disagree with the outcome of the “core vs. content” debate that occurred during the drafting of the Standard years ago. Other countries appear more or less indifferent. These discussions will be held during development and deliberation of the discussion paper by the CCFFP and should
not affect adoption of the amendment as proposed by South Africa and agreed to by the CCFFP.

- “Core” refers to the amount of fish flesh in a breaded fish product by using the AOAC gravimetric scrap method once the breading has been removed.
- “Content” refers to the amount of actual fish flesh in a breaded fish product minus the breading and minus any added water content as determined by Kjeldahl methodology that determines the Nitrogen content. The Nitrogen content is then multiplied by a predetermined factor for each species of white-fleshed fish to estimate the actual amount fish flesh minus any added water content from prior processing or additive use.

CCPFV: Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables

*Proposed Draft Standard for Table Olives (revision of Codex STAN 66-1981) (REP 13/PFV para. 38, Appendix II)*

**Background:**
- For the past 6 years the CCPFV members and the International Olive Council collaborated on the revision of this standard to reflect changes in international trade and consumer protection, the revised Draft Standard was approved at the CCPFV with unanimous consensus.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the decision of the 26th (2013) CCPFV session to forward the proposed draft Standard for Table Olives (Revision of CODEX STAN 66-1981) to Step 5/8 with omission of Steps 6 and 7 for adoption by the 36th Session of the Commission.

CCASIA: FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Asia

*Proposed Draft Regional Standard for Tempe REP 13/ASIA para. 117, Appendix II*

**Background:**
- Tempe is a product originating from Indonesia, which is prepared by the fermentation of soybeans by the mold of *Rhizopus sp* and intended for human consumption. Indonesia led the working group for this standard.

**U.S. Position:**
- The conversion factor for determining protein content from soy in the proposed draft tempe standard differs from the factor used in some other Codex texts and should be reviewed by technical experts.
- Regarding the labeling provision, the United States supports the CCFL Committee’s decision to revise the provision for labeling which originally made explicit that soybean product derived from biotechnology should be labeled depending on national legislation. Instead, CCFL agreed to replace this provision with the general reference to CCFL guidance on biotech labeling.
CCFH: Codex Committee on Food Hygiene

Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria Related to Foods (REP 13/FH para. 56 and Appendix III)

Background:
- The Committee had agreed to take up the revision to the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997) at its 41st (2009) session, with Finland and Japan serving as co-leads for this work. Five physical working groups have been held, including one that met just prior to the 2012 session of CCFH.
- The Committee agreed to a number of revisions to the document, including text related to attributes and variable sampling plans, a moving window approach, and trend analysis to better explain these concepts.
- The Committee was unable to agree on a definition of “metric” and agreed to delete it since the definition was confusing and did not add value.
- The Committee deleted a bullet point on use of microbiological criteria in validation, as microbiological criteria are rarely used for this purpose.
- There was concern expressed about aspects of the examples that had been developed to help clarify some of the purposes of microbiological criteria (See Position of Other Delegates below). The Committee addressed several options related to how these examples should be made available. The Committee agreed to ask FAO/WHO to conduct a peer review of the examples prior to posting the examples on the FAO/WHO websites, where they will be linked to other relevant information.
- The Committee also agreed to request FAO/WHO to address the statistical and mathematical considerations related to establishing the performance characteristics of a sampling plan, including the development and interpretation of operating characteristic curves, the impact of assumptions about the distribution and standard deviation of microorganisms in a food, establishing the length of a moving window, and other relevant aspects.

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports adoption of the document.

Position of Other Delegations:
- Some countries wanted to maintain the examples, as they found them useful in understanding the application of microbiological criteria. However, other delegations were concerned that the inclusion of examples with specific criteria would be interpreted as CCFH endorsement. Brazil requested that there be no reference to the examples in the document and that FAO/WHO make the examples more general by eliminating any association with a specific product or commodity, fearing that it might have a negative impact on trade. An Observer expressed concern that the examples were not always consistent with existing Codex texts and that this should be corrected by FAO/WHO before being made
available. The Observer also proposed excluding examples that, in the Observer’s opinion, were not practical and feasible.

- Because the examples are not referenced in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria* nor are they being attached as an annex, we believe it unlikely that countries will challenge the adoption of the document at the Commission. However, some delegations may take the opportunity to express concern about specific aspects of the examples.


**Background:**
- At the 43rd (2011) Session of CCFH, the Committee agreed to develop an Annex to the Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables on berries (draft Berries Annex), with work to be done by an electronic working group (eWG) led by Brazil. The Commission approved the new work at its 35th Session in July 2012. The eWG submitted a draft annex for consideration by the 44th (2012) Session of CCFH in New Orleans.
- The major issue of concern was the definition of “berries” and the scope of the Annex. The Committee ultimately reached consensus by agreeing to limit the scope to all edible varieties of strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, mulberries, blueberries, currants, gooseberries and ground cherries, and included their scientific names to avoid confusion, since common names differ from country to country. In so defining the scope, the need for a definition of berries was eliminated. The Committee also agreed that for wild berries only measures for handling and post-harvest activities would apply.
- The Committee, in revising the Annex, noted that there was duplication with the main code and other annexes that would need to be addressed in a future revision of these documents and did not focus on issues of duplication and consistency among these documents.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the Proposed Draft Annex on Berries to the Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- Numerous wording changes were made by many different delegations. Since there appeared to be no outstanding issues, we do not expect countries will challenge the adoption of the document at the Commission.

**CCNFSDU: Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses**

**Draft Revised Guidelines on Formulated Supplementary Foods for Older Infants and Young Children (CAC/GL 8-1991) (REP 13/NFSDU, para. 41, Appendix II)**

**Background:**
The Commission adopted the Guidelines on Formulated Supplementary Foods for Older Infants and Young Children in 1991. Since that time, new international recommendations have been issued regarding energy requirements and nutrient contributions from complementary foods for infants and young children. A proposal to revise the guidelines, taking those recommendations into account, was presented by Ghana at the 30th (2009) session of the CCNFSDU.

The title and terminology in the guidelines have been revised to "complementary foods" consistent with WHO terminology for foods for older infants and young children. These products include but are not limited to cereal-based porridges, ready-to-use products, and food-based home fortificants. They do not include micronutrient powders. Their intended use is to provide the nutrients that are either lacking or are present in insufficient quantities in a local diet. There is an emphasis on the need to take local conditions into account when formulating products to meet the needs of a population in a specific country or region.

Ghana has taken responsibility for accomplishing this work by organizing, chairing, and advancing the activities of an electronic working group and presenting a draft of the updated revisions for consideration at the CCNFSDU meeting each year. In addition, Ghana and the United States co-chaired a Physical Working Group that met before the 2011 CCNFSDU session.

At the 2012 CAC Session, the revised draft guidelines were adopted at Step 5.

At the 2012 CCNFSDU Session, the Committee focused on sections requiring further discussion and after making additional amendments, agreed to advance the draft revision for adoption at Step 8.

**U.S. Position:**

The United States supports adoption of the draft revision of the Guidelines on Formulated Supplementary Foods for Older Infants and Young Children at Step 8.

**Positions of Other Delegations Identified in the 2012 CCNFSDU Report:**

- In the report of the last session, no Codex member government opposed advancing this draft guideline for adoption at Step 8.

**Draft Nutrient Reference Values (NRVs) (REP 13/NFSDU para. 65, Appendix V) (sodium and saturated fatty acids)**

**Background:**

- This action is an important contribution to implementing the WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health (Global Strategy-DPAH) (WHA Resolution 57.17) and to reducing the global burden of diet-related NCDs.

- The Commission previously recognized the global public importance and convincing evidence for limiting Saturated Fatty Acids (SFA) and sodium intake by adopting Codex provisions that:
  - added these two nutrients to the list of nutrients that should always be declared in nutrition labeling (in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling, CAC/GL 2-1985), and
established conditions for claiming that a food is “free of” or “low” in these two nutrients (in the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997).

- The high priority for establishing Codex NRVs for SFA and sodium is further recognized in the CCFL’s referral of these two nutrients to the CCNFSDU for consideration of NRVs-NCD.

- At the 33rd (2010) CAC Session, the Commission approved new work for the CCNFSDU to establish:
  - general principles and criteria for the development of Nutrient Reference Values for food labelling purposes for nutrients associated with risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases (NRVs-NCD) for the general population older than 36 months in an Annex to the Guidelines Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985); and
  - NRVs-NCD for selected nutrients based on these principles and criteria.

- Consistent with the Committee’s decision to advance these NRVs to Step 5/8 at the 33rd (2011) CCNFSDU session, both these NRVs were established in accordance with all the proposed draft general principles in Appendix V, REP12/NFSDU. These principles include convincing scientific evidence for a relationship between these two nutrients and NCD risk, and agreement on the global public health importance of limiting their intake as identified in the WHO Global Strategy.

- Although one delegation expressed the view at the (2012) 35th CAC Session that the draft principles should be fully resolved before final adoption of the proposed NRVs, it is important to note that the main unresolved issue at the 2011 CCNFSDU session concerned whether “probable evidence” in addition to “convincing evidence” should be considered in establishing an NRV-NCD, and that this is not applicable to either SFA or sodium because these nutrients have a convincing level of scientific evidence.

**U.S. Position:**

- The United States supports adoption of the following proposed draft Nutrient Reference Values for nutrients associated with risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases (NRVs-NCD) for the general population at Step 5/8:
  - Saturated fatty acids 20 g/day
  - Sodium 2000 mg/day

- The United States strongly supports adhering to the Project Document timeframe for the Commission’s final adoption of these NRVs-NCD and the general principles at the 36th (2013) CAC Session, so as not to delay this important contribution to implementing the WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health and to reducing the global burden of diet-related NCDs.

**Position of Other Delegations:**

- Re: Sodium NRV
No member government objected to the proposed sodium NRV of 2000 mg/day.

In addition, the WHO representative noted that the 2012 WHO guideline on sodium intake for adults and children supports the 2000 mg/day proposed value.

**Re: SFA NRV**

- Two Delegations (Malaysia and the Philippines) objected to the proposed NRV of 20g/day.
- Other Delegations supported the value.
- The WHO representative stated that they would support the 20 g SFA proposed value *as noted below*.

---

**Proposed Draft General Principles for Establishing Nutrient Reference Values for (NRVs-NCD); and consolidated version of the General Principles for Establishing Nutrient Reference Values** *REP 13/NFSDU para. 51, Appendix III para.59, Appendix IV*

**Background:**
- At the 33rd (2010) CAC Session, the Commission approved new work for the CCNFSDU to establish:
  - general principles and criteria for the development of Nutrient Reference Values for food labelling purposes for nutrients associated with risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases (NRVs-NCD) for the general population older than 36 months in an Annex to the Guidelines Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985) (hereafter referred to as GNL); and
  - NRVs-NCD for selected nutrients based on these principles and criteria.
- The CCNFSDU extensively discussed the development of these general principles during three Committee meetings, and during three electronic working groups and two physical working groups chaired by the United States and co-chaired by Thailand and Chile.
- At the 2011 CCNFSDU session, the main unresolved issue was whether “probable evidence” in addition to “convincing evidence” should be considered in establishing an NRV-NCD. This issue was a main focus of the 2012 eWG in which most comments supported “convincing/generally accepted” evidence as the sole basis for an NRV-NCD, while acknowledging in the Annex to the Guidelines that governments have the flexibility to consider a lower level of evidence.
- At the 2012 session, the CCNFSDU agreed to acknowledge governments’ flexibility in the preamble to the general principles. It further agreed to add text to acknowledge that the level of scientific evidence for an NRV-NCD would be convincing/generally accepted scientific evidence and “the comparable level of evidence under the GRADE classification” (used in WHO guidelines). The WHO representative described the WHO Guidelines assessment approach.
- At the 2012 session, the CCNFSDU agreed on text that consolidates the general principles for NRVs-NCD and vitamin and mineral NRVs, and it was clarified that
the consolidation was considered as editorial amendments and thus not subject to the Step procedure.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption at Step 5/8 of the proposed draft Principles for Establishing Nutrient Reference Values Associated with Risk of Diet-Related Non-Communicable Diseases for the General Population.

**Position of Other Delegations**
- One Delegation (Malaysia) objected to recommending adoption of the general principles at Step 5/8.

**Proposed Draft Additional or Revised Nutrient Reference Values for Labelling Purposes in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (REP 13/NFSDU para. 103, Appendix VII) (micronutrients)**

**Background:**
- At the 31st (2008) CAC Session, the Commission approved new work for the CCNFSDU to:
  - develop general principles for establishment of vitamin and mineral NRVs for the general population; and
  - update and extend the current list of vitamin and mineral NRVs in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling based on these principles.
- At the 34th (2011) CAC Session, the Commission approved an Annex to the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling that provided general principles for establishing vitamin and mineral NRVs for the general population. This Annex included, inter alia, principles for selection of suitable data sources to establish NRVs which identified relevant and recent daily nutrient intake values provided by FAO/WHO as primary sources, and also allowed consideration of values that met certain criteria from other recognized authoritative scientific bodies (RASB).
- In recent years, the CCNFSDU considered potential NRVs derived from a 2004 FAO/WHO report on vitamin and mineral requirements in human nutrition, and also considered values from additional sources (e.g., the U.S. Institute of Medicine).
- At the 2012 CCNFSDU Session, the Committee considered the recommendations of an electronic working group led by Australia, and agreed on a subset of suitable NRVs that were derived from WHO/FAO Recommended Nutrient Intakes and the general principles that could be advanced to Step 5/8. This included proposed NRVs for Vitamin K, Thiamin, Riboflavin, Niacin, Vitamin B6, Folate, Vitamin B12, Pantothenate, Biotin, Calcium and Iodine (as identified in Appendix VII, REP13/NFSDU), For other vitamins and minerals, the Committee decided to conduct further work before advancing the NRVs for adoption.
- At the 2012 CCNFSDU Session, the Committee also agreed to include a table with conversion factors for niacin and folate equivalents after the list of NRVs in Section 3.4.4 of the Guidelines with a note at the bottom of the table about their application (See Appendix VIII).
**U.S. Position**

- The United States supports adoption at Step 5/8 of the proposed draft additional or revised Nutrient Reference Values for Labelling Purposes in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling at Step 5/8 with the deletion of the text (struck, below) in the note at the bottom of the table on conversion factors for vitamin equivalents in Appendix VII:
  - The conversion factors for vitamin equivalents in the Table provide supporting information for national authorities to enable national authorities to determine the application of NRVs at the national level (and they are not intended as a harmonization of the conversion factors per se.)

- At the 2013 CCNFSDU session, the United States stated that it disagreed with including the text (that they are not intended for harmonization) in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (expressed in REP13/CCNFSDU, para. 97).
- The United States considers this text inconsistent with Codex harmonization goals, potentially misleading because it implies that the proposal is of lesser value than other Codex texts (and that there may be something unreliable about the conversion factors), and unnecessary because the use of Codex provisions by governments is voluntary. This latter point is further emphasized in the Preamble to the General Principles for Establishing Nutrient Reference Values of Vitamins and Minerals (GL -1985, Annex).
- The United States is ready to work with other delegations to agree in advance on acceptable text so that the proposed draft revisions can be adopted at the 36th (2013) Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

**Positions of Other Delegations**

- No other government objected to advancing the proposed NRVs and table of conversion factors for niacin and folate to Step 5/8.

**CCNEA: FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee on the Near East**

**Regional Standard for Date Paste REP 13/NEA para. 89, Appendix III**

**Background:**

- At the 5th (2009) CCNEA Session, Saudi Arabia presented a proposal for the Committee to start work on Date Paste and Date Molasses.
- At the 6th (2011) CCNEA Session, Saudi Arabia presented a project document for Date Paste.
- Tunisia and Saudi Arabia were selected by the Committee to enhance the project document with trade data from the region and to present it directly to the CCExec.
- At the 7th (2013) CCNEA Session an in-session working group was formed led by Tunisia which had generally reached consensus on the draft standard.
- The Committee agreed to delete the reference to the Standard for Dates because some of the quality factors in the Standard were not applicable to this product and
to include the necessary provisions on total ash and acid insoluble ash content instead.

- The Committee agreed that the products should contain no food additives.
- The Committee agreed that the methods of analysis for moisture, mineral matter content, ash and acid insoluble ash content should be AOAC 934.06, ISO 762:1982, AOAC 940.26 and AOAC 900.02D, respectively.

**U.S. Position**

- The United States submitted comments to Circular Letter (CL2013/1-NEA) on the Proposed Draft regional Standard on Date Paste at Step 5/8 and suggested that the layout of the regional standard should be amended to reflect the same format as used by CCPFV for consistency.
- The United States supports adoption of the regional standard at step 5/8 if the format is consistent with the standard layout used by CCPFV.
- Given significant international trade in this product in other regions (China, South America, India and North Africa), after adoption CCPFV should review to see if this standard should be converted from a regional standard into an international standard.

**Positions of Other Delegations**

- The Draft standard is strongly supported by all members of CCNEA.

**TFAF: Task Force on Animal Feeding**

**Draft Guidelines on the Application of Risk Assessment for Feed REP 13/AF para. 27, Appendix II**

**Background:**

- The Task Force (TF) maintained the approach to make this document consistent with other Codex texts and Codex principles on risk assessment as much as possible, with some modifications to make it specifically applicable to animal feeding.
- The glossary of definitions was modified to make it consistent with the Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding (CAC/RCP 54-2004) and other Codex texts. The TF agreed to add Codex definitions, such as 'food' and 'processing aids,' where mentioned in the text. The TF agreed to develop a new definition for 'biotransformation,' which is defined as a "product resulting from the transformation of a chemical or biological agent in the body of the food producing animal (e.g., via metabolic processes)."
- The TF indicated that preliminary risk management activities may encompass several steps, including identification of a food safety problem arising from feed; establishment of a risk profile; ranking of the hazard for risk assessment and risk management priority; determination of a risk assessment policy for the conduct of the risk assessment; definition of the output form of the risk assessment; commissioning of the risk assessment, and consideration of the possible results of the risk assessment.
The TF agreed to The Netherlands’ proposal to revise the Sections on Exposure Assessment. The proposed revisions further distinguished risk characterization from exposure assessment activities and clarified that feed risk assessments used to derive a risk estimate do not represent a full human risk assessment. The TF accepted the proposal with some refinements.

The TF also included text to illustrate the need for risk characterization and subsequent risk management options to consider exposure assessments of hazards from other sources, such those from the environment or food of non-animal origin.

The TF also included text to explain that an initial output of a risk assessment could be based on a comparison of the estimated feed hazard in edible products with existing international or national levels for food commodities.

Based on the work of the electronic working group prior to the second meeting of the TF and the physical meeting of this group in Bern the day prior to the meeting, the Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Application of Risk Assessment for Feed were finalized and the entire TF approved them at its second session and recommended adoption at Step 8 by the 36th CAC (2013).

U.S. Position

- The United States strongly supports the adoption of this document.

Proposed Draft Guidance on Prioritizing Hazards in Feed REP 13/AF para. 62, Appendix III

Background:

- An electronic working group chaired by Switzerland finalized for review by the Task Force (TF) the draft guidance document for national governments in prioritizing hazards in animal feed. The resulting draft included one annex illustrating an example of the prioritization process and another annex describing examples of hazards in feed with potential relevance for human health. The TF decided to include a third annex to list separately additional references on information on potential hazard/feed/edible product combinations and examples of prioritization frameworks, processes and methods.

- The TF reviewed the draft and maintained the approach that the document should be as consistent as possible with other Codex text and principles.

- The TF agreed to provide an example of prioritization process using a multi-criteria analysis approach, while clarifying that other approaches could be used for prioritization. The introduction to the example illustration makes clear that this serves for illustrative purposes only and is based on a generic example which does not apply to any real specific hazard/feed/edible product combination.

- The TF agreed to describe the prioritization process as consisting of seven steps, (1) identification of the hazard, the feed and edible product potentially associated with food safety problems; (2) identification and definition of the criteria by which each selected hazard/feed/edible product combination will be quantified; (3) assignment of criterion-based values to the hazard/feed/edible product combinations; (4) normalization of these values to make them comparable
between criteria; (5) weighting of the criteria to reflect their relative importance; (6) combining the weighted normalized values for each hazard/feed/edible product combination to produce a score and ranking of the scores to obtain the order of priority; and (7) reporting of the process, methods and results.

- The TF agreed to indicate in the document that the criteria which could be used for prioritization included those related to the extent of the occurrence of the hazard; effect on human health; and other legitimate factors relevant for the health protection of consumers, in accordance with Codex principles.
- The TF amended some of the examples listed as hazards with potential relevance to human health. The TF agreed with the U.S. interventions to delete *trichonella* from the examples listed and delete 'viruses' from the annex since viruses pertained to animal health, which is outside the scope of work of the TF.
- The TF decided to include zeraleone as an example of mycotoxins, as requested by Thailand, but noted that it was not a major contaminant of edible products as it was rapidly metabolized and/or excreted.
- As requested by the European Union, the TF amended the section on organic chemicals to distinguish between dioxins and polychlorinated biphenyls and to include medicated feed as another potential source of cross contamination of feed.
- Upon the conclusion of the document, the TF opened for debate whether the Annex on Examples of Hazards of Potential Relevance for Human Health ("Annex") should be retained and advanced to the Commission for adoption. Some delegations supported retaining the Annex as it was essential for completeness of the document and served to provide a common understanding of these hazards. Other delegations opposed retaining the Annex, arguing that the information was too broadly described, it would be difficult to maintain and update and it could be misinterpreted and possibly serve as a basis for creating unjustified barriers to trade.
- The majority of TF members favored retaining the Annex but agreed to include additional language in the document to clarify that the content of the Annex was subject to being updated, was not a comprehensive description of all situations related to feed and food safety, not necessarily applicable to all countries, and its primary purpose was to provide illustrative examples.
- The TF focused its work at the meeting mainly on the Proposed Draft Examples of Hazards in Feed with Potential Relevance for Human Health and were able to agree on document for recommendation at Step 5/8

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States strongly supports the adoption of the document, which completes the work of the TFAF.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The TF overwhelmingly supported the adoption of the Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Application of Risk Assessment for Feed at step 8.
The majority of the TF members supported adoption of the Proposed Draft Examples of Hazards in Feed with Potential Relevance for Human Health at Step 5/8.

Argentina, Brazil, and Costa Rica expressed their reservation on the inclusion of the Annex. Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Saudi Arabia and Thailand noted in the report that they required more time to consult at a national level on the changes made to the document.

The EU, its member countries, Canada, and Australia, along with many other countries all strongly supported both documents.

CCFICS: Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification System

Draft and Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems (REP 13/FICS para. 38 and Appendix II)

Background:

- The 16th (2007) Session of CCFICS considered a Discussion Paper prepared by Australia to undertake new work to develop guidance on what constitutes a national food control system. There was significant support for this work although some Members questioned whether development of guidance relating to national food control systems was within the mandate of the Committee. CCFICS asked Australia to prepare a revised Discussion Paper and also asked the CAC to clarify whether the Committee could carry out work on this subject.

- The 2008 (17th) Session of the Committee considered the revised Discussion Paper and agreed to undertake new work on the subject, noting that the Commission had indicated that undertaking this work was within the mandate of the Committee. The 32nd (2009) Session of the Commission approved new work to develop Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems based on the Project Document submitted by CCFCS.

- The document was developed over the next three sessions of CCFICS using three physical working groups plus plenary Session discussion. The Document consists of a set of Principles as well an extensive section describing the framework of a national food control systems, including extensive guidance on policy setting, system design, system implementation, and monitoring/review. Extensive and significant discussion occurred during the development of the document, particularly with respect to ensuring that adequate guidance on all components of a national food control system (regulatory foundation/legislation, basic characteristics, inspection and enforcement programs, laboratory programs, staff competence and training, surveillance/investigation/response to foodborne outbreaks, outreach and communication, international engagement, and adequate resources) were included in the document.

- The Introduction, Objective and Principles portions of the Document were approved at Step 5 by the 35th (2012) Session of the CAC.

- The 20th (2102) Session of CCFICS completed work on the Principles and Guidelines, making many technical revisions to the document, and forwarded the
text for adoption at Step 8 (Introduction/Objectives/Principles) and Steps 5/8 (balance of the text consisting of the Framework portion and its various component parts).

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States strongly supports adoption of the *Draft and Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems* at Step 8 and 5/8. We believe the document provides very important information to countries for the design and implementation of a national food control system. We appreciate the work of CCFICS in developing this guidance that will be of significant importance in helping to ensure food safety.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- We believe there is good support for this document from all Codex Member countries and observers organizations. There was extensive discussion during development of this document both as to its content and as to how the content was organized; we believe there was good consensus on both areas at the conclusion of the work. We are not aware of any concerns from countries regarding either the guidance or how the guidance is presented.

**CCFO: Codex Committee on Fats and Oils**

*Proposed Draft Amendment to parameters for rice bran oil in the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils (REP13/FO para. 89, Appendix III).*

**Background:**
- At the last session, the Committee agreed to amend certain rice bran oil fatty acid parameters in Table 1 of the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils.
- It also agreed to amend certain desmethylsterol levels for rice bran oil in that standard.
- Thailand spearheaded this work.
- The United States was a participant in this work and was successful in incorporating U.S. values into these proposed changes.
- The proposed draft amendment to parameters for rice bran oil in the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils was advanced for adoption at Step 5/8.
- The Committee requested comments from CCMAS on whether mean ± 3SD is appropriate to establish ranges.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the proposed revisions to the standard at Step 5/8.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- Most delegations supported the changes and the advancement of this for adoption at Step 5/8.
**CCMAS: Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling**

**Draft Principles for the Use of Sampling and Testing in International Food Trade**  
(REP 13/MAS para. 73, Appendix III)

**Background:**
- The initial motivation for the Principles document came from an intra-session (not in plenary) presentation at the 31st session of CCMAS (2010), made by the Brazilian Delegation.
- The presentation focused on inadequacies in *the Guidelines for Settling Disputes Over Analytical (Test) Results* (CAC/GL 70-2009), which had been approved by CCMAS and adopted by Commission in 2009. CAC/GL 70-2009 only addresses disputes over analytical results, and Brazil and others were interested in a broader disputes document. (CAC/GL 70-2009 had been reduced to a focused “analytical results” document because consensus could not be reached on a broader document and there were concerns that a broader document was outside the terms of reference of CCMAS).
- As part of the discussion of measurement uncertainty, CCMAS established an inter-session working group (Chaired by Brazil with the assistance of New Zealand) to create a discussion paper “that would consider procedures for conformity assessment and resolution of disputes and what further guidance was needed” (ALINORM 10/33/23, para. 98).
- That discussion paper was presented at the 32nd (2011) session of CCMAS and was extensively discussed during the plenary session. The paper was quite long and involved, and there was no consensus about the topics covered or even if the topics were within the terms of reference of CCMAS. For example, the paper dealt a great deal with conformity assessment, which is the purview of CCFICS and not CCMAS.
- Following the discussions, a new work proposal focused primarily on sampling and testing was adopted. Given the reduced focus on dispute resolution, Brazil withdrew as sponsor/chair of the work and was replaced by New Zealand. The current Draft document has been developed through a series of inter-session and intra-session working groups and line-by-line editing during the 33rd (2012) and 34th (2013) sessions of CCMAS.
- Through the process, the document has been reduced to a number of concise statements regarding sampling and testing. Earlier references to “consumer and producer risk”, which many participants found confusing, have been removed, as well as any reference to conformity assessment.
- The current document is in line with the feedback received from U.S. stakeholders, who were generally supportive of a Principles document but concerned about the prescriptive nature of the original draft.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the adoption of this document at Step 5/8.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
Australia, the EU and the United States were not supportive of the document when it contained reference to “consumer and producer risk,” but the removal of these terms and the other changes were accepted by these countries.

India, which did not participate in the drafting of the early document, offered a number of interventions during the 34th session of CCMAS. Many of these interventions suggested the use of more restrictive language, such as reference to “Codex Standards” in place of more generic “standards.” Most of these were not accepted because of the scope and intended audience. A more general reference to “standards” was determined to be appropriate. India may ask for further edits to the document at the 2013 CAC.

CCFA: Codex Committee on Food Additives


**Background:**

- The Codex General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA, CODEX STAN 192-1995) is intended to be the single reference for food additives in Codex. The GSFA sets forth the conditions under which food additives are recognized as suitable for use in all foods, whether standardized by Codex or not. In order for a food additive to be listed in the GSFA, it must have been assigned an Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), and assigned an International Numbering System (INS) number.

- The GSFA contains the following elements:
  1. A Preamble, which describes the scope and principles of the GSFA.
  2. Three Annexes:
     - Annex A is a guideline for considering maximum use levels for food additives assigned a numerical ADI by JECFA.
     - Annex B is a listing of the food category system used to develop and organize the Tables that are included in the GSFA. A descriptor for each food category is included.
     - Annex C is a cross reference of the food category system and Codex commodity standards.
  3. Food additive provisions:
     - Table 1 lists, in alphabetic order, for each food additive or food additive group with a numerical ADI, the food categories in which the additive is recognized for use, the maximum use level, and its technological function. Table 1 also includes the uses of those additives with non-numerical ADI (which are found in Table 3) for which the use is specified in accordance with the Annex to Table 3.
Table 2 contains the same information as Table 1, but is listed by food category number.
Table 3 lists additives that have been assigned a non-numerical ADI (“not specified” or “not limited”) by JECFA that are acceptable for use in foods in general in accordance with GMP.
The Annex to Table 3 lists food categories and individual foods that are excluded from the general conditions of Table 3. Provisions for use of Table 3 additives in the food categories listed in the Annex to Table 3 are specifically listed in Tables 1 and 2.

- As of the 35th CAC (2012), approximately 2400 food additive provisions have been adopted, and approximately 3600 food additive provisions remain in the step process.
- The 45th CCFA (2013) considered provisions in Tables 1 and 2 for those additives listed in Table 3 that have the function of “acidity regulator” or “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener.” The CCFA employed a horizontal approach to these Table 3 additives, which considered whether the use of the functional class was technologically justified or not in a particular food category. The CCFA also developed a set of Working Principles (FA 45/CRD 2, Appendix VI) that ensured a uniform procedure and assisted in the discussion of the specific provisions for Table 3 additives with the function “acidity regulator” or “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener.”
- The 45th CCFA (2013) also considered food additive provisions for aluminum-containing additives.
- The 45th CCFA forwarded for adoption (at Step 8 or 5/8) 528 provisions for food additives (including 26 provisions for aluminum-containing additives). One of these provisions replaced a currently-adopted provision.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of these food additive provisions.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The Delegation of the EU noted that they have already taken measures to restrict exposure to aluminum from food additives, including consideration of aluminum lakes of colors and revision of specifications for food additives with aluminum impurities. They expressed concern that the uncertainties in the exposure to aluminum from all sources may lead to the Provisional Tolerable Weekly Intake (PWTI) (2 mg/kg bw) being exceeded. The Delegation of Norway supported this view. The Delegations of the EU and Norway expressed their reservation to the CCFA’s recommendation to forward the provisions for aluminum-containing food additives for adoption at Step 8 or 5/8.

**Proposed Draft Amendments to the International Numbering System (INS) of Food Additives (REP 13/FA para. 116 and Appendix IX)**

**Background:**
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The need for the identification of food additives on food labels arises from the provisions of the Codex General Standard for the Labeling of Prepackaged Foods (GSFL) (CODEX STAN 1 - 1985). The Codex Class Names and the International Numbering System for Food Additives (CAC/GL 36-1989) has been prepared by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC) to provide a voluntary, harmonized international numerical system for identifying food additives in ingredient lists as an alternative to the specific name, which may be lengthy. The 18th CAC (1989) adopted the International Numbering System (INS) as a Codex Advisory Text on the basis that the list would be an open one, and that proposals for inclusion of further additives would be considered (ALINORM 89/40, para. 297).

Inclusion of a food additive in the INS does not imply approval by Codex for use in food. The list includes additives that have not been evaluated by JECFA. The INS does not include flavors, since the GSFL does not require these to be specifically identified in the list of ingredients, and since flavors have a JECFA number as an identifier. Further, it does not include chewing gum bases, and dietetic and nutritive additives. However, it does include enzymes that function as food additives.

The INS serves as the official source of additive names, INS numbers and functional classes for use in the GSFA. The INS also provides a list of technological purposes for each additive contained in the INS.

The 45th CCFA (2013) recommended the addition of additive names and technological purposes, and the revision of existing additive names and technological purposes to the Codex Class Names and the International Numbering System for Food Additives (CAC/GL 36-1989), as outlined in REP 13/FA Appendix IX. The proposed amendments were discussed, and it was agreed to forward them to the CAC for adoption at Step 5/8.

**U.S. Position:**

- The United States supports adoption of the proposed amendments to the INS.

**Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives arising from the 76th JECFA meeting (REP 13/FA para. 125 and Appendix X)**

**Background:**

- As part of its work, JECFA establishes specifications of identity and purity for food additives, including flavorings, used in food. JECFA is the expert risk assessment body that provides scientific advice to CCFA, and ultimately the CAC, which are responsible for setting standards based on scientific criteria. Therefore, CCFA considers the JECFA’s food additive specifications of identify and purity to represent the minimum criteria necessary to establish food grade quality for an additive. The CCFA provides recommendations to the CAC for adoption of the JECFA specifications of identity and purity as Codex specifications (CAC/MISC 6-2010).
The 45th CCFA (2013) forwarded full specifications for 8 food additives (5 new, 3 revised), and for 93 flavorings to the CAC for adoption at Step 5/8 as Codex specifications.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the specifications.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The Delegation of the EU expressed its reservation to the references to food additives used in food additives in some of the specifications, including 3 enzyme preparations. In their view, the specifications should be related to the substances themselves, and not to preparations or formulations. They were of the opinion that the CCFA, as risk manager, should consider how the use of food additives in food additives should be addressed, and whether criteria for their use should be developed.
- The JECFA Secretariat explained that the inclusion of such “secondary additives” is an integral part of the description of the manufacturing process that is included in the specifications, and that this information is important for both food manufacturers and consumers. The JECFA Secretariat recommended that the CCFA develop guidance on how to address the use of food additives in food additives, and to prepare a discussion paper for the next Session.
- The CCFA supported the JECFA Secretariat’s recommendation. The Delegation of the EU agreed to prepare the discussion paper.

**U.S. Observations:**
- The United States does not have a specific policy regarding the use of food additives in food additives, but has relied on the Food Chemicals Codex (FCC) policy regarding “added substances” (FCC 8, p. 1658). The United States notes that the use of an additive in another additive would result in the presence of the secondary additive in food at a much lower level than the primary additive; consequently, the exposure to such secondary additives would be expected to be minor. Finally, the United States notes that the GSFA is not the appropriate place for use levels of additives in additives to be listed, as these “secondary” uses are more closely related to processing aids, which are not included in the GSFA.

**CCS: Codex Committee on Sugars**

*Proposed Draft Standard for Non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice (CL 2013/09-CS (Panela))*

**Background**
- The 17th (2010) Session of the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean had supported a proposal from Colombia for the elaboration of a worldwide standard for “panela” and the Executive Committee had recommended approval of the development of a worldwide standard for this product in the Committee on Sugars.
The Commission further noted that the CCS was presently adjourned *sine die* and that the United Kingdom, host country of CCS, had stated that it would not be in a position to hold the presidency if the Committee became active again.

Colombia expressed its willingness to host the Committee with the understanding that the country would hold the secretariat of the CCS only for the time envisaged for completion of the standard as set out in the project document and working by correspondence only.

The Delegation of the United Kingdom thanked the Delegation of Colombia for its willingness to take on this work.

The Commission further noted that the elaboration of the standard would follow the uniform procedure for the elaboration of Codex standards.

**U.S. Position**

- The United States does not support the adoption of this document through an accelerated Step 5/8 process in the Codex Step process at this time. We do not agree that substantial consensus was reached on the provisions of this document that would warrant an accelerated process of Step 5/8.
- The U.S. experience with this process was that country comments were not translated and the relevant documents were not available until after many repeated requests. In the U.S. experience with this working group, there was a significant absence of interaction with those who submitted comments to resolve the issues.
- Consequently, this document, while a good effort by Colombia to meet the terms of reference, does not yet reflect a consensus document. As such, we propose retaining the document at Step 5 for further consideration and comment.

**U.S. Observations:**

- Several countries, including the United States, commented that the color section should identify the characteristic color as brow to golden brown. We continue to have this observation.

**CCCF: Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food**

*Proposed Draft Maximum Levels for lead in fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink; canned fruits; and canned vegetables (REP 13/CF para. 42, Appendix II)*

**Background:**

- The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an eWG led by the United States to revise the Maximum Levels (MLs) for lead in fruit juices, milk and milk products, infant formula, canned fruits and vegetables, fruits, and cereal grains (except buckwheat, canihua and quinoa) in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF).
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, the United States introduced the document prepared by the eWG (CX/CF 13/45/13) and presented the proposals to revise or retain the MLs for fruit juices, milk, infant formula, canned fruits and vegetables and cereal grains (except buckwheat, canihua and quinoa).
The United States Delegation noted that since no safe level of lead has been identified by JECFA, the focus of the paper was to review occurrence data to determine what percentage of samples can meet proposed new MLs. The paper did not propose MLs based on levels of exposure or on consumption.

After extensive discussions on the proposals presented in the paper, the Committee agreed to the following:

- **Milks and Cereals**: Retain the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg for milk and 0.2 mg/kg for cereals.
- **Fruit Juices**: Revise the current ML of 0.05 mg/kg to 0.03 mg/kg for fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink, but retain the current ML of 0.05 mg/kg for juices and nectars from berries and other small fruits.
- **Canned Fruits and Vegetables**: Consolidate the MLs for the individual canned fruits and vegetable and revise the current ML of 1 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg.
  - For canned fruits, as consumed, include canned mixed fruits but exclude canned berries and other small fruits.
  - For canned vegetables, as consumed, include canned mixed vegetables but exclude canned leafy vegetables (including canned brassica leafy vegetables) and canned legume vegetables.
- **Infant formula**: Reconsider the proposed revised ML of 0.01 mg/kg from current ML of 0.02 mg/kg for infant formula, including follow-up formula, at its next session based on additional data submitted to GEMS/Foods.
  - If no additional data are made available, consider adopting the proposed revised ML of 0.01 mg/kg.

The Committee agreed to forward the following proposed draft MLs to the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8:

- 0.03 mg/kg for fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink (excluding juices and nectars from berries and other small fruits).
- 0.1 mg/kg for canned fruits, including canned mixed fruits (excluding canned berries and other small fruits).
- 0.1 mg/kg for canned vegetables, including canned mixed vegetables (excluding canned brassica vegetables, canned leafy vegetables, and canned legume vegetables).

The Committee also agreed to inform the Commission that it is retaining the current MLs of 0.02 mg/kg for milks, 0.2 mg/kg for cereals, and 0.05 mg/kg for juices and nectars from berries and other small fruits.

The Committee further agreed to request the Commission to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standards for canned fruits (i.e., canned fruit cocktail, canned tropical fruit salad, canned grapefruit, canned mandarin oranges, canned mangoes, canned pineapples, canned raspberries and canned strawberries) and to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standards for canned vegetables (i.e., canned asparagus, canned carrots, canned green beans and canned wax beans, canned green peas, canned mature processed peas, canned mushrooms, canned palmito (palm hearts), canned sweet corn, canned tomatoes and table olives).
**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of the proposed revised draft MLs for fruit juices, canned fruits, and canned vegetables at Step 5/8.
- The United States supports retaining the current MLs for milks, cereals, and juices/nectars from berries and other small fruits.
- The United States supports requesting the Commission to revoke the lead MLs for individual standards for canned fruits and vegetables.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- Brazil and a number of other delegations did not support lowering the current ML of 0.02 to 0.01 mg/kg for infant formula. These Delegations:
  - Argued that milk, for which the current ML of 0.02 mg/kg is maintained, is the main component of infant formula and therefore questioned the proposal to lower the ML for infant formula.
  - Questioned the small data set of only 11 quantifiable results out of 138 total results from only two countries and argued for more data from other countries and regions.
- The EU Delegation, while supporting lowering the ML, argued that the paper clearly indicated that the proposed lower ML could be applied to follow-up formula.
- There was general consensus by the Committee for maintaining the current MLs for milks and cereals, requesting the Commission to revoke the lead MLs for individual standards for canned fruits and vegetables, and adopting the proposed revised MLs for fruit juices, canned fruits, and canned vegetables at Step 5/8.

**Proposed Draft Maximum Levels for Deoxynivalenol (DON) in Cereals and Cereal-Based foods for infants and young children (REP 13/CF para. 70, Appendix III)**

**Background:**
- Cereal-based foods for infants and young children: 0.2 mg/kg, as consumed – forward to the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States does not object to the adoption of the proposed ML of 0.2 mg/kg for cereal-based foods for infants and young children at Step 5/8.
- The United States originally supported a ML of 0.5 mg/kg as this level is still health protective for infants and young children; however, the United States agreed to the lower ML based on input from U.S. industry sources saying the lower level can be achieved when applied to the products as consumed.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- Norway pointed out that one of the major conclusions of a new risk assessment conducted in its country was that infants and children up to 9 years could exceed the tolerable daily intake of DON and could not support the MLs in any of the commodities.
However, they dropped their reservation but asked for more time to consult with their risk assessment bodies before making a final decision – this matter is likely to be raised at the Commission meeting.

Proposed Draft Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Ochratoxin A in Cocoa (REP 13/CF para. 79, Appendix IV)

Background:
- The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an electronic working group (eWG) led by Ghana to start new work on a Code of Practice for ochratoxin A in cocoa which was approved by the 35th (2012) Session of the CAC.
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, the Delegation of Ghana, as the chair of the eWG, presented the document highlighting key issues addressed in the Code of Practice.
- There was general support for the code of practice and its advancement to Step 5/8, but with the need to improve certain parts of the text. In view of the comments made, the committee agreed to establish an in-session working group, led by Ghana, to consider the comments submitted and to prepare a revised draft.
- The Delegation of Ghana presented the revised draft code of practice (CRD 26) which the Committee supported and forwarded the proposed draft code of practice to the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8.

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports adoption of this code of practice at Step 5/8.

Position of Other Delegations:
- There was a general consensus by the Committee for supporting adoption.

Proposed Draft Code of Practice for the reduction of hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products (REP 13/CF para. 92, Appendix VI)

Background:
- The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an electronic working group (eWG) led by Australia and co-chaired by Nigeria to start new work on a code of practice for hydrocyanic acid (HCN) in cassava and cassava products which was approved by the 35th Session of the CAC.
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, the Delegation of Nigeria, as the co-chair of the eWG, introduced CRD 27 containing relevant revisions made based on the comments submitted to the meeting. The Delegation explained that the information available on management practices to reduce the presence of HCN in cassava and cassava products was sufficiently inclusive to ensure global application of the code of practice.
- The Committee agreed the revisions made at this session took into account the available management practices to ensure worldwide implementation of the code of practice and forwarded the proposed draft code to the Commission for adoption at Step 5/8.
**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of this code of practice at Step 5/8.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- There was a general consensus by the Committee for supporting adoption of this code of practice at Step 5/8.

**CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues**

**Background:**
- 397 MRLs for 35 pesticides were advanced to Step 8 for adoption by the CAC. 361 of the 397 MRLs were advanced using the accelerated 5/8 procedure. Of these 397, 18 MRLs were recommended by applying proportionality, 37 are for crop groups including nine MRLs advanced on the updated fruit groups adopted by the CAC during its 35th session (2012).

**Draft Maximum Residue Limits at Step 8 (REP13/PR, Appendix II)**
- 130 Diflubenzuron (16 MRLs)
- 176 Hexythiazox (1 MRL)
- 184 Etofenprox (1 MRLs)
- 197 Fenbuconzaole (13 MRLs)
- 204 Esfenvalerate (3 MRLs)
- 248 Fluriafol (2 MRLs)

**Draft Maximum Residue Limits at Step 5/8 (REP13/PR, Appendix III)**
- 25 Dichlorvos (16 MRLs)
- 26 Dicofol (1 MRL)
- 81 Chlorothalonil (2 MRLs)
- 96 Carbofuran (1 MRL)
- 112 Phorate (1 MRL)
- 119 Fenvalerate (2 MRLs)
- 57 Cyfluthrin/beta-cyfluthrin (6 MRLs)
- 169 Cyromazine (3 MRLs)
- 173 Buprofezin (2 MRLs)
- 175 Glufosinate-Ammonium (37 MRLs)
- 179 Cycloxydim (39 MRLs)
- 206 Imidacloprid (2 MRLs)
- 209 Methoxyfenozide (7 MRLs)
- 210 Pyraclostrobin (1 MRL)
- 211 Fludioxonil (1 MRL)
- 213 Trifloxystrobin (10 MRLs)
- 216 Indoxacarb (1 MRL)
- 229 Azoxystrobin (3 MRLs)
• 233 Spinetoram (16 MRLs)
• 234 Spirotetramate (1 MRL)
• 243 Fluopyram (22 MRLs)
• 251 Saflufenacil (1 MRL)
• 252 Sulfoxaflor (30 MRL)
• 253 Penthiopyrad (22 MRL)
• 255 Dinotefuran (24 MRLs)
• 256 Fluxapyroxad (47 MRLs)
• 257 MCPA (23 MRLs)
• 259 Sedaxane (21 MRLs)
• 260 Ametoctradin (19 MRLs)

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of these MRLs. The United States notes that 37 of these MRLs are for crop groups and supports JMPR recommending for crop groups when possible. The use of crop groupings to establish MRLs is very important, especially for minor crops. Additionally, the 30 MRLs for sulfoxaflor resulted from the U.S. proposal for the pilot project whereby JMPR would evaluate a chemical before finalization of any national review/registration. Provided the CAC adopts these MRLs during the next session, this will result in Codex MRLs being established within 4 months of the national registration.

**Position of Other Key Delegations:**
- The Delegations of the EU and Norway raised reservations for 22 of the 35 chemicals where MRLs were advanced to Step 8. The specific reservations for each chemical are outlined in CRD 11. The EU raised reservations regarding MRLs for dichlorvos, diclofol, chlorothalonil, phorate, fenvalerate, diflubenzuron, cyromazine, buprofezin, glufosinate-ammonium, hexythiazox, cycloxydim, imidacloprid, methoxyfenozone, spinetoram, fluopyram, saflufenacil, sulfoxaflor, penthiopyrad, dinotefuran, fluxapyroxad, MCPA, and ametoctradin.

**CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues**

*Proposed Draft Revision to the Codex Classification of Food and Animal Feed-selected vegetable commodity groups REP 13/PR, para. 123, Appendix X*

**CCFL: Codex Committee on Food Labelling**

*Proposed Draft amendments to the Guidelines for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL23-1997) concerning Non-Addition of Sodium Salts REP 13/FL para. 41, Appendix II*

**Background:**
- As part of the CCFL response to the implementation of the WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health (the Global Strategy), the Committee...
considered amendments to the Guidelines for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims regarding amendments to the text for the non-addition of sodium salts.

- At the 39th CCFL (2011), the Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group chaired by Canada to develop non-addition claims for sugars and salt, propose an amendment to the text of section 6.3 to clarify that sodium would be captured in the claims that would require a change of 25% in order to be made, review paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4, and consider conditions for a claim related to trans fatty acids.
- At the 40th CCFL (2012), regarding the non-addition of salt claim, the Committee agreed to refer to “sodium salts” citing as its reasoning the recommendation of the Global Strategy to reduce sodium from all sources, not just from sodium chloride. The United States, however, preferred the option referring to sodium chloride. The text was referred to the Commission at Step 5 in 2012.
- The claim for non-addition of sodium salts (currently at Step 8) is the last CCFL item remaining from the WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health as all other remaining items were approved at Steps 5/8 by the Commission in 2012.
- At the 41st CCFL (2013), some editorial changes were made to the text.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States does not oppose the proposed new section 7.2 with edits from the 41st CCFL. The United States, however, questions the usefulness of such a claim because only products without the addition of any sodium salt could bear the claim.

**Positions of Other Key Delegations:**
- One delegation, Argentina, indicated they preferred deletion of the footnote.
- Cameroon noted their reservation for using “including but not limited to” as opposed to their preference of using “examples.”
- Costa Rica noted their reservation for using “low in” in a footnote as opposed to their preference for using “free of.”

**Proposed Draft amendments to the Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods concerning use of ethylene as Sprouting Inhibitor for Onions and Potatoes REP 13/FL para. 69, Appendix IV**

**Background:**
- At the 41st (2013) session of the CCFL, the Committee further considered the use of ethylene as a sprouting inhibitor for potatoes and onions, as consensus was not reached on the use of this substance at the 40th (2012) session of the CCFL.
- Prior to the 41st (2013) session, the United States and Cameroon co-chaired an eWG, with the terms of reference to further consider the use of ethylene for use as a sprouting inhibitor for onions and potatoes only.
- At the 41st session, the United States provided a report of the electronic working group, which proposed two options for listing ethylene with conditions regarding
its use. The majority of respondents favored option A, which would list ethylene with the following conditions:
  o Need recognized by the certification body or authority for sprout inhibition of stored potatoes and onions where varieties that have long dormancy characteristics are not available, or these varieties are not suited to local growing conditions.
  o Must be used in a manner that minimizes exposure to operators and workers.

**U.S. Position**
- The United States is neutral on the inclusion of ethylene since it is not currently permitted as a sprouting inhibitor for organic potatoes and onions under the USDA organic regulations. The U.S. organic standards permit other uses of ethylene for ripening of tropical fruit, degreening of citrus, and for induction of pineapple flowering.
- The United States does not object to the inclusion of the substance under Option A, as was supported by the CCFL.

**Positions of Other Key Delegations**
- The majority of delegations indicated support for expanded use of ethylene for sprout inhibition of potatoes and onions under option A.
- Norway indicated concerns regarding data gaps related to the safety of ethylene.
Part 2 – Other standards and related texts submitted for adoption

CCFFP: Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products

Amendments to sections I-6.5, I-8.5 and II-8.7 of the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (Criterion for Salmonella in the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (CODEX STAN 292-2008) and Sections 7.1 and 7.2.2.2 to the Code of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products (CAC/RCP 52 – 2003) REP 13/FFP, (paras. 12 and 14, Appendix II).

Background
- The Committee agreed to remove the criterion for Salmonella from section I-6.5 and to make consequential amendments to sections I-8.5 and II-8.7, based on the conclusions of the FAO and WHO Expert Group on Salmonella in bivalves (see Agenda item 2b) and the recommendation of the 43rd (2011) session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH).
- The Committee considered the further proposal by CCFH to include in section 7.2.2.2 of the Code of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products “when appropriate, taking into account the epidemiological situation as indicated by the results of environmental monitoring and/or other surveillance, the competent authority may decide to implement a criterion for Salmonella.”
- Some delegations expressed the view that such an inclusion was not necessary as section 7.2.2.2 sufficiently covered this matter, while another delegation believed that such guidance from CCFH was contrary to the conclusions and recommendations of the expert meeting and should not be included. Several delegations supported the amendment to section 7.2.2.2, noting section 7.2.2.2 dealt with monitoring, whereas the proposal from CCFH was specifically about the implementation of a criterion. In view of the discussion, the Committee therefore agreed to amend section 7.2.2.2 as proposed by CCFH.
- 12. The Committee agreed to send the amendments to the Standard for Live and Raw Bivalve Molluscs (sections I-6.5, I-8.5 and II-8.7) and the Code of Practice for Fish and Fishery Products (section 7.2.2.2) to the 36th Session of the Commission for adoption (Appendix II).

US Position:
- The United States supports the amendment.

CCPFV: Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables

Amendment to the Guidelines for Packing Media in Canned Fruits (CAC/GL 51-2003) (REP 13/PFV para. 80, Appendix IV)

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports the decision of the 26th (2012) CCPFV session to forward the amended text for adoption by the 36th Session of the Commission.
Amendment to the Standards for Certain Canned Citrus Fruits, Preserved Tomatoes and Processed Tomato Concentrates (section 4 – food additives) REP 13/PFV paras. 123-124 – Appendix VI

Background:
- The food additive provisions of the Standards for Preserved Tomatoes and Processed Tomato Concentrates were revised by the CCPFV.
- A general reference to the General Standard for Food Additives was included in food additive provisions for the Certain Canned Citrus Fruits standard.

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports the decision of the 26th (2012) CCPFV to forward the amended text for adoption by the 36th (2013) Session of the Commission.

Amendment to the Standard for Canned Applesauce (section 9 – methods of analysis) REP 13/PFV, para. 128, Appendix IV

Background:
- The committee agreed to include methods of analysis for soluble solids and minimum fill in the Standard for Canned Applesauce (para. 128, Appendix VII).

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports adoption of the amended text.

CCCASIA: Codex Regional Committee on Asia

Amendments to some food additive provisions in the Regional Standards for Fermented Soybean Paste (CODEX STAN 298R-2009) and for Chili Sauce (CODEX STAN 306R – 2011)

Background
- The 45th (2013) CCFA discussed the additives listed in REP 13/ASIA paras. 18 – 20 for the Regional Standard for Chili Sauce under the agenda item for the endorsement of food additive provisions in Codex commodity standards. The CCFA endorsed all of these provisions (REP 13/FA, para. 38 and Appendix III (page 49)).

U.S. Position:
- The United States can support the endorsement of these provisions.
CCFICS: Codex Committee on Food Inspection and Certification Systems

Amendments to the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange of Information in Food Safety Situations (REP 13/FICS para. 58 and Appendix III)

**Background:**
- An electronic working group (eWG) of the Codex Ad-Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding (TF) proposed amendments to a number of Codex texts to incorporate “feed” into the scope of the documents. Among these documents were two developed by CCFICS: the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange of Information in Food Safety Situations (CAC/GL 19-1995); and, the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange between Countries on Rejections of Imported Food (CAC/GL 25-1997).
- CCFICS considered these revisions at its 19th (2011) Session with mixed views expressed by countries on the need for the revisions. Many countries believed that if changes were made to the scope of the document to include feed, the inclusion should only be with respect to the impact of feed on food safety. Noting the complexity of the issue, the Committee requested the United States to develop a Discussion Paper that would, among other things, more thoroughly consider the inclusion of feed into the two documents and suggest revisions to the amendments proposed by the eWG of the TF.
- CCFICS considered the revisions to the proposed amendments at its 20th (2013) Session. The Committee agreed that the revisions should focus on the impact of feed only as it relates to food safety. After general discussion, CCFICS agreed with the proposed revised amendments, incorporating a few minor changes suggested by the Committee. The Committee forwarded the proposed amendments to the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange of Information in Food Safety Situations to the Commission for adoption.
- Because of limited time and several proposed changes to the proposed amendments to the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange between Countries on Rejections of Imported Food, the Committee could not complete work on this document and requested the United States to work with the European Commission to further revise the document for consideration by the CCFICS at its next (2014) Session.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports adoption of amendments to the Codex Guidelines for the Exchange of Information in Food Safety Situations to incorporate the term “feed” as it relates to food safety into the scope of the document.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- We believe there is good support for the proposed amendments. The only delegation expressing concern with certain of the amendments was the European Commission (on behalf of the EU) and these concerns were resolved during discussion by the Committee.
- The EU agreed with the need to focus the incorporation of feed into the scope of the document so that its inclusion focused on feed as it relates to food safety, and not to the impact of feed as a stand-alone entity.
- There were no expressions of concern on the proposed amendments by other countries or observers. The Committee as a whole reached consensus on the final amendments.

CCMAS: Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling

*Methods of Analysis and Sampling in Codex Standards at different steps, paras 16-54, Appendix II*

**Background:**
- The changes made were the endorsement of specific methods or sampling plans. Some items were not endorsed and sent back to the specific committee.
- These changes were either requested by the specific committees or were (generally) editorial in nature.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the endorsement of the methods as recommended by the Committee.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- There were no specific objections to the endorsement of the methods.

CCFO: Codex Committee on Fats and Oils


**Background:**
- At the 32nd (2011) and 33rd (2012) Sessions of the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling: the CCFO agreed with CCMAS that the provision for relative density should be retained in the Standards for Named Animal Fats, for Named Vegetable Oils and for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils as it is still in use.
  - As there was no information available on the method for relative density at the present session, the CCFO agreed to request the representative of the American Oil Chemists’ Society (AOCS) to look into this matter, and if necessary, to develop the method and to inform the CCFO at its next session. The Committee also agreed to request CCMAS to look into an appropriate method for the provision.
  - With regard to the provision for erythrodiol+uvaol content in the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils, the CCFO agreed that the method of analysis in Section 8.8 should be COI/T.20/doc. No 30-2011, which was
developed by the International Olive Oil Council (IOC) and is available on the website of the IOC. It was also agreed to include the method in Section 8.7 for the determination of sterol composition and content, in addition to the methods currently included in the Standard (Appendix II).

- 5th Session (2011) of the Committee on Contaminants in Foods
  - In response to the CCCF observation that halogenated solvents could be considered as processing aids, the CCFO clarified that halogenated solvents should be considered as contaminants because they were no longer used for the production of olive pomace oil. The Committee, therefore, agreed to add “other than halogenated solvents” after “solvent” and to add “by” after “or” in the description of olive pomace oil (Section 2.3) in the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils (CODEX STAN 33-1981) for clarification.
  - Regarding the section on halogenated solvents (Section 5.3) in the Standard, the CCFO agreed to retain the section as there could still be contamination with such substances from other sources and to request the CCCF to include the provisions for halogenated solvents in the General Standard on Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF) so that the section on contaminants in the standard could be fully aligned at a later stage. (Appendix II)

- Section on Contaminants in some standards
  - With regard to the Standards for Edible Fats and Oils not Covered by Individual Standards (CODEX STAN 19-1981), for Named Animal Fats (CODEX STAN 211-1999) and for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils (CODEX STAN 33-1981), the CCFO agreed to replace the specific provisions for arsenic and lead with the general reference to the GSCTFF as these maximum levels were already included in the general standard. It was also agreed to delete the methods of analysis for these substances in the Standards and the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils (CODEX STAN 210-1999) subsequently. (Appendix II)

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States has no objection to the retention of the relative density in the referenced standards and to the request to CCMAS to advise on the appropriate method. Revision of the method will be considered at the next CCFO meeting.
- The United States has no objection to inclusion of the (International Olive Oil Council) IOC method COI/T.20/doc in the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils to replace the defunct IUPAC Method for erythrodiol+uvaol content in Section 8.8 and Appendix II, and adding this IOC method as a third acceptable method for the analysis of desmethylsterols in Section 8.7.
- The United States supports the revision to the description of olive pomace oil in the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils to exclude halogenated solvents from being used to make olive pomace oil.
The United States supports retention of Section 5.3 in the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils until the provision is fully aligned with the GSCTFF.

The United States supports replacement of the specific lead and arsenic contaminant provisions with the general reference to the GSCTFF in the Standard for Edible Fats and Oils not covered by Individual Standards, the Standard for Named Animal Fats, and the Standard for Olive Oils and Olive Pomace Oils since these specific contaminant provisions are identical to those already in the GSCTFF.

Amendments to the lists of acceptable previous cargoes in the Code of Practice for the Storage and Transport of edible Fats and Oils in Bulk (CAC/RCP 36-1987)

Background:
- At the 2013 session, the EU put forth a CRD proposing the following amendments:
  - To restrict the entry "MOLASSES" (CAS No 57-50-1) to "Molasses obtained from citrus, sorghum, sugar beet, and sugar cane" as the term "molasses" could be applicable to any liquid food or feed ingredient obtained from plants that contains in excess of 43 % sugars.
  - To delete the additional condition for POTABLE WATER (CAS No 7732-18-5), "only acceptable where the immediate previous cargo is also on the list" taking into account current shipping and cleaning practices.
- Concerning molasses, the Committee agreed with the proposal to restrict entry "Molasses" (CAS No 57-50-1) to molasses obtained from citrus, sorghum, sugar beet, and sugar cane.
- Concerning potable water, the Committee agreed to delete the additional condition "only acceptable where the immediate previous cargo is also on the list".

U.S. Position:
- The United States does not oppose the restriction of “molasses” (CAS no 57-50-1) to molasses obtained from citrus, sorghum, sugar beet and sugar cane as applicable to the acceptable previous cargo list. However, there was no basis provided for concluding that this is a genuine issue.
- The United States does not oppose the deletion of the requirement that when potable water is the previous cargo, the cargo preceding the potable water must also be on the list.

CCCF: Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food

Consequential amendments to the Standards for Edible cassava Flour, Gari and Sweet Cassava

Background:
- The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an electronic working group (eWG) led by Australia to start new work on MLs for hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products that was approved by the 35th (2012) session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
In order to carry out this task, CCCF agreed that the eWG would undertake a review of the levels and MLs for hydrocyanic acid in existing Codex commodity standards with a view toward the possible revision of these MLs and the establishment of new MLs for additional commodities, such as ready-to-eat cassava chips.

At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, Australia summarized the discussion, conclusions and recommendation of the eWG as presented in working document CX/CF 13/7/10.

The Committee also agreed to keep the existing MLs for hydrocyanic acid in the Codex commodity standards for gari and cassava flour unchanged and to transfer them to the (General Standard on Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF)); to introduce consequential amendments to the standards for gari (CODEX STAN 151-1989) and cassava flour (CODEX STAN 176-1989) to remove these MLs from the standard: and to include a general reference to the GSCTFF in the section on contaminants.

**U.S. Position:**

- The United States supports the consequential amendments to the Standards for Edible Cassava Flour, Gari and Sweet Cassava.

**CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues:**

*Consequential amendments to the maximum residue limits for pesticides for fruit commodity groups due to revision of the Classification of Food and Feed as per these commodity groups REP 13?PR, para. 110, Appendix XIII*

**Background:**

- The electronic working group, chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by the United States, presented amendments and edits to the Revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds. The Committee proposed revisions to the Root and Tuber Vegetables Group and agreed to forward this group to Step 5.

**U.S. Position**

- The United States supports this revision.

**CCFL: Codex Committee on Food Labelling**

*Consequential Editorial Amendments to the Guidelines on Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1009) concerning clarifying section 6.3 on Comparative Claims (REP 13/FL para. 45, Appendix III, part B (Referral from CCNFSDU)*

**Background:**

- At the 39th CCFL (2011), the Committee agreed to establish an eWG chaired by Canada to develop non-additions claims for sugars and salt, propose an amendment to the text of section 6.3 to clarify that sodium would be captured in the claims that would require a change of 25% in order to be made, review
Sections 6.3 and 6.4, and consider conditions for a claim related to trans fatty acids.

- At the 40th CCFL (2012), the Committee approved inclusion of sodium in Section 6.3 and the edit was approved by the Commission at Steps 5/8.
- Additionally, CCFL asked CCNFSDU whether the condition for 10% of the NRV for comparative claims for micronutrients in Section 6.3 is still in line with current evidence based guidance on micronutrients.
- CCNFSDU informed the CCFL that the value of 10% was the result of a pragmatic approach and also stated that Section 6.3 in the guidelines was confusing as the sentence included both macronutrients and micronutrients.
- CCNFSDU suggested the text be made clearer.
- The Secretariat confirmed that such a change could be made as an editorial change that would not go through the step process but simply adopted by the Commission.

**Position of Other Key Delegations:**

- After a brief discussion at the CCFL, no delegations were opposed to the editorial amendments for Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 for comparative claims.

**Amendments to the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985) concerning definitions and replacing the existing annex with the new Annex:**

**General principles for establishment of nutrient reference values for the general population** (REP 13/FL, para. 59, Appendix III, part A (see also CX/CAC 13/36/3, CCNFSDU N04-2010)

**Background:**

- The Committee was informed that CCNFSDU had established a consolidated text of the General Principles for Establishing NRVs of Vitamins and Minerals and General Principles for Establishing NRVs-NCD and related amendments to the Guidelines for Nutrition and Health Claims, the definition of NRVs (section 2.6) and the presentation of nutrient content (section 3.4).
- Malaysia argued that the General Principles for Establishing NRVs-NCD have not yet been adopted by the Commission and therefore it is inappropriate to consider consolidation at this time. This delegation also expressed that Annex 1 of CX/FL/13/41/2, on the definition of NRV should not be changed as it had only recently been adopted and objected to the proposed NRV-NCD for Saturated Fatty Acids.
- The Committee agreed to editorial amendments in 3.2.1.2 (amending “risk relationship” to “risk”) and 3.2.2.1 (amending CCNFSDU to read Codex Alimentarius Commission) and to add footnote 3 for sodium in section 3.4.4.2 to cite the updated WHO Guideline on Sodium Intake for Adults and Children (WHO 2012), which further supports the selection of sodium.
- In conclusion, the Committee agreed to forward the amendment proposed by CCNFSDU to the Commission for adoption. (Appendix IIIa). The Committee noted reservations of Malaysia and the Philippines.

**U.S. Position:**
The United States supports these amendments to advance this agenda item.

**Part 3- Standards and related texts held at Step 8 by the Commission**

**CCRVDF: Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Food**

*Draft MRLS for Bovine Somatotropin ALINORM 95/31, Appendix II, ALINORM 03/41, para 34.*

**Background:**
- The 35th (2012) Session of the Commission agreed to request JECFA to re-evaluate BST and to continue holding the draft MRLs for BST at Step 8, pending JECFA re-evaluation and CCRVDF recommendations.
- The re-evaluation is expected to be completed in November 2013 and the results will be presented at the 37th CAC (2014).

**CCNEA: FAO / WHO Coordinating Committee for the Near East**

*Draft Regional Code of Practice for Street-Vended Foods (REP 13/NEA para. 46 and Appendix II)*

**Background:**
- The 34th session of the CAC (2011) adopted the Proposed Draft Code at Step 5, held it at Step 8, and submitted the hygiene provisions for endorsement to the Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) with a view to its final adoption by the 36th Commission (2013) following further consideration of these provisions by the 7th Coordinating Committee for the Near East (CCNEA).
- The 7th session (2013) of CCNEA generally agreed with the changes made by CCFH to the hygiene provisions of the standard. In addition, the Committee made a number of comments and amendments to the version that is now before the CAC.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States congratulates the member countries of CCNEA for their work on this important Regional Standard.
- In particular, the United States would like to highlight the coordination between CCNEA and CCFH as an example of good practices within Codex.
- The United States supports adoption of the Standard at Step 8.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- There seems to be significant support within the Near East region even from those countries who did not attend the CCNEA meeting. Other regions have not expressed a strong position for either adoption or rejection of the Standard.
Agenda Item 6: Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 5

CCFFV: Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

Proposed Draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit (REP 13/FFV para. 85, Appendix IV)

Background:
- At the 17th CCFFV session the delegation of Colombia submitted a proposal to develop a Codex Standard for Golden passion fruit which was accepted by the committee, submitted to and subsequently approved the 34TH CAC.
- Many CCFFV members have indicated their desire to broaden this standard to include other types of fresh passion fruit traded for the following reasons:
  - A general standard would optimize the use of the Committee’s resources.
  - Many other passion fruit species and hybrids of passion fruit are traded therefore the scope of the standard should be enlarged to cover other species. This single standard could separate those provisions common to all species and those specific to the relevant specie. The specific names, i.e. scientific and/or common names of the different species or commercial varieties, could be addressed through labeling.
  - Golden passion fruit is only a small part of the international fresh passion fruit trade.

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports the decision of the CCFFV chair that “delegations could submit comments and information at Step 5 for consideration by the Commission on the economic importance of other species of passion fruits for their countries which could possibly allow the enlargement of the scope by having specific annexes attached to common provisions in the main body of the standard.”
- If no written comments are submitted to broaden the scope of the standard, the United States will support the adoption of the draft Codex Standard for Golden Passion Fruit at Step 5.

CCFP: Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products


Background:
- The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft Section to the 36th Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix VII) and to CCMAS for endorsement.
**U.S. Position:**

- The United States supports advancement of this document, provided that bioassays are eligible for consideration under criteria.
- The United States supported and drafted criteria in order to allow both the mouse bioassay (MBA) and HPLC methods to be used as reference methods. The criteria represent a difficult and carefully crafted agreement between countries that depend on the MBA and countries with legislation restricting animal use. However, there is an attempt within CCMAS to exclude bioassays from consideration under criteria for Type II and Type III methods.
- The MBA is not mentioned in the Draft Criteria; however CCMAS discussed how the MBA could not be used under criteria because it is a Defining Methods (Type I). This interpretation is based on a false notion that bioassays are, by default, Defining Methods, and appears influenced by countries with animal welfare legislation looking for a procedural loophole. Method Type (I or II) is only defined within the Codex Procedural Manual. A Defining Method (Type I) by Codex definition is the only method for establishing the accepted value of the item measured. Also by definition, Type II methods can only be used as reference methods where Type I methods do not apply. It is apparent that the MBA is not a Defining Method because the MBA uses a saxitoxin reference standard to measure saxitoxin equivalents as do the HPLC methods. Also note that HPLC methods must use the MBA to determine toxicity equivalence factors to convert analog levels into saxitoxin equivalents. Logically, if the MBA is the Type 1 Method for measuring saxitoxin equivalents, then CCMAS made an error endorsing the current HPLC method in the Standard, and it should be replaced with the MBA because by definition it would be the only method that can be used to establish the value of the item measured (saxitoxin equivalents).
- The MBA is the global reference method for the saxitoxin group. The MBA meets Codex Procedural Guide parameters for Type II/III reference method criteria. The MBA is used by the U.S. as the best reference method for a variety of reasons. FAO/WHO endorsed the MBA as the best reference method. Developing countries do not have access to facilities and expertise to use HPLC methods and must use the CCMAS turned down the Criteria because they do not require HPLC methods to measure all the toxin analogs, and because they do not require consistent toxicity equivalence factors. These two issues were appropriately covered in the original U.S. Draft Criteria, but countries moving towards HPLC methods asked for these leniencies to cover for HPLC shortcoming.
- The United States supports CCMAS’ required revisions of the Draft Criteria with respect to HPLC requirements, but strongly apposes blocking use of the MBA based on arbitrary interpretation of definitions rather than on its ability to meet the criteria on a scientific basis.

**CCPFV: Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables**

*Proposed Draft Standard for Certain canned Fruits and the Proposed Draft Annex on Mangoes REP 13/PFV, para. 70, Appendix III*
**Background:**
- Acting on the report of the “Priorities Working group” presented at the 25th (2010) CCPFV Session, the Committee agreed to revise the remaining standards for canned fruit- by having a general provision section and individual annexes tailored to the characteristics of each commodity. The delegation of Cuba agreed to lead the Working group on Certain Canned Fruits.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the decision of the 26th (2010) CCPFV Session to forward the proposed draft Standard for Certain Canned Fruits (general provisions and the proposed draft Annex on Mangoes) to the 36th Session of the CAC for adoption at Step 5 and to return the annexes on pears and pineapples to Step 2/3 for further elaboration, comments and consideration at its next session.

**Position of Other Countries**
- The EU, its members and some developing countries support having a direct reference to the GSFA in Section 4 for antioxidants and firming agents, but not for the inclusion of colors for use in canned mangoes.

**U.S Comment:**
- The United States supports having a general reference to the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) for the Food Additive sections of CCPFV standards. The CCPFV practice of food additive prescription duplicates the functions of CCFA, occupies too much of the CCPFV time and limited resources and very few members actively participate in the e-working group. Additionally, the prescription of food additives results in revision to the standard whenever, a new food additive is added or one deleted from the GSFA. The United States maintains that the Codex procedure allows for amendments to the GSFA if certain food additives e.g., acidity regulators are not applicable to a particular food category.

**Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Certain Quick Frozen Vegetables (REP 13/PFV, para. 86, Appendix VI)**

**Background:**
- Acting on the report of the “Priorities Working Group” presented at the 25th (2011) CCPFV Session, the Committee agreed to revise the existing ten CCPFV standards for quick frozen commodities to include a general provision section and individual annexes tailored to the characteristics of each commodity. The Working Group on Vegetables, led by the United States agreed to include a new annex for Quick Frozen French Fries.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the decision of the 26th (2012) CCPFV Session to:
  - forward the proposed draft Standard for Certain Quick Frozen Vegetables (general provisions) to the 36th (2013) Session of the Commission for adoption.
o establish an electronic working group, led by the United States to work on the revision of the Annexes.

CCASIA: Codex Committee on Asia

Proposed Draft Standard for Non-Fermented Soybean Products REP 13/ASIA para. 109, Appendix III

Background:
- The initial proposed draft, presented by China, encountered a few difficulties related to the classification and definition of non-fermented soybean products. CCASIA agreed that the new standard would focus on soybean milk, soybean curd, compressed soybean curd, and soybean milk film and advanced the standard to step 5.

CCCF: Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food

Proposed draft maximum levels for DON in raw cereal grains (maize, wheat and barley) and associated sampling plan and in flour, semolina, meal and flakes from wheat, maize or barley REP 13/CF para. 70, Appendix III

U.S. Position

- At the 6th (2012) Session of CCCF, the proposed MLs for DON were returned to Steps 2/3 and an eWG was established, led by Canada and co-chaired by the EU, for further development of the paper.
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, the Delegation of EU introduced the paper (Canada did not attend the meeting) and highlighted the proposed MLs for DON in raw cereal grains (wheat, maize, and barley) with the associated sampling plan; flour, semolina, meal, and flakes derived from wheat, maize, or barley; and cereal-based foods for infants and young children.
- After an extensive discussion on the proposed MLs presented in the paper, the Committee agreed to the following MLs:
  o Raw Cereal Grains (wheat, maize, and barley): 2 mg/kg, prior to sorting and removal of damaged kernels with the associated sampling plan with sample size of 5 kg for maize and 1 kg for wheat and barley – forward to the Commission for adoption at Step 5.
  o Flour, semolina, meal, and flakes derived from wheat, maize, or barley: 1 mg/kg – forward to the Commission for adoption at Step 5.

U.S. Position:
- The United States supports adoption of the proposed ML of 1 mg/kg for flour, semolina, meal, and flakes derived from wheat, maize, or barley at Step 5.
- The United States does not support adoption of the proposed ML of 2 mg/kg for raw cereal grains at Step 5 and expressed its reservation for the following reasons:
o Questioned the need to establish a ML for DON in raw wheat, maize, and barley with the establishment of a ML for DON in semi-processed products derived from wheat, maize and barley.
o Dry milling of raw cereal grains can substantially reduce DON levels
o Since DON is water soluble, it is partitioned into the aqueous phase during wet milling of corn to substantially reduce DON in the solid corn starch fraction used for food products
o Because DON can be reduced substantially during milling, setting an ML for DON in raw cereal grains may restrict trade unnecessarily.

Position of Other Delegations:

- Raw Cereal Grains (wheat, maize, and barley)
o While supporting the proposed ML of 2 mg/kg for raw grains, the EU Delegation expressed its reservation on the sample size of 1 kg for wheat and barley in the associated sampling plan – it supports a sample size of 5 kg for wheat and barley, similar to maize.
o The Russian Federation Delegation expressed its reservation on the proposed ML of 2 mg/kg as it argued for a lower ML of 0.7 mg/kg for wheat and wheat products and 1 mg/kg for raw barley after sorting and removal of damaged kernels due to high consumption of bread and wheat products along with other grain products, including wheat and barley in Russia.

- Flour, semolina, meal, and flakes derived from wheat, maize, or barley
  o Initially, the Delegations of EU and Norway expressed their reservations on the proposed ML of 1 mg/kg for flour and semolina.
o The EU Delegation questioned the need to establish a ML in processed cereal products by arguing a ML should be established only for raw cereals that are in international trade – this would be in line with Codex having a ML for ochratoxin A in raw cereals only.
o The Russian Federation Delegation expressed its reservation for the same reason stated for the raw cereal grains.
Agenda Item 7 – Revocation of Existing Codex Standards and Related Texts

CCFA: Codex Committee on Food Additives

*Food additive provisions of commodity standards REP 13/FA para. 101 Appendix VII*

**Background:**
- The 45th CCFA (2013) forwarded for revocation the provisions for aluminum-containing food additives included in seven commodity standards for which there is no active committee (REP13/FA Appendix VII).
- The CCFA also recommended that the CCPFV consider revocation of the provision for aluminum potassium sulfate (INS 522) in the Standard for Canned Chestnut and Canned Chestnut Puree (CODEX STAN 145-1985), and that the Committee on Sugars (CCS) consider revocation of the provisions for sodium aluminosilicate (INS 554) and calcium aluminum silicate (INS 556) in the Standard for Sugars (CODEX STAN 212-1999).

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports revocation of the provisions in Appendix VII.

*Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives (REP 13/FA para. 125 and Appendix X)*

**Background:**
- The specifications for mineral oil, medium and low viscosity, class I (INS 905e), class II (INS 905f), and class III (INS 905g) were withdrawn because the temporary ADI for class II and class III were withdrawn by JECFA. However, as these specifications also covered class I, for which a full ADI had been allocated, JECFA prepared new specifications for class I only, with the title “mineral oil, medium viscosity.”
- Consequently, the 45th CCFA (2013) agreed to request the CAC to revoke the specifications for mineral oil, medium and low viscosity (INS 905 e, f, and g).

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports revocation of the specifications for mineral oil, medium and low viscosity (INS 905 e, f, and g).
**CCCF: Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food**

*Maximum levels for lead in the individual standards for canned fruits and canned vegetables (General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (GSCTFF) REP 13/CF, para. 43, Appendix II)*

**Background:**
- The committee established an eWG, led by the United States, to review maximum level for lead in the GSCTFF: fruit juices, milk, infant formula, canned fruits and vegetables and cereal grains.
- The committee agreed to revise the draft MLs for fruit juices and nectars, read-to-drink; canned fruits and canned vegetables.
- The committee also agreed to consolidate the MLs for the individual canned fruits and vegetables and to assign a revised ML of 0.1 mg/kg for canned fruits and canned vegetables and canned mixed fruits and vegetables with the exclusion of canned berries and small fruits.
- As a result of the above actions, the Committee agreed to ask the Commission to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standards for canned fruits and to revoke the MLs for lead for the individual standard for canned vegetables.

**U.S. Position**
- The United States supports the decision to revoke these MLs.

**CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues**

*Revocation of Existing Codex CXLs for Pesticides (REP13 Appendix IV)*

**Background:**
- Some 146 pesticide/commodity CXLs for 22 pesticide chemicals were recommended for revocation. These are typically CXLs being replaced based on additional data, uses no longer supported, or CXLs deemed by JMPR to have potential dietary intake concerns with no alternative GAP

- 25 Dichlorvos (5 MRLs)
- 26 Dicofol (26 MRLs)
- 81 Chlorothalonil (1 MRL)
- 96 Carbofuran (1 MRL)
- 112 Phorate (1 MRL)
- 119 Fenvalerate (39 MRLs)
- 157 Cyfluthrin/beta-cyfluthrin (4 MRLs)
- 175 Glufosinate-Ammonium (29 MRLs)
- 176 Hexythiazox (1 MRL)
- 179 Cycloxydim (14 MRLs)
- 189 Tebuconazole (1 MRL)
- 197 Fenbuconazole (5 MRLs)
- 206 Imidacloprid (1 MRL)
- 209 Methoxyfenozide (4 MRL)
- 210 Pyraclostrobin (1 MRL)
- 211 Fludioxonil (2 MRLs)
- 213 Trifloxystrobin (2 MRLs)
- 216 Indoxacarb (1 MRL)
- 229 Azoxystrobin (1 MRL)
- 234 Spirotetramate (1 MRL)
- 243 Fluopyram (3 MRLs)
- 251 Saflufenacil (3 MRLs)

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States has no objections to the revocation of these Codex MRLs for these compounds for the specified commodities.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The Delegations of the EU and Norway noted a reservation for the revocation of the existing MRLs for saflufenacil on dry beans, dry peas, and dry soya beans since they had a reservation for the draft MRL for pulses advanced to step 5/8.
Agenda Item 8 – Amendments to Codex Standards and Related Texts

To date the Codex Secretariat has not issued any documents for this agenda item.
Agenda Item 9 – Proposals for the Elaboration of New Standards and Related Texts and for the Discontinuation of Work

Table 1 Proposals for New Work

CCNASWP: Coordinating Committee for North America and Southwest Pacific

Regional Standard for fermented Noni Juices

Background:
- At the 12TH Session (2012) of CCNASWP, Tonga, as Chair of the eWG on Noni, introduced the discussion paper on Noni and recalled that the original proposal for the development of a standard for Noni was first tabled at the 5th CCNASWP in 2006.
- Tonga emphasized the importance of developing a standard for Noni since it could become a potential trade commodity for the Pacific Island Countries (PICs).
- The United States, along with other delegations, indicated that there was still a need to better clarify the nature, scope, safety, and intended use of Noni.
- In addition, the U.S. Delegate expressed concern as to its safety, referring to a French study that discouraged consuming over 30 ML/day of Noni juice, whereas certain consumers in the PICs exceeded 500 ML/day.
- Tonga clarified that the advice was intended for European consumers, whereas in the PICs, consumption could be higher due to their knowledge of long-term safe use of Noni products.
- The Committee agreed to establish an eWG, to be led by Tonga with the assistance of Australia and Canada, to start new work on the development of a regional standard but with the scope to focus on fermented noni juices.

U.S. Position:
- The United States believes there are still outstanding safety questions that need to be addressed as work on the standard proceeds but there is no need to intervene at the CAC 2013.

Position of Other Delegations:
- Although the United States underlined that it was premature to start work on Noni with outstanding safety questions, there was general support for a regional standard.
- Canada, Australia and New Zealand supported the work as a way to encourage greater participation from the PICs in Codex.
- Australia helped prepare the draft that will be considered by the CAC: Australia and Canada will also help further in the eWG.
CCFFV: Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables:

**Standard for Okra**

**Background:**
- The delegation of India presented a proposal for the development of Codex Standards for Okra

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the development of on a Codex standard for Okra led by the delegation of India.

**Proposed Codex Standard for Ware Potato (paras. 123-124 and Appendix VI).**

**Background:**
- The delegation of India presented a proposal for the development of Codex Standards for Ware potatoes. Ware potatoes are the regular cooking type potatoes. The word ware is used to differentiate them from another type of potatoes, “Early Potatoes,” which is mainly produced in Europe.
- EU members opposed India’s proposal, citing the lack of an EU standard or directive and noting that the late submittal of the document did not allow sufficient time for consultation with domestic industry. (However, there is a UNECE standard for Early and Ware Potatoes, UNECE STANDARD FFV-52, which is applied in Europe.)
- During the ensuing discussion of the proposal, no working group was formed. Later when this omission was recognized, the CCFFV agreed to forward the project document to the Executive Committee and the Commission requesting approval of new work for the establishment of a Codex standard for ware potato. This timeframe gave countries approximately 10 months to consult with their stakeholders and to make any relevant comments at the 36th Session of the Commission in 2013.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the development of a Codex Standard for Ware potatoes.

CCFFP: Codex Committee for Fish and Fishery Products

**Proposed Draft Code of Practice for Processing of Fish Sauce (REP 13/FFP para. 153, Appendix X) – New Work**

**Background:**
- The Committee completed work on the Standard for Fish Sauce in 2011. Thailand and Vietnam introduced a discussion paper and project document at the
32nd (2012) Session of the CCFFP to develop a Code of Practice for Fish Sauce, highlighting the necessity for additional guidance to support compliance with the Standard. The CCFFP agreed with the new work proposal and forwarded the document to the CAC for approval. Upon CAC approval, Thailand and Vietnam will prepare a draft for circulation at the next session of the CCFFP.

- Although the Standard has been finalized, discussions arose regarding histamine in fish and fishery products. Those discussions resulted in a FAO/WHO Expert Meeting and the subsequent creation of a CCFFP working group. The working group results will be discussed at the next session of the CCFFP and may come up during discussions of this new work on the Code of Practice as well.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports this proposal for new work.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- The U.S. Delegation is not aware of objections to this proposal for new work. Discussions continue on the issue of histamine in the working group.

**CCPFV: Codex Committee for Processed Fruits and Vegetables**

*Standard for Ginseng Products (conversion of the Regional Standard for Ginseng Products to a worldwide standard) REP 13/PFV para. 138, Appendix VIII*

**Background:**
- At the 25th (2010) CCPFV Session the Republic of Korea supported by CCASIA members requested to convert the CCASIA Regional Standard for Ginseng products to an international Codex Standard.
- The CCPFV requested the Republic of Korea to develop a discussion paper detailing the scope of the Regional Standard for Ginseng Products (Asia) (CODEX STAN 295R-2009) and any other relevant information on the products covered by the Standard, with a view to examining the proposal for the extension of the territorial application of the Standard at the next session.
- At its 26th (2012) session, CCPFV agreed with the proposal to convert the Regional Standard for Ginseng Products into a worldwide standard at the 2013 session.

**U.S. Position**
- The United States believes that there is sufficient international trade in Panax ginseng products to justify the conversion of the regional standard into a worldwide standard and therefore supports approval by the 36 CAC (2013).
- The United States supports this proposal’s limitation of the new work to cover only Panax plant varieties and not all plant with ginsenosides qualities.
CCASIA: FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Asia

*Code of Hygienic Practice for Street-Vended food REP 13/ASIA, paras. 220 – 221, Appendix IV*

**Background:**
- India submitted a new work proposal on street vended foods in the last CCASIA session in November 2012. CCASIA approved the new work, provided the scope is not overly broad and focuses on hygienic practices.
- If the new work is approved by the Commission, CCASIA will establish an eWG on this new work and India will chair.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States position is neutral on this issue, but advises that other work on street vended foods conducted by other Codex regional committees and studies by FAO/WHO on the same subject be used as references to ensure consistency.

CCFH: Codex Committee for Food Hygiene

*New Work: Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-Moisture Foods (REP 13/FH paras. 121-124 and Appendix V)*

**Background:**
- At the 43rd (2011) session of CCFH, the Committee agreed that developing stand-alone codes for products such as chocolate and spices was not the best use of resources and indicated that a better approach would be to develop a horizontal code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods. Such a code could include a variety of low moisture food products, some of which were covered by existing codes of practice being considered for revision, as well as cocoa/chocolate, ground nuts and tree nuts, desiccated coconut, dried fruit, certain soy products and seeds used for food, and spices. The Committee agreed that the United States would prepare a Discussion Paper for the development of a code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods for consideration by the 44th (2012) Session of CCFH.
- Based on an established process for addressing new work proposals, a CCFH Ad Hoc Working Group for the Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities, led by the United States, met immediately prior to the 44th (2012) Session and considered several items, including a discussion paper from the United States, along with a project document from Canada, on a Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-moisture Foods.
- There was general support for this new work, although some countries felt the scope was too broad, and recommended seeking the advice of FAO/WHO. It was agreed that documents such as the Code of Hygienic Practice for Spices and Dried Aromatic Herbs, currently under revision, could become an annex to this code.
- The Committee recommended new work on a Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Foods. The Committee further agreed to request FAO/WHO to provide the Committee with scientific advice on which low moisture foods should be considered as the highest priorities for the Committee; the associated microbiological hazards; information relevant to the risk management of the microbiological hazards associated with the identified range of low moisture foods; the role of agricultural and handling/manufacturing practices in the introduction and control of hazards; and the identification of the critical control points for mitigation of the risks associated with low moisture foods.

- The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by Canada and co-chaired by the United States, to develop the proposed draft Code for comments at Step 3 and consideration by its next Session pending approval by the Commission. The Committee also agreed to establish a physical working group with interpretation in English, French and Spanish to meet immediately prior to the next session.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports approval of new work on a Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-moisture Foods.

**Position of Other Delegations:**
- There was also discussion on a discussion paper and project document submitted by India just prior to the meeting for a code of hygienic practice for storage of cereals (grains) and whether this could be addressed in the Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-moisture Foods. The possibility of this also becoming an annex to the Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-moisture Foods was discussed. The consensus was that this proposal required further review and study prior to deciding on whether it should be taken up as new work.

- We do not think countries will challenge the approval of new work on a Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-moisture Foods.

**CCNFSDU: Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses**

**Proposal to Review the Codex Standard for Follow-Up Formula (CODEX STAN 156-1987)**

**Background:**
- At the 33rd (2011) and 34th (2012) CCNFSDU sessions, the Delegation of New Zealand presented a discussion paper to consider the review of the Codex Standard for Follow-Up Formula.
- The current standard applies to food intended for use as a liquid part of the weaning diet for infants and young children aged 6 to 36 months.
- The Delegation of New Zealand indicated that the Standard was developed over 20 years ago and commented on the diversification of follow-up formula in several countries, and recommended that it be updated.
At the 2012 CCNFS_DU Session, the Committee agreed to a full review of the Standard, including the description and age range for these products (i.e., older infants and/or young children), essential composition and quality factors, optional ingredients, labelling and other provisions. The Committee also agreed that the review should include whether this standard was still necessary in light of global and infant feeding recommendations.

**U.S. Position**
- The United States supports the proposed new work to review the Codex Standard for Follow-Up Formula (CODEX STAN 156-1987).

**Position of Other Delegation:**
- No member government objected to the proposed new work.
- The WHO representative stated that the World Health Assembly has clearly stated that specially formulated milks such as so called follow-up milks are not necessary (WHA 39.28).

**CCNEA: FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for the Near East**

**Standard for Halal Food REP 13/NEA para. 117 (see Annex 2 of this document).**

**Background:**
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCNEA, Egypt put forward a proposal for new work on either a regional or international standard on Halal food.
- The issue of a standard for Halal food had previously been raised in 1997 by Saudi Arabia when the Committee deferred work pending the publication of the General Guidelines for Use of the Term Halal (CAC/GL 24-1997) that was under development by CCFL.
- In 2011 at the 6th session of CCNEA that took place in Tunisia, the delegation from Egypt put forward a proposal for a regional standard on Halal. At that time, the Committee decided that, as there was significant international trade in Halal a regional standard may be inappropriate.
- At the 2013 session of CCNEA there was support for work on an international standard on Halal to prevent fraud as several delegations felt that the existing criteria were not sufficient.
- The Committee agreed that Egypt should develop a project document taking into account the work already completed in the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) General Guidelines on Halal Food. In addition, the project document would identify the gaps in the current texts, including the Codex General Guidelines for the Use of the Term Halal (CAC/GL 24-1997).

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States seeks greater clarity on specific concerns with gaps that may exist in the existing Codex guidelines before it can consider any proposed new work on the use of the term Halal at this time.
It has not been clearly demonstrated why new work is needed or how it might affect the current Codex General Guidelines for the Use of the Term Halal.

**Position of Other Delegations**
There seems to be significant support within the Near East region even from those countries who did not attend the CCNEA meeting.

**Proposal to Develop a Regional/International Standard for Chilled and Frozen Meat (REP 13/NEA para. 125 (see Annex 3 of this document))**

**Background:**
- At the 7th Session of CCNEA that took place in Beirut, Lebanon (2013), Egypt put forward a proposal for new work on either a regional or international standard for Chilled and Frozen Meat.
- The Secretariat informed the Committee that the new work proposal would need to take into consideration all relevant Codex texts currently available for meat and meat products; should identify gaps in these texts, and should propose how to address these gaps.
- The Committee agreed that Egypt would prepare the project document with the assistance of interested countries and that the gaps in existing texts would be indentified in the project document.

**CCFA: Codex Committee on Food Additives**


**Background:**
- The 34th CAC (2011) requested the CCFA to consider the need to revoke or revise the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Food Additive Intakes (CAC/GL 3-1989) (the “Guidelines”).
- The 44th CCFA (2012) was of the view that the Guidelines were useful for countries to assess food additive intakes, and that it should be revised to take into account the FAO/WHO Principles and Methods for the Risk Assessment of Chemicals (EHC 240). The Committee established an electronic working group led by Brazil that prepared a project document for new work on the revision of the Guidelines, including an outline of the revised Guidelines, for consideration at the next session.
- The 45th CCFA (2013) considered a revised project document (FA 45/CRD 20), and discussed its scope and the main aspects to be covered. The CCFA recalled that the scope of the revision of the Guidelines was to assist member countries, especially developing countries, in assessing dietary exposure in a simple way. However, the CCFA noted that the Guidelines could also be used as a screening tool by national governments and to support work on the GSFA, and amended the scope accordingly.
The 45th (2013) CCFA agreed to start new work on the revision of the Guidelines and to forward the revised project document (REP 13/FA, Appendix V) to the CAC for approval as new work.

The 45th (2013) CCFA further agreed to establish an eWG, led by Brazil, to prepare a proposed draft revised Guidelines for circulation for comments at Step 3, and consideration at its next session, subject to approval as new work by the 36th CAC.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the revision of the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Food Additive Intakes (CAC/GL 3-1989) as new work.

**CCPR: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues**

*Guidance document on performance criteria specific for methods of analysis for determination of pesticide residues REP 13/PR para. 140, Appendix XI*

**Background:**
- The U.S. Delegation was asked to chair the in-session work group on Methods of Analysis for Pesticide Residues.
- The in-session work group proposed that a guidance document on specific performance criteria for methods for determination of pesticide residues be developed. The work group drafted a proposal for new work and presented this to the Committee (CRD31).
- The Committee agreed with this proposal and agreed to forward the proposal for approval as new work to the 36th (2013) Session of the Commission.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the new work as outlined in Appendix XI of the meeting report and has agreed to chair the work group if approved by the Commission.

**Position of Other Key Delegations:**
- The proposal for new work was endorsed by the CCPR Chair, with no objection or suggested changes raised from any Member Country.

*Priority list for the establishment of maximum residue limits for pesticides REP 13/PR Para. 161, Appendix XIV* . Nomination and Prioritization of Compounds to be Considered by the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

**Background:**
- The report of the eWG on Priorities included the tentative list of scheduled compounds for review by the JMPR.
- For 2014, all U.S. nominations for evaluation of new compound, periodic re-evaluations, and follow-up evaluations for additional use were included.
The Priority Lists of Chemicals provides the tentative schedules of chemicals to be evaluated by the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) from 2014 to 2016.

The Committee agreed to re-establish the Electronic Working Group on Priorities led by Australia.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States supports the new work for JMPR.

**Position of Other Key Delegations:**
- The proposal for new work was endorsed by the CCPR Chair, with no objection or suggested changes raised from any Member Country.

**CCFL: Codex Committee on Food Labelling**

*Review of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods to address the issue of date marking REP 13/FI para 111, Appendix XIV*

**Background:**
- At the 40th CCFL (2012), New Zealand introduced this topic and the Committee agreed to develop a discussion paper (prepared by New Zealand) to outline potential issues regarding date marking and consider new work.
- At the 41st CCFL (2013), New Zealand introduced their discussion paper and proposed a project document for reviewing current Codex text and proposing amendments where appropriate on date marking in the General Standard.
- The Committee agreed to propose new work to the Commission to review the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods to address the issue on date marking.
- Subject to the approval of the Commission, the Committee also agreed to establish an eWG chaired by New Zealand and co-chaired by Australia with a physical working group to be held immediately before the next session of CCFL to consider comments submitted at Step 3.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States is supportive of work on date marking to address gaps identified by CCFL in understanding of the purpose and consistent application of date marking as reflected in current Codex texts.
- The United States believes that the current Codex guidance on date marking should be retained (including definitions), and CCFL should only address where there are remaining gaps.
- The United States believes date marking best serves to indicate if a food is no longer marketable and not as a primary source of information on whether a food is safe to consume.
- The United States would not be able to support work that recasts current date marking definitions as indicators of food safety and noted this position during debate at CCFL.
The United States also supports referring this work to CCFH for their advice as work progresses as noted in the proposed project document (Appendix VI of the Final Report).

**Positions of Other Key Delegations:**
- Many delegations were in strong support of this new work including Argentina, New Zealand, India, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and others.
- No delegations were opposed to the new work.
- Many developing countries expressed their interest in this work.
Table 2: proposals for the Discontinuation of Work

**CCCF: Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food**

*Proposed draft revision of guideline levels for radionuclides in the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed including development of guidance to facilitate the application and implementation of the GLs. REP 13/CF para. 54*

**Background:**
- The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an eWG group, led by The Netherlands and co-chaired by Japan, to develop a Codex document on the Review of the Codex Guideline Levels (GLs) for Radionuclides in Food. The eWG would review the current GLs for radionuclides in food; and develop, base on the review, clear guidance on the interpretation and application of the levels.
- At the 7th (2013) Session of CCCF, The Netherlands introduced the document which was basically divided into (1) information on GLs in relation to Codex; (2) Japanese limits and issues of interpretation of these limits; (3) issues considered in the review of the GLs; and (4) conclusions and recommendations for consideration and action by the Committee (working document CX/CF 13/7/6).
- After further discussion and based on the conclusions and recommendations, the Committee agreed to the following:
  - not change the current GLs to MLs for radionuclides in the GSCTFF as GLs provide countries flexibility to determine whether and under what conditions food could be distributed with their territory or jurisdiction,
  - not change the present approach using GLs for groups of radionuclides to be assessed independently, and
  - not change the current GL values in the GSCTFF and therefore to discontinue the work on the revision of the GLs for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF.
- Based on the information provided by the IAEA Representative on the ongoing work of the Inter-agency Working Group as described in paragraph 49 and CX/CF 13/7/4, the Committee further decided to discontinue work on the development of guidance to facilitate the interpretation and implementation of the GLs for radionuclides in food in the GSCTFF. The Committee also agreed not to consider the appropriateness to develop additional GLs for drinking water for inclusion in the GSCTFF.
- The Committee noted that after completion of the work carried out by the Inter-agency Working Group, CCCF could decide to start new work on radionuclides as necessary.
- The Committee therefore agreed to recommend to the 36th (2013) Session of the Commission that work be discontinued on discontinuation of work on the revision of the GLs for radionuclides in the GSCTFF, including the development of guidance to facilitate the application and implementation of the GLs.

**U.S. Position:**
• The United States supports the discontinuation of this work.

**Position of other Delegations:**

• There was general consensus by the Committee to discontinue work on the revision of the GLs for radionuclides in the GSCTFF, including the development of guidance to facilitate the application and implementation of the GLs.

**Proposed draft maximum levels hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products REP 13/CF para. 87**

**Background:**

• The 6th (2012) Session of CCCF established an eWG led by Australia to start new work on MLs for hydrocyanic acid in cassava and cassava products that was approved by the 35th (2012) session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

• In order to carry out this task, CCCF agreed that the working group would undertake a review of the levels and MLs for hydrocyanic acid in existing Codex commodity standards with a view to the possible revision of these MLs and the establishment of new MLs for additional commodities, such as ready-to-eat cassava chips.

• At the 7th Session (2013) of CCCF, the Delegation of Australia summarized the discussion, conclusions and recommendations of the eWG (working document CX/CF 13/7/10).

• After further discussion, the Committee agreed to recommend discontinuation of work on the revision or establishment of MLs for cassava and cassava products as additional occurrence data and information on the effects of processing in reduction of hydrocyanic acid are needed.
Agenda Item 10: Matters referred to the Commission by the Codex Committees and Task Forces

CCFO: Codex Committee on Fats and Oils

Amendments to the lists of acceptable previous cargoes in the Code of Practice for the Storage and Transport of Edible Fats and Oils in Bulk (CAC/RCP 36-1987)

Background:
- The Delegation of the European Union introduced CRD 3 and informed that the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) had evaluated all substances in the List against the criteria. In order to facilitate the review of the substances and not to delay the process, the Delegation proposed that the four (4) substances below be evaluated by JECFA due to the following issues:
  - (i) **CALCIUM LIGNOSULPHONATE LIQUID** (CAS No 8061-52-7): insufficient information in particular related to impurities in crude quality material and its reactivity with fats and oils, thus, despite the fact that JECFA had established an ADI, the criteria were not fulfilled.
  - (ii) **CARNAUBA WAX** (CAS No 8015-86-9): concerns regarding the efficiency of tank cleaning following transport as a previous cargo.
  - (iii) **MONTAN WAX** (CAS No 8002-53-7): insufficient data and it cannot be excluded that it contains components of concern
  - (iv) **SILICON DIOXIDE** (CAS No 7631-86-9): concerns regarding the difficulties in transfer and cleaning of the tanker based on current shipping practices.
- The Delegation also proposed amendments as follows:
  - (v) To restrict the entry "MOLASSES" (CAS No 57-50-1) to "Molasses obtained from citrus, sorghum, sugar beet, and sugar cane" as the term "molasses" could be applicable to any liquid food or feed ingredient obtained from plants that contains in excess of 43 % sugars.
  - (vi) To delete the additional condition for POTABLE WATER (CAS No 7732-18-5), "only acceptable where the immediate previous cargo is also on the list" taking into account current shipping and cleaning practices.
  - (vii) To delete some substances currently on the list (e.g. candelilla wax (CAS No 8006-44-8), bees wax white (CAS No 8006-40-4) /yellow (CAS No 8012-89-3), etc.) as they do not appear to be transported as previous cargoes.
- The Delegation also proposed that further information on the current shipping practices should be requested in order to avoid that substances, which are not transported as previous cargoes, are evaluated by JECFA.
- In order to facilitate the review process the Committee discussed the EU proposals to consider whether agreement could be reached on the way forward for each substance.
- Proposals (i) to (iv)
  - The observer from FOSFA explained that the substances under (ii) and (iv) were not carried in bulk and that the substance under (iii) had been deleted.


from the FOSFA list and the industry was only concerned about the substance under (i).
  o Some delegations supported the deletion of these substances while others were of the opinion that further study was needed. The Committee decided to retain these substances in the list and that the working group should look at these substances and make recommendations for the next session.

- Proposals (v) and (vi) (Also discussed under Agenda Item 5)
  o Concerning molasses, the Committee agreed with the proposal to restrict entry "Molasses" (CAS No 57-50-1) to molasses obtained from citrus, sorghum, sugar beet, and sugar cane.
  o Concerning potable water, the Committee agreed to delete the additional condition "only acceptable where the immediate previous cargo is also on the list".

- The Committee agreed to forward these proposals to the Commission for approval.
- Proposal (vii)
  o After some discussion, the Committee agreed that the working group should review this issue and that the industry should confirm if these substances were still transported as previous cargoes.
  o Additionally, the Committee agreed to the proposal by Canada that the working group should review the category of white mineral oils some of which had high and some low viscosity and a range of ADI to check which were acceptable and which could be of a food safety concern.
  o An i session working group chaired by Malaysia was convened to develop the Terms of Reference for an eWG to review the Codex list of acceptable previous cargoes and these were presented to the Committee.

CCMMP: Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products

New Work on Processed Cheese

Background:

- The 35th (2012) Session of the CAC agreed to discontinue work on a standard for process(ed) cheese and requested a Circular Letter (CL) be prepared asking Members to identify the gaps in the safety and quality provisions of Codex texts that would justify new work, and describe the scope of any new work to address these gaps.
- The FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees were asked to further discuss the need for a standard for processed cheese and identify the scope of the work needed.
- With regard to the gaps in safety and quality, Member Countries commented that:
  o A standard on processed cheese would help to differentiate products present in international trade in particular to deal with products with low dairy content; therefore a standard would prevent consumers from being misled.
A standard would ensure that the products have adequate nutritive and safe composition.

- CCLAC, CCAfrica and CCNear East were very supportive of new work on an international standard on processed cheese. These regions hold the view that an international standard is needed for these products which they regard as important for their consumers. Fair trade issues appear to be the primary concern.
- There has been some talk among these regions to pursue this at the regional level with possible development of regional standards. However, since processed cheese is a globally traded product, regional standards are not really viable options.
- Other comments recalled the failure of the CCMMP to find consensus on the compositional aspects of processed cheese and state that these products are traded internationally without problems.
- Against this background New Zealand, as host country of CCMMP, recently indicated a willingness to assist in a further effort by leading an electronic working group (eWG) open to all interested parties to re-examine the options for initiating new work along the lines set out under Option 1 of Agenda paper CX/CAC 13/36/10 add.1 -- the establishment of an eWG to prepare a project document for new work on a standard for processed cheese.
- The proposal would not commit the CAC to new work – but only to see if a viable new work proposal could be submitted for one or more types of processed cheese.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States sees no obvious gaps in the safety and quality provisions of these texts that would justify new work on processed cheese.
- Codex texts such as the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (GSLPF), the General Standard for the Use of Dairy Terms (GSUDT), the General Standard for Cheese, the Guidelines for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims and the Code of Hygienic Practices for Milk and mild Products can all be used to ensure that there are no gaps in the safety and quality provisions of a food labeled as “processed cheese.”
- The United States is still considering the New Zealand proposal.

**CCSAHF: Codex Committee on Spices, Aromatic Herbs and Their Formulation**

**Background:**
- During the 35th (2012) Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the delegation of India submitted a proposal for the establishment of a Codex Committee on Spices, Aromatic Herbs and their Formulations.
- The paper noted that:
  - global production in these products was increasing internationally,
  - developing countries were the main producers of spices, and
the lack of international standards, made it difficult to comply with the various import requirements which resulted in trade barriers.

- Several countries supported the establishment of a spices committee, while other countries stated they needed additional time to consider the proposal and still others suggested that the work be done by a time limited task force or by an electronic working group.
- India was asked to prepare a discussion paper for consideration by the 2013 session of the Commission, clarifying the scope of the work and the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees were asked to discuss the establishment of a spices committee at the regional coordinating committee meetings.
- Overall, there seemed to be general support among the regional coordinating committees for work to be done on spices, recognizing that they are being widely traded internationally.
- However, most regions had some concerns over:
  - the mechanism for accomplishing this work, with some regions favoring a committee, while others favored a time-limited task force or an electronic working group
  - the scope of the work, the range of products and the need for prioritization of the work.
  - the additional work for the Codex programme as a whole and the additional human and budgetary resources that participation in another Codex committee would put on Member Countries.

U.S. Position

- While the United States agrees that there is significant international trade in spices, aromatic herbs and their formulations, at this point, the U.S. position is still under development.
- In line with comments by other countries, the United States believes the scope of the work should be better defined so as to bring clarity to the work to be covered and to avoid any future confusion.
- The United States also remains concerned about the demands on our human and financial resources which participation in another committee will entail.
Agenda Item 11: Strategic Planning of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

**Background:**
- The Commission asked that the Strategic Plan be discussed at the FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committee meetings.
- Issues raised in the FAO Regional Coordinating Committees were discussed at some length at the March CCEexec Subcommittee meeting (chaired by Vice Chair Samuel Godefroy).
- The Subcommittee reached consensus on an approach that is consistent with the U.S. strongly-held position that Codex should remain true to its mandate to develop harmonized, science-based international food standards that protect consumer health and help ensure fair practices in the food trade, and should not stray into areas beyond its mission.
- The Strategic Plan further clarifies that “consumer concerns” and other factors may be considered in Codex only to the extent that they are consistent with the Procedural Manual, and in particular the “Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making Process and the Extent to Which Other Factors are Taken into Account.”
- The Executive committee also added new text in Paragraph 3 of the Introduction: “This document does not supersede, extend, or contradict the interpretation of the Codex mandate, standards of provisions of the Procedural Manual adopted or approved by the Commission.” (emphasis added).

**U.S. Position:**
The United States supports adoption of the Strategic Plan as forwarded by the CCEexec Subcommittee.
Agenda Item 12: Financial and Budgetary Matters

Funding Options for Scientific Advice for Codex Alimentarius Commission

Background:

- The Codex subsidiary bodies receive scientific advice primarily from the expert bodies, notably the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA).
- These expert meetings are independent of the Commission and the subsidiary bodies, although their output contributes significantly to the credibility of Codex’s work by providing the scientific basis for many Codex standards.
- The experts selected to participate in the expert meeting must be pre-eminent in their field, have the respect of their scientific peers, and be impartial and objective their judgment. They are appointed as independent experts, not as representatives of any government or organization.
- There is increasing recognition that the resources available for scientific advice are inadequate to meet the increasing requests from the Codex subsidiary bodies, and the current financial situation no longer allows response to all requests for scientific advice by Codex.
- The expert bodies have made pleas to the Codex Member Countries for contributions to the expert bodies. While their efforts were successful in that there was a significant increase in funding in the past year, there is a recognition that this funding may not be sustainable.
- The 35th (2012) session Codex Alimentarius Commission agreed with the establishment of a CCEXEC Sub Committee to review funding options for consideration by the 2013 CCEXEC and the CAC. The TORs for the subcommittee are as follows:
  o Identify the various funding options and strategies that are and might be available for sustainable support for scientific advice by FAO/WHO for Codex activities.
  o Propose approaches that could be taken by FAO and WHO to secure the funds in a sustainable manner through their own allocations.
  o Examine approaches that Codex, FAO and WHO could take to sustain and increase funding for scientific advice, from Codex Members and other government sources.
  o Make recommendations for possible mechanisms through which FAO and WHO could receive funding from non-governmental sources to support scientific advice.
- The Subcommittee, chaired by Vice Chair Samuel Sefa-Dedeh prepared a report which examines possible mechanisms through which FAO and WHO could increase funding through the regular budgets of FAO and WHO; through extra-budgetary resources; and from non-government organizations and private funding sources.
**U.S. Position:**

- The United States has had a long-standing interest in this issue and appreciates the efforts that went into making the discussion paper a comprehensive document on the scientific expert bodies, and the funding situation with which they are currently faced.

- The advice provided by these expert bodies is critical to the scientific basis of Codex standards and related texts and the United States considers ensuring that they are adequately supported vital to the timely and relevant development of Codex standards.

- To that end, we believe we should (1) focus on examining both short term approaches to meet immediate needs and long term approaches that will provide sustainable support for the future, and (2) develop more concrete proposals for expanding the donor base.

- While we believe that a serious effort to resolve the funding problems of the expert committees may require innovative approaches, including changes to rules or policies governing acceptance of funds from non-governmental sources, we strongly agree with the point made in paragraph 7 of the discussion paper, that discussions on funding sources should be anchored on the principle that “All extra-budgetary resources received are utilized in a manner that does not compromise objectivity, independence and transparency of the provision of scientific advice.”

- Additionally, we believe that the current operating procedures employed by FAO and WHO to administer the funds and most importantly, to select scientific experts, should be maintained.

- One course of action would be to focus on more concrete proposals for acceptance of contributions from non-governmental organizations, including private sector organizations. This will require some legal review of the current statues of FAO and WHO as well as the Commission, and the development of criteria that ensure contributions do not involve a direct commercial interest in the outcome of the expert body review. We caution that if there is a serious commitment to resolving the lack of adequate funding for the expert bodies, seeking additional funding sources beyond the current donors will be required.

- If it is decided to seek funding from non-governmental sources, and after receiving assurances that the use of such sources is permissible (along with associated changes to rules and policies if required) we recommend that a communication package be developed which would explain to potential donors the expert bodies’ vital role in the development of Codex standards, and hence, their valuable contributions in promoting the safety of the world’s food supply.

- The United States is also interested in exploring the ideas in paragraph 31-33 pertaining to un-earmarked extra budgetary funds. We understand from FAO’s April 5, 2013, comments that there is no legal impediment to receipt of extra-budgetary funds to support scientific review/advice work, and therefore there is no need to amend Article 9 of the Statutes of the Commission. We would appreciate clarification of this conclusion. Does it remove a limitation previously thought to exist and allow use of additional funds to support this work?
Agenda Item: 13 Matters Arising from FAO and WHO

Agenda Item: 14 Relations between the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other International Organizations
Agenda Item: 15 Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson and Appointment of the Coordinators

**Background:**
- It is expected that the current chair and three vice-chairs will be re-elected for a second term by unanimous acclamation. To date, there has been no indication of any challenges to their office.
Agenda Item 16: Designation of Countries responsible for Appointing the Chairpersons of Codex Committees and Task Forces and Schedule of Sessions 2014 – 2015.

**U.S. Position:**
- The United States has no plans to relinquish the chair of any of the three committees which it currently hosts: The Codex Committee on Food Hygiene; The Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs and the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.