



REPORT OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION Rome, 7–17 April 1970

[TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

Hyperlinks to non-FAO Internet sites do not imply any official endorsement of or responsibility for the opinions, ideas, data or products presented at these locations, or guarantee the validity of the information provided. The sole purpose of links to non-FAO sites is to indicate further information available on related topics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

[Participants and Officers of the Commission](#)

[Address by Assistant Director-General](#)

[Tribute to Mr. H.V. Dempsey](#)

[Adoption of Agenda](#)

PART II

[Executive Committee - Reports of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Sessions](#)

- [Meat Hygiene](#)
- [Uniform System of References for Codex Documents](#)

- Inclusion in Codex Standards of criteria which were not verifiable by examination of the end-product

PART III

Membership of the Codex Alimentarius Commission
Status of Acceptances of Recommended Codex Standards

PART IV

Finance of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme for 1970/71 and 1972/73

PART V

Rules of Procedure of the Commission

- Rule VI.3 (Regional or Group of Countries Standards)
- Amendment of Rule XII (Languages)
- Consideration of Substance of Rule XII.3 (Languages Used in Subsidiary Bodies of the Commission set up under Rule IX.1(b))

PART VI

Food Standards and Food Legislation in Africa, Asia and Latin America

PART VII

Information on the Activities of Other International Organizations Working on the Standardization of Foods and Related Matters

- UN Economic Commission for Europe
- International Olive Oil Council
- International Organization for Standardization
- Commission of the European Economic Community
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- Council of Europe (Partial Agreement).

Related Activities within FAO and WHO
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

PART VIII

Consideration of Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards

- Decisions and Remarks Affecting All Standards Considered at Step 8

- [Draft Standard for Canned Pineapple](#)
- [Draft Standard for Olive Oil, Virgin and Refined and for Refined Olive-Residue Oil](#)
- [Draft Standard for Edible Mustardseed Oil](#)
- [Draft Standard for Quick-Frozen Guttled Pacific Salmon](#)
- [Draft Standard for Canned Shrimps or Prawns](#)
- [Draft General Standard for Edible Fungi and Fungus Products](#)
- [Draft Standard for Dried Edible Fungi](#)
- [Draft European Regional Standard for Fresh Fungus Chanterelle](#)
- [General Comment on the three Standards for Edible Fungi](#)
- [Draft European Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters](#)
- [Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Peas](#)
- [Draft Standards for Apricot, Peach and Pear Nectars, Apple Juice, Orange Juice, Lemon Juice and Grapefruit Juice](#)
- [Tolerances for Pesticide Residues](#)
 - [Diphenyl](#)
 - [Heptachlor](#)
 - [Hydrogen Phosphide](#)
 - [Inorganic Bromide](#)
 - [Piperonyl Butoxide](#)
 - [Pyrethrins](#)
 - [General](#)

[PART IX](#)

[Sampling Plans](#)

[PART X](#)

[Consideration of Standards at Step 5 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards](#)

- [Cocoa Products and Chocolate](#)
- [Processed Fruits and Vegetables \(processed raisins, processed tomato concentrate, canned peas, canned mandarin oranges\)](#)
- [Fish and Fishery Products \(quick-frozen fillets of plaice, quick-frozen fillets of ocean perch\)](#)
- [Processed Meat Products \(canned hams, canned corned beef, canned luncheon meat, canned chopped meat\)](#)
- [Quick Frozen Spinach and Quick-Frozen Raspberries](#)
- [Foods for Special Dietary Uses \(low-sodium foods\)](#)
- [Pesticide Residues](#)
- [Code of Hygienic Practice for Tree Nuts](#)
- [Meat - Descriptions of Cutting Methods of Commercial Units of Carcasses, Halves and Quarters in International Trade](#)

PART XI

Labelling Provisions in the Step 9 Sugar Standards

Consideration of the Need for a Standard for Powdered Dextrose

PART XII

The Idea of a General Standard

PART XIII

Definition of “Food Additive”, “Contaminant”, and “Process”

General Principles for the Use of Food Additives

List of Food Colours

PART XIV

Codex General Subject Committees Reports of the Codex Committees on

- Food Hygiene
- Food Labelling
- Food Additives
- Pesticide Residues
- Methods of Analysis and Sampling

Codex Committee on General Principles (Confirmation of Chairmanship)

PART XV

Codex Commodity Committees Reports of the Codex Committees on

- Fats and Oils
- Meat and Meat Products, ¹ Sub-Committee I on Cutting Methods and Cuts of Carcases, and Sub-Committee IV on Processed Meat Products and Consumer Packaged Meat²
- Foods for Special Dietary Uses
- Cocoa Products and Chocolate
- Processed Fruits and Vegetables
 - Proposed amendment to Step 9 Standard for Canned Peaches
- Fish and Fishery Products

Codex Committee on Sugars (Confirmation of Chairmanship)

Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters (Confirmation of Chairmanship)

Report of the Coordinating Committee for Europe

Reports of the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Groups of Experts on Standardization of

- Fruit Juices
- Frozen Foods

PART XVI

Report on the Twelfth Session of the Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts
on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products

Relationship between the Commission and the Committee of Government Experts
(Governing Paragraph 10)

Edible Ices

PART XVII

Soups and Broths

Consideration of Possible Programme of Work of the Commission for the Next Ten Years

PART XVIII

Timetable of Codex Sessions 1970/71

PART XIX

Other Business

- Statement of the Mexican Delegation Regarding the European Regional Standard for Honey

PART XX

Valediction

APPENDICES

Appendix I - List of Participants

Appendix II - Report of the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee

Appendix III - Uniform System of References for Codex Documents

Appendix IV - Report to the FAO Conference on Rule VI. 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the
Codex Alimentarius Commission

Appendix V - Argentine and United Kingdom Statements

Appendix VI - General Principles for the Use of Food Additives

Appendix VII - List of Food Colours which have been given an ADI or Temporary ADI

¹ Re-named Codex Committee on Meat

² Re-named Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products

PART I

PARTICIPANTS AND OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. The Seventh Session of the Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission was held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, from 7 to 17 April 1970. The session was attended by 276 participants, including the representatives and observers of 60 countries and observers from 26 international organizations (see Appendix I for List of Participants).

2. The Seventh Session of the Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission was convened by the Directors-General of FAO and WHO and was opened on behalf of both Directors-General with a speech of welcome by Mr. P. Terver, Assistant Director-General, FAO.

3. The Assistant Director-General conveyed the best wishes of the Director-General of FAO, who was paying state visits to a number of countries in the Far East, for the success of the session. He welcomed, in particular, the new Members of the Commission and was pleased to see that the Codex Alimentarius Commission now had 74 Member Countries. He stressed the importance of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in connection with the removal of some of the non-economic obstacles to international trade, and referred to the increasing interest in the work of the Commission by the developing countries, a number of which had requested advice, guidance and assistance in the preparation of sound national food legislation. The Assistant Director-General emphasized the very close and constructive relationship with WHO in implementing the aims of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, and stated that this relationship was a very good instance of the effective partnership which could be achieved between UN agencies. He paid tribute to Mr. J.H.V. Davies, the retiring Chairman of the Commission, for the very valuable contribution he had made to the work of the Commission since its inception.

4. The Commission was presided over by its Chairman, Mr. J.H.V. Davies (United Kingdom) and its three Vice-Chairmen, Mr. I.H. Smith (Australia), Mr. E. Mortensen (Denmark) and Prof. Dr. O. Högl (Switzerland). The Joint Secretaries were Mr. G. O. Kermode and Mr. H. J. McNally (FAO) and Dr. C. Agthe (WHO).

5. During the session, the Commission elected Mr. G. Weill (France) as Chairman of the Commission to serve from the end of the Seventh Session until the end of the Eighth Session. The Commission also elected Dr. N.A. de Heer (Ghana), Mr. A. Miklovicz (Hungary) and Mr.

G. R. Grange (United States of America) as Vice-Chairmen of the Commission to serve from the end of the Seventh Session until the end of the Eighth Session.

6. The Commission elected from the Members of the Commission representatives for the following geographic locations in the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, to hold office from the end of the Seventh Session to the end of the Ninth Session of the Commission in accordance with Rule III.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission: Africa - Tunisia, Asia - Japan, Europe - Federal Republic of Germany, Latin America - Argentina, North America Canada, South-West Pacific - Australia.

Tribute to Mr. H.V. Dempsey (Canada)

7. The Chairman informed the Commission of the death last summer of Mr. H.V. Dempsey (Canada), who was a former Vice-Chairman of the Commission. He recalled the active rôle which Mr. Dempsey had played in the work of the Commission, both as Vice-Chairman and leader of the Canadian delegation, during his many years with the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Commission observed a minute's silence in memory of Mr. Dempsey.

Adoption of Agenda

8. The Commission unanimously adopted the provisional agenda (document ALINORM 70/1), with a slight re-arrangement in the order of items, which had the effect of moving agenda item 18(c) forward to become agenda item 12.

PART II

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH SESSIONS

9. The Commission received reports concerning the 14th and 15th sessions of the Executive Committee held in Rome from 17 to 19 September 1969 and on 3 April 1970, respectively. In introducing these reports, the Chairman indicated that most of the substantive items considered by the Executive Committee would be dealt with by the Commission under the agenda items relating to the matters concerned. The Report of the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee is reproduced as Appendix II to this Report.

Meat Hygiene

10. The Commission was informed that a meeting of an ad hoc Group of Experts, which had been convened by the Directors-General of FAO and WHO to elaborate a first draft code of

hygienic practice for meat, had taken place at WHO Headquarters, Geneva, from 17 to 20 March 1970. The ad hoc Group of Experts had reached agreement on a first draft code, and this would be sent to governments for their comments as soon as possible, in order that the comments would be available to the Codex Committee on Meat and Meat Products¹, which would be considering the draft code (document CX/MMP 70/3, Appendix II) at its next session later in the year.

Uniform System of References for Codex Documents

11. The Commission adopted the uniform system of references for Codex documents, which had been recommended by the Executive Committee at its 14th Session and which appears as Appendix III to this Report. The Executive Committee had considered that the system of references should be regarded as an interpretation of paragraph 9(e) of the Guidelines for Codex Committees, concerning the need to assign consecutive reference numbers in a suitable series to all the documents of Codex Committees. The Commission noted that this system of references for Codex documents would be included in the next (third) edition of the Procedural Manual.

Inclusion in Codex Standards of criteria which were not verifiable by examination of the end-product

12. The Commission noted that the Executive Committee, at its 15th session, had agreed that, wherever possible, verifiable end-product specifications were preferable, for inclusion in Codex standards, to provisions which were not enforceable by examination of the endproduct. The Commission also noted that the Executive Committee had also agreed that Codex standards could contain provisions such as those relating to conditions of manufacture and raw materials used, which could not be determined by an examination of the end-product. The Commission further noted that the Executive Committee had agreed that this principle applied equally to aspects of Codex standards other than quality criteria.

¹ Now renamed the Codex Committee on Meat (see paragraph 177).

PART III

MEMBERSHIP

(as at 17 April 1970)

Membership of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

13. The Commission had before it a list of Members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The membership, as at 17 April 1970, is set out below. The Commission noted that since its last session membership had increased from 65 to 75 countries.

Europe

1. Austria
2. Belgium
3. Bulgaria
4. Denmark
5. Finland
6. France
7. Germany, Fed. Rep.
8. Greece
9. Hungary
10. Iceland
11. Ireland
12. Israel
13. Italy
14. Luxembourg
15. Malta
16. Netherlands
17. Norway
18. Poland
19. Portugal
20. Romania
21. Spain
22. Sweden
23. Switzerland
24. Turkey
25. United Kingdom
26. Yugoslavia

North America

27. Canada
28. U.S.A.

Latin America

29. Argentina
30. Barbados
31. Brazil
32. Chile
33. Colombia
34. Cuba
35. Ecuador
36. Guatemala
37. Guyana

- 38. Mexico
- 39. Paraguay
- 40. Peru
- 41. Trinidad and Tobago
- 42. Uruguay
- 43. Venezuela

Africa

- 44. Algeria
- 45. Cameroun
- 46. Congo, Dem. Rep.
- 47. Ethiopia
- 48. Ghana
- 49. Ivory Coast
- 50. Kenya
- 51. Madagascar
- 52. Morocco
- 53. Nigeria
- 54. Senegal
- 55. Sudan
- 56. Togo
- 57. Tunisia
- 58. Uganda
- 59. United Arab Republic

South-West Pacific

- 60. Australia
- 61. New Zealand

Asia

- 62. China
- 63. India
- 64. Iran
- 65. Iraq
- 66. Japan
- 67. Jordan
- 68. Kuwait
- 69. Lebanon
- 70. Pakistan
- 71. Philippines
- 72. Saudi Arabia
- 73. Singapore

- 74. Syrian Arab Republic
- 75. Thailand

Status of Acceptance of Recommended Codex Standards

14. The Commission noted that four recommended Codex standards and three recommended codes of hygienic practice would be issued to governments during the course of the session. The recommended standards were the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, the Standard for Canned Pacific Salmon, the European Regional Standard for Honey and a number of Tolerances for Pesticide Residues. The recommended codes of practice were the General Principles of Food Hygiene, the Code of Hygienic Practice for Canned Fruit and Vegetable Products and the Code of Hygienic Practice for Dried Fruits. The Commission also noted that it was hoped to send the adopted recommended standards for fats and oils, margarine, sugars and processed fruits and vegetables to governments for acceptance shortly after the current session. The Commission recalled the decision which it had taken at its Sixth Session that its adoption of the acceptance procedure for Codex standards was on a provisional basis, in order to see how the acceptance procedure worked in practice.

PART IV

FINANCE OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS

PROGRAMME FOR 1970/71 AND 1972/73

15. The Commission considered a document which had been prepared by the Secretariat containing information on the 1970/71 budget of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme and on the programme of work and budget for 1972/73. The Commission noted that the budget for 1970/71 had been approved by the 15th Session of the FAO Conference, that the contribution of WHO to the joint costs of the Programme in respect of 1970 had been approved by the 22nd World Health Assembly and that the WHO contribution in respect of 1971 would be considered by the 23rd World Health Assembly meeting in May 1970. The attention of the Commission was drawn to the fact that Trust Fund 40 was exhausted at the end of 1969 and that commitments under the Trust Fund were being financed under the Regular Programme in 1970/71. The Commission was informed that the governing bodies had been pleased to note that effect had been given by the Commission to the recommendations of the 14th Session of the FAO Conference that the Commission should carefully examine its work priorities and endeavour to complete some of the work in hand before embarking on new subjects or proposing the establishment of any further subsidiary bodies. The Commission also noted that it had been found possible to effect certain economies in the costs of Codex meetings and also in the costs of external translation and printing of Codex documents, through improved printing and reproduction techniques. The

Commission also noted that FAO would continue to furnish internal translation and printing of documents, over and above the joint budget (\$515, 000), of the order of \$371,000. The Commission was informed that the DirectorsGeneral of FAO and WHO would examine the 1972/73 budget requirements of the Joint Programme in the light of the Commission's consideration of the proposed programme of work for the next ten years and such priorities as the Commission might establish for new work. It was indicated to the Commission that it was hoped to present the joint budget, in the future, in such a way that the technical support to the Programme by the Technical Divisions of the two Organizations would be shown in a comprehensive manner.

PART V

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION

Rule VI. 3 (Regional or Group of Countries Standards)

16. The Commission had before it a paper which had been prepared by the Secretariat in consequence of a suggestion which had been put forward by the 15th Session of the FAO Conference that "the Codex Alimentarius Commission should re-examine, at its next session, the principles governing the elaboration of standards for regions or groups of countries, as reflected in Rule VI. 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission". The Commission also had before it the views of the 15th Session of the Executive Committee on this matter (paragraph 11 of Appendix II to this Report). The Commission agreed to draw to the attention of the FAO Conference the fact that, under the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, a two-thirds majority of the votes cast would be required to change the Rule. The Commission also agreed to draw to the attention of the Conference that there were two different points of view held by Member Countries regarding the elaboration of regional standards. Some Members of the Commission considered that, in order that the Commission should remain fully master of its own programme of work, a decision on whether a standard should be elaborated for a region should be a matter for the Commission. Other Member Countries held the view that if a majority of Members in a region attached importance to the elaboration of a standard for the region concerned, it would not be right for Member Countries outside the region to prevent them from doing so. The Commission agreed that the Rule would be open to review in the light of developments, but considered that the time for reconsideration of the Rule would best be judged by the Commission itself and its Executive Committee. The Commission agreed to draw these matters to the attention of the next session of the FAO Conference in the terms set out in Appendix IV to this Report.

Amendment to Rule XII (Languages)

17. The Commission had before it a document prepared by the Secretariat dealing with (a) the subject of Rule XII (languages) as a whole, and (b) the proposal made by the Argentine delegation at the Sixth Session of the Commission that Rule XII.3 be amended, so that

English, French and Spanish would be mandatory working languages in subsidiary bodies of the Commission set up under Rule IX.1(b). The Commission also had before it the Report of the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee, which contained the recommendations of the Executive Committee on these two matters. The Commission noted the difficulties in interpreting Rule XII. 1, particularly the reference therein to the official and working languages of FAO and WHO. Because of these difficulties, which were explained in the Secretariat document on the subject, the DirectorsGeneral had proposed an amendment of the Rule. The proposed amended version of the Rule had been considered by the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee had agreed with the substance of the proposed amendment to the Rule, but had considered it desirable to introduce a number of drafting amendments.

18. The Commission considered the amended version of the Rule, as recommended by the Executive Committee and adopted it unanimously. The amended version of Rule XII. 1, as adopted by the Commission, reads as follows:

“Rule XII

1. The languages of the Commission and of its subsidiary bodies set up under Rule IX. 1(a) shall be not less than three of the working languages, as shall be determined by the Commission, which are working languages both of FAO and of the Health Assembly of WHO.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 above, other languages which are working languages either of FAO or of the Health Assembly of WHO may be added by the Commission if
 - a. the Commission has before it a report from the Directors-General of FAO and WHO on the policy, financial and administrative implications of the addition of such languages; and
 - b. the addition of such languages has the approval of the Directors-General of FAO and WHO.”

19. The Commission determined that the languages of the Commission should be English, French and Spanish, as was required under the amended version of Rule XII.1.

20. As a consequence of the adoption of the amended version of Rule XII.1, the Commission also adopted unanimously the following amended versions of Rule XII.2 and Rule XII.3, which will become Rule XII.3 and Rule XII.4, respectively:

“Rule XII

3. Where a representative wishes to use a language other than a language of the Commission he shall himself provide the necessary interpretation and/or translation into one of the languages of the Commission.

4. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Rule, the languages of subsidiary bodies set up under Rule IX.1(b) shall include at least two of the languages of the Commission.”

Consideration of Substance of Rule XII.3 (Languages used in Subsidiary bodies of the Commission set up under Rule IX.1(b))

21. The Commission considered the section of the Secretariat paper referred to in paragraph 16 of this Report (document ALINORM 70/8-Part II), dealing with the proposal made by the Argentine delegation at the Sixth Session of the Commission that Rule XII.3 be amended so that English, French and Spanish would be mandatory working languages in subsidiary bodies of the Commission set up under Rule IX.1(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. The paper set out the replies of host governments on the question of whether they would be prepared to undertake an obligation to provide full facilities in the three languages. The paper also contained an estimate of what it would cost to provide for Spanish as a working language in all Codex Committees and Sub-Committees. The Commission also had before it the Report of the 15th Session of the Executive Committee, which set out the views and recommendations of the Executive Committee on this question.

22. In general, host governments had indicated that, while they sympathized with the desire of the Spanish-speaking countries to have Spanish provided as a third working language in Codex Committees, there were both financial and practical difficulties in the way of undertaking an obligation to provide full facilities in the three languages. This was particularly the case for those host countries where the mother tongue was not one of the languages of the Commission.

23. A summary of the views of host governments and the reaction of the representative of Latin America in the Executive Committee to those views are set out in paragraphs 3 to 5 of the Report of the 15th Session of the Executive Committee (Appendix II to this Report).

24. The delegation of the Argentine recalled that the case for the provision of Spanish had been set out in paragraph 37 of the Report of the Sixth Session of the Commission. The delegation stated that the need for the provision of Spanish had been fully established and that the costs of providing for the use of Spanish were a consequence of the fact that the Commission was an international body. The Argentine delegation stressed that it was only in the past two years that the Latin American countries in general had become actively interested in the work of the Commission by becoming Members of the Commission. A greater number of Latin American countries would participate in the work of Codex Committees if facilities were available in Spanish. In the absence of such facilities, it would be extremely difficult to justify the attendance of delegates from Latin America at Codex Committee sessions, particularly in view of the heavy travel costs involved. This would impair the implementation of the aims of the Food Standards Programme as a world-wide programme. The delegations of the Argentine supported by the other Spanish-speaking delegations present at the session urged that Rule XII.3 be amended to provide for the use of the three languages.

25. Most delegations were sympathetic to the wishes of the Spanish-speaking countries, but recognized that there were serious practical difficulties in the way of giving effect to these wishes. It was pointed out that the Rules of Procedure had originally only required one of the Commission's languages to be provided at sessions of Codex Committees and that host governments had had this in mind when accepting the obligation to chair a committee. The required languages had subsequently been increased to two and to increase them immediately to three would throw a totally unforeseen burden on these countries. A changeover to three languages could only be made gradually.

26. The delegation of France stated that it would consider sympathetically whether it would be possible to provide full facilities in Spanish for the next session of the Codex Committee on General Principles, but, at the same time, considered that some thought ought to be given to the question of whether, for example, documents for the session could be sent to one of the Spanish-speaking countries for translation into Spanish. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany offered to provide facilities in Spanish in the Codex Committee on Meat and Meat Products. The delegation of the U.S.A. indicated that it would provide a number of documents in Spanish relating to the draft standard for table olives at the next session of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.

27. The Commission noted the point made by the Executive Committee that it should not be taken as axiomatic that all Codex Committees would always select English and French as the languages in which they would work. The Commission agreed that, as recommended by the Executive Committee, it would be a step in the right direction if the Directors-General were to write to host governments, stressing the particular importance of at least providing simultaneous interpretation in the three languages of the Commission, and other facilities as far as possible. The Commission also agreed, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, to request the Directors-General to consider doing what they could to provide as many working documents as possible in Spanish for Codex Committee sessions. The Commission agreed that the Spanish-speaking countries should be asked to state the relative importance they attached to the following:

- a. translation of working documents for a session into Spanish;
- b. simultaneous interpretation;
- c. translation of the draft report and other documents of the session into Spanish.

The Commission further agreed that an opportunity should be offered to the Spanish-speaking delegations and the delegations from host countries to discuss this subject further during the course of the session.

28. This meeting took place under the chairmanship of Mr. G. Weill (France). It considered the following proposal of the delegation of the Argentine concerning the use of Spanish in all Codex Committees.

"Proposal of Argentina concerning the Use of Spanish in All Codex Committees - Amendment to Rule XII

Rule XII.4

Apart from the dispositions of paragraph 3 of this Rule, the languages of the subsidiary bodies created by Rule IX.1(b) shall include at least three of the languages of the Commission, subject to the following norms with reference to the Spanish language.

- a. As from 1971, the host country of any of the subsidiary bodies mentioned in Rule IX.1(b), with the exception of the Coordinating Committees, will provide simultaneous translation into/from the Spanish language, and also provide a Spanish version of the final report of each meeting.
- b. The dispositions of item (a) will have no effect in those cases in which no delegations of Spanish-speaking countries have expressed their desire to participate in the meeting of any subsidiary body, at least thirty days before the initiation of the meetings.
- c. In accordance with the text of Article 10 of the Statute the Commission, as from 1971, will pay the cost of translations into the Spanish language of the working documents for the subsidiary bodies mentioned in item (a).

The proposal of the delegate of the Argentine was supported by the delegations of the Spanish-speaking countries present.

29. As regards sub-section (a) of the proposal of the delegation of the Argentine, it was pointed out that the cost of providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish and a draft report in Spanish at Codex Committee sessions (excluding the Coordinating Committee for Europe) had been estimated at \$59,000 in a biennium, or an average of about \$ 2,000 per Codex Committee session. This estimate provided for (i) interpretation facilities on the basis of two Spanish interpreters in a team of six interpreters, interpreting simultaneously in English, French and Spanish, (ii) one Spanish translator to translate the draft report, (iii) a Spanish stenographer, and (iv) the travel costs of the above four people, recruited from an international centre in Europe to work in another European country.

30. As regards sub-section (b) of the proposal, it was indicated that for practical reasons host countries would require about two months' notice of the intention of Spanish-speaking countries to send delegates to Codex Committee sessions.

31. As regards sub-section (c) of the proposal, it was pointed out that the cost of translating working documents into Spanish for the Codex Committee sessions had been estimated at \$ 91,000 in a biennium, or an average of about \$ 3,000 per Codex Committee session. This figure would, however, vary from Committee to Committee, since the volume of documentation varied from Committee to Committee.

32. The budget for the Commission had already been fixed for the biennium 1970/71 and any proposal to increase the budget of the Commission in the succeeding biennium in order to cover the cost of translating working documents into Spanish would have to be carefully considered by the Directors-General of FAO and WHO and would require to be approved by the governing bodies of both Organizations.

33. Each of the Spanish-speaking delegations was asked to indicate its priorities as between the various Codex Committees and it emerged that the priorities of the individual Spanish-speaking delegations were varied. Taken as a whole, therefore, it was noted that there was no Codex Committee in which Spanish-speaking countries did not wish to participate. The delegations of the host countries indicated that their governments were sympathetic to the wishes of the Spanish-speaking delegations but that they had no authority to commit their governments to any increased expenditure arising from the addition of Spanish as a further working language in the Committees for which they were responsible. Some delegations from the host countries said that it would be extremely difficult for them, on practical grounds, to work in the three languages of the Commission.

34. It was noted that interpretation facilities and documentation in Spanish would be provided at sessions of the Commission, Executive Committee, Milk and Milk Products Committee, Group of Experts on Quick-Frozen Foods and Group of Experts on Fruit Juices.

35. Taking into account that the Directors-General had been requested by the Commission to write to host countries stressing the importance of at least providing simultaneous interpretation in the three languages of the Commission and other facilities as far as possible, the meeting recognized that it would not be possible to go any further at this stage. The hope was expressed that at the next session of the Commission the delegations of the host countries would be in a position to state whether their governments would be willing to undertake the cost of providing the necessary facilities in Spanish in the Codex Committees for which they were responsible.

36. The Commission took note of the report on the meeting made by Mr. G. Weill (France) and decided that the proposal of the delegation of the Argentine should be included in the report so that host governments would be in a position to study it. The Commission asked the Executive Committee to study further the questions raised in the discussion of this issue, with a view to submitting a report to the next session of the Commission.

PART VI

FOOD STANDARDS AND FOOD LEGISLATION IN AFRICA, ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA

37. The Commission had before it three Secretariat papers containing information on food standards and food legislation in Africa, Asia and Latin America. These papers were revised versions of the Secretariat papers on this subject which had been discussed by the Commission at its fifth and sixth sessions.

38. The delegation of Ghana stated that of the 74 Member Countries of the Commission, 44 were developing countries. The Commission and the governing bodies of FAO and WHO

should consider ways and means of lending more practical assistance to the special needs of Africa to develop sound basic food legislation and food standards. African countries either had no food standards or regulations or had legislation that was out of date. There was a serious lack of trained personnel and training facilities and insufficient coordination between the services concerned. There were now 16 African Member Countries of the Commission, but not all of them were in a position to participate fully in its work. This was partly due to financial reasons and partly because the African countries did not have a sufficient number of trained personnel in the fields dealt with by the various Codex Committees, but it was also because much of the work of the Committees had only a tenuous relationship to the food situation in their countries. The Commission should aim, therefore, at closing the gap between the developed and developing countries in the field of food legislation and food control.

39. The delegation of Ghana added that Africa appeared to be the only geographical region where there was very little development of national Codex work and no attempt being made to harmonize national food legislations and standards. Most of the problems to be dealt with in Africa related to food hygiene, bacteriological examination of foods, food additives, pesticide residues and food labelling. There was an important need to deal with the broad principles of food legislation suited to the needs of Africa.

40. At the Sixth Session of the Commission, Ghana had put forward the proposal that in order to avoid the creation of varying national food regulations in Africa, (a) a Coordinating Committee for Africa should be set up, (b) competent consultants in food legislation under a United Nations development programme of assistance to African countries should be recruited, and (c) a short-term training programme for nationals of developing countries at FAO or WHO or other agencies dealing with Codex work should be organized. Although the Commission, at its sixth session, considered that it was premature to set up a Coordinating Committee for Africa, there was at least a need to establish a nucleus for Codex work in Africa. In the absence of a Coordinating Committee for Africa, it would be very helpful if the Secretariat could study closely the assistance needed by African countries in the elaboration of national food legislation and standards, with particular reference to imports, exports and traditional foods moving in intra-regional trade which require control in the matter of hygienic and bacteriological requirements. The delegation of Ghana suggested, in connection with the future work of the Codex Committees dealing with food hygiene, labelling, additives and contaminants, pesticide residues and also in connection with the subject of weights and measures, that simple but specific questionnaires might be sent to African countries, so that even though these countries might not be able to attend the sessions of the Codex Committees concerned, the Committees would have the necessary data to enable them to give due consideration to the needs of these countries.

41. The other African countries represented at the session indicated that they held similar views to those of Ghana regarding Africa's needs in the field of basic food legislation and food standards. They also supported the suggestion that a Coordinating Committee for Africa be set up. It was stated that each region in Africa had its own needs in this field. Some African delegations pointed out that, given the limited resources of Africa in the field of trained personnel, laboratory facilities and food technology they might not be in a position, for some

time to come, to accept international standards which were too advanced or too sophisticated. The international standards should be relevant to conditions in Africa and should not be difficult to enforce.

42. The delegation of Nigeria stressed the importance of providing expert advice and more frequent technical training courses for participants from the developing countries. The delegation of Nigeria also considered that there was a need for FAO and WHO to step up their activities in the field of technical assistance programmes, both in the form of package assistance projects and technical training courses for the developing countries. The delegation of Nigeria attached great importance to the provision of training facilities for officials from the developing countries, and expressed the hope that the developed countries might make available more of such training facilities.

43. A number of delegations from the developed countries also supported the view that the special needs of the developing countries should be accommodated as far as possible within the framework of the Food Standards Programme. The delegation of France suggested that, in order to assist the international trade of the developing countries, governments of developing countries might be permitted to accept Codex standards in respect of their international trade only, thus placing them in a position to have less sophisticated standards for internal use. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany suggested that help be extended to the developing countries by way of assistance projects in the field of consumer protection, including food standards. Some delegations suggested that UNDP projects were one of the ways in which this could be achieved. The delegation of the U.S.A. thought that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene might perhaps be in a position to elaborate codes of hygienic practice suited to the needs of the African countries, and indicated that this matter would be brought to the attention of the Chairman of that Committee.

44. The Secretariat informed the Commission that both FAO and WHO were fully aware of the problems facing the developing countries in the field of food legislation and food standards work generally. A report from an FAO expert who had recently carried out a survey in this field in five African countries tended to confirm the views expressed by the delegation of Ghana and other African countries. The delegation of Nigeria suggested that this survey be extended to other African countries. FAO had reviewed, on request, proposals for draft food legislation and draft standards in one of the African countries and had put forward suggestions. It was only in relatively recent times that such requests had been made. There had also been discussions with UNDP, and the possibility of arranging assistance to developing countries under technical assistance and bilateral aid programmes was being explored. There had also been some contact with the Economic Commission for Africa and the Organization for African Unity. Details of technical assistance afforded by FAO in the fields of food control, standardization and methods of analysis to the developing countries were given to the Commission. FAO was participating in 27 major projects in various fields of food and nutrition, with 132 field experts, covering 23 countries. There were 10 other major projects in an advanced stage of preparation. Exclusive of this, technical support was being provided by FAO for about 140 projects. While many of these projects covered one or more aspects of food control to a varying degree, the particular attention of the Commission was drawn to one

project which was the only one so far dealing exclusively with food control. The project, which was a three-year one, was in Saudi-Arabia, and it covered the setting up of laboratories, training of food analysts and food inspectors, advising on food standards, food legislation and methods of analysis and sampling.

45. The representative of WHO pointed out that WHO was well aware of the fact that tropical and sub-tropical countries had problems of their own, which were related to climatic conditions, ecological factors, eating habits, and other factors. In the overall programme of WHO, there were many activities, which were of interest to African, Latin American and Asian countries, in food safety and control, hygiene and associated public health matters. They consisted notably of advisory services to various countries requesting assistance, the convening of seminars, the issue of reports of several meetings of expert committees, the exchange of research workers, and the arranging of fellowships. Three seminars had been convened recently, at which participants from Asia, Latin America and certain African countries were present. A seminar was being planned for participants from Africa, to be held in 1972, at which specific problems relating to food hygiene and the prevention of food-borne diseases would be considered. Food standardization and legislation within the framework of the Codex Programme would also be discussed. Research, supported by WHO, covered, inter alia, the elaboration of simple procedures for examination of foods which would be of interest to the developing countries. A new project "Socio-economic consequences of the zoonoses" had been adopted recently by the World Health Assembly, which would take into account the losses on meat and milk due to zoonoses.

46. The Commission considered that:

- a. the question how best to make advice and assistance available to the developing countries in the field of food legislation, standards, training of personnel, and the setting up of proper laboratory facilities for enforcement was a matter for FAO and WHO;
- b. the work of the Commission was relevant to the needs of the developing countries in that (i) Codex standards would afford consumer protection to the developing countries, particularly in respect of imports, and (ii) the question of developing and reaching agreement on regional standards for traditional products moving in intra-African trade and the need for avoiding diversification of standards and food legislations was one falling within the competence of the Commission.

The Commission also recognized the need for advice to the developing countries in the field of basic food legislation.

47. The Commission noted that out of an African membership of 16, six Member Countries present at the session had requested the setting-up of a Coordinating Committee for Africa. A seventh, Senegal, had made a similar request at the Sixth Session of the Commission. The Commission instructed the Commission's Secretariat to communicate with the remaining African Member Countries in order to obtain their views on the question of setting up a Coordinating Committee for Africa. The Commission thought that, as an alternative to setting

up a Coordinating Committee for Africa, consideration might be given to setting up a Coordinator for Africa. The Commission considered that if replies were received in good time, the Executive Committee might be in a position at its next session to put forward some practical recommendations to the Commission on this matter. The Commission noted that the Secretariat hoped to be in a position to put forward, in due course, positive proposals to the governing bodies of FAO and WHO as to how best to meet the needs of the African countries.

48. As regards the region of Asia, a number of delegations from this region stated that the information given in the Secretariat paper dealing with this region could still be brought more up-to-date, and some delegations gave recent data on their food trade, standardization activities and food legislation. In order to achieve this, the Commission agreed that consideration should be given to the possibility of convening a regional seminar on food standards and legislation for Asia.

49. A number of delegations from the region of Latin America also stated that the information given in the Secretariat paper dealing with this region could still be brought more up-to-date, and some delegations gave recent data on their food trade, standardization activities and food legislation. Concerning one of the territories mentioned in Annex I of document ALINORM 70/31, the delegations of the Argentine and the United Kingdom made statements which appear in Appendix V of this Report. During the session, a corrigendum to ALINORM 70/31 was issued using the terminology contained in the UN Terminology Bulletin No. 250 of 1st April 1969. The necessity for grouping together countries with similar food habits and economies, in order to stimulate their participation in food standardization work was mentioned by the delegation of Cuba. The Cuban delegation pointed out that some of the developing countries might encounter difficulties in applying Codex standards. The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago considered it important that Codex standards should not be too sophisticated since this would increase the difficulty of enforcement. The delegation of Cuba expressed the view that it was mainly the consumers in the developing countries who were most in need of health protection.

50. The Commission expressed the wish that the DirectorsGeneral of FAO and WHO draw the attention of the forthcoming regional conferences of FAO and WHO to the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

PART VII

INFORMATION ON THE ACTIVITIES OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WORKING ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FOODS AND RELATED MATTERS

51. The Commission received reports on the activities of the undermentioned international organizations:

UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) (ALINORM 70/28-Part I)

52. The Commission had before it a progress report on the activities of the Working Party on Standardization of Perishable Foodstuffs of the Economic Commission for Europe. The ECE representative drew attention to the main features of the report and also gave information as regards further progress which had been achieved since the report had been drafted. The Commission took note that the recommendations for Unshelled Hazelnuts, Decorticated Hazelnuts, Walnuts in Shell, Cultivated Mushrooms, Leeks and Raspberries would be before the next session of the Working Party for consideration for adoption as European standards and the Draft Standard for Unshelled Pistachio Nuts would be considered for adoption as a recommendation. The ECE representative expressed the satisfaction of his Organization regarding the excellent cooperation which existed between the Economic Commission for Europe and the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the continued progress being made in the work of the two Joint Groups of Experts on the Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods and Fruit Juices.

International Olive Oil Council (IOOC) (ALINORM 70/28-Part II)

53. The Commission had before it a report prepared by the Secretariat of the IOOC. The representative of IOOC gave a résumé of the work done by his Organization on standards for olive oils and table olives. The Commission expressed its appreciation of the excellent cooperation from IOOC in the development of the Draft Standard for Olive Oil, Virgin and Refined, and for Refined Residue Olive Oils (Refined Olive Residue Oils). The Commission noted with satisfaction the cooperation between IOOC and the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables in the development of a Codex Standard for Table Olives.

International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (ALINORM 70/28-Part III)

54. The Commission had before it a report prepared by Technical Committee 34 of the ISO. The ISO representative briefly reviewed the contents of the report, which set out the activities and programme of work of ISO on the testing and sampling, handling, transportation, storage and packaging of agricultural food products as well as on problems of terminology. It was noted that some 170 Recommendations were under consideration by ISO. The ISO representative drew particular attention to the close collaboration which existed between this Organization and the Commission, which enabled any overlap of activities to be avoided.

Commission of the European Economic Community (EEC) (ALINORM 70/28-Part IV)

55. The Commission had before it a report prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission of the EEC which set out the present state of the work of the Community in the field of

harmonization of food legislation. The report indicated that general regulations covering packaging materials, dietetic foods, low-sodium dietetic foods, foods for infants and children, labelling, preserves and canned foods, sampling procedures and irradiation were in the course of preparation. It also summarized the state of the work within the Commission of the Community on food additives (colours, preservatives, antioxidants, emulsifiers, stabilizers, thickeners, gelling agents, aromatic substances and artificial sweeteners) and on commodities or commodity groups.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (ALINORM 70/28-Part V)

56. The Commission took note of a paper prepared by the Secretariat of the OECD, summarizing the standardization activities of the OECD in the field of fruits and vegetables and livestock products. The paper drew the Commission's attention to the fact that the OECD Descriptive System for Carcasses of Bovine and Porcine Species was considered by the Committee for Agriculture at its 23rd Session (April 1966, AGR/T(65)31), and that the above Committee agreed not to publish the Descriptive System but to submit it to the Codex Alimentarius Commission as an aid in its developing of meat descriptions (see Appendix II, ALINORM 70/17). As regards the OECD Code of Sanitary Regulations for International Trade in Slaughter Livestock and Fresh Meat (AGR/T(66)1, Second Revision), the Commission noted that this Code was nearing finalization. The Commission expressed its appreciation of the close cooperation between OECD and the Codex Committee on Meat and Meat Products. The Commission noted the work being done by the OECD in the development of interpretive brochures for the European standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Council of Europe (Partial Agreement) (ALINORM 70/28-Part VI)

57. The Commission had before it a report prepared by the Secretariat of the Council of Europe (Partial Agreement). The representative of the above Council drew the Commission's attention to the work done by the Sub-Committee on Poisonous Substances in Agriculture and the Sub-Committee for the Health Control of Foodstuffs, in the fields of pesticides and food additives, respectively. The Commission noted that work carried out by the Council of Europe (Partial Agreement) on natural and artificial flavours and packaging materials was of particular interest to the Codex Committee on Food Additives, which was awaiting the Council's reports on these subjects. In reply to the delegation of Ghana, the representative of the Council of Europe (Partial Agreement) stated that countries wishing to obtain reports of the Council should write to the Council's Secretariat. The Commission looked forward to receiving in due course the recommendations of the Council of Europe (Partial Agreement) on the subject of flavours and packaging materials.

Related Activities within FAO and WHO (ALINORM 70/28)

58. The Commission had before it a short résumé of the activities within FAO and WHO on food additives, pesticide residues, food irradiation, food hygiene and food legislation. The representative of WHO briefly summarized the future activities of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert

Committee on Food Additives. Appreciation was expressed concerning the expert advice provided by the above Committee as well as the Joint FAO Working Party of Experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues to the Commission, particularly in respect of the acceptable daily intake of chemicals found in food.

59. The delegation of Canada expressed concern about the levels of mercury found in food, especially fish, in certain areas, and recommended that the Commission regard this as an urgent matter requiring consideration by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives at its 1970 meeting or at the earliest possible opportunity. Several delegations were in support of this recommendation. The Secretariat pointed out that the question of environmental pollution by mercury had been considered by FAO and that this matter had been brought to the attention of Member Governments; furthermore, that the Codex Committee on Food Additives, at its last session, had referred the question of mercury to the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives for consideration in 1971. A large number of delegations attached importance to this question and the Commission agreed to request the Directors-General of FAO and WHO to consider how to deal with this problem as soon as possible.

60. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew the Commission's attention to the desirability of holding a third Joint FAO/WHO Conference on Food Additives to provide guidance to the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives on matters such as the evaluation of the technological efficacy of food additives, means of dealing with urgent problems, such as that raised by the delegation of Canada, and other matters relating to the control of food additives. The Secretariat informed the Commission that this question had been raised in the FAO Programme Committee and that provision had been made tentatively for holding the Food Additives Conference. It was however considered important to know in greater detail what the items would be which the Conference would discuss. The delegation of Canada suggested that the Conference might discuss possible ways of dealing with urgent matters concerning health as well as the problem of exchange of information on an international level. As regards the former, the representative of WHO pointed out that this question was under consideration in WHO.

61. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany agreed to prepare a working paper setting out the subjects which a Joint FAO/WHO Conference on Food Additives might discuss. The Commission decided that such a working paper should be put before the next session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and that the working paper together with the views expressed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives should be submitted to the Commission at its next session. This would enable the Commission to express an opinion as to the desirability of holding a third Joint FAO/WHO Conference on Food Additives.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

62. The delegation of Canada pointed out that at a session of the Agriculture Committee of GATT the need for work in the field of harmonization of food legislation to remove non-tariff barriers to international trade was discussed. The delegate representing Canada at that

session of GATT pointed out the extensive work already done by the Commission in this field. The Commission agreed that, in order to avoid duplication of work, the Director-General of FAO should be requested to communicate with that Organization offering on behalf of the Commission, cooperation and technical information in the form of standards, definitions for food products and other related matters.

PART VIII

CONSIDERATION OF STANDARDS AT STEP 8 OF THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS

63. The Commission had before it working papers prepared by the Secretariat (ALINORM 70/41 and Addenda 1–5) containing proposed amendments and comments from governments on the Step 8 standards. The Commission also received proposals for the amendment of the standards from the floor. The Commission also took into account the endorsement and recommendations of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling on the labelling provisions of the Step 8 standards.

Decisions and Remarks Affecting All Standards Considered at Step 8

Labelling

64. The Commission agreed that section 5 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CAC/RS 1-1969) should not be automatically attracted to the labelling section of Codex standards, since section 5.1 would clearly have no place in specific Codex standards, and section 5.2, dealing with irradiated foods, would need to be examined on a case by case basis to see whether or not it was applicable to the standard concerned. The Codex Committee on Food Additives would have the possibility of judging the safety of the proposed application in each case.

Food Additives

65. The Commission confirmed its previous decision that food additives, which had not been endorsed or temporarily endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives, should be deleted from the standards before issuing them to governments for acceptance.

Contaminants

66. The Commission agreed that the general statement dealing with pesticide residue tolerances should be deleted from the standards unless tolerances applicable to the product covered by the standard had been adopted by the Commission at Step 8. In this connection, the Commission noted that pesticide residue tolerances were being established not on a food

by food basis, but on a pesticide by pesticide basis. Thus, in the case of many standards, it would not be possible to insert a reference to applicable pesticide residue tolerances by the time the standards had been adopted by the Commission at Step 8.

Editorial Revision of Standards Adopted at Step 8

67. The Commission agreed that there was a need to revise standards editorially before issuing them to governments for acceptance in the three languages of the Commission, and that this was particularly so in the case of the section on methods of analysis. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat might exercise a reasonable degree of discretion, in consultation with the Chairmen of the Committees concerned, in removing any ambiguities or obscurities in provisions of Step 9 standards.

Remarks on Drained Weight

68. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany was of the opinion that in the case of food packed in liquid media the consumer would be better protected if he were informed as to the quantity of the ingoing food item in question. It was therefore in favour of establishing minimum limits for ingoing food ingredients in the Standards for Canned Pineapple, Canned Shrimp and Prawns, and certain Edible Fungus Products, and of declaring the quantity of ingoing food rather than drained weight.

Remarks on Declaration of Country of Origin

69. The delegation of the Argentine wished to go on record as stating that the declaration of country of origin of all foods should be mandatory.

Draft Standard for Canned Pineapple

70. The Commission considered the above standard which was contained in Appendix IV to ALINORM 70/20. The Commission also considered the redrafted labelling section of the standard as presented by the Secretariat in document CX/FL 70/3. The Commission agreed on the following amendments to the draft standard:

- 1.1(b) To read as follows:
“packed with water or other suitable liquid medium; it may be packed with nutritive sweeteners, as specified in sub-section 2.1.1(c), seasonings or other ingredients appropriate to the product;”
- 1.3(b) Slices should be translated as “rodajas” in the Spanish version of the standard.
- 2.1 “dry sweeteners” should read “dry nutritive sweeteners”. This change to be made wherever the words “dry sweeteners” appear in the standard.
- 2.3 This should read 2.2 with appropriate numerical changes thereafter.
- 2.3.2 The last part of this provision to read “... and canned pineapple with special ingredients shall have a flavour characteristic of that imparted by the pineapple

and the other substances used.”

2.3.8 Delete the words “within each classification”.

6.1.1 Add the words “when completely filled” at the end of this provision.

6.1.2.2 Add the word “examined” after the words “of all containers” in the second line of this provision.

6.1.4 Delete the words “within each classification”.

7.2(c) (Document CX/FL 70/3)

Add the words “and water” after the word “dimethylpolysiloxane”

71. The Commission agreed that the following comments should be recorded in the report.

a. Nutritive Sweeteners

A number of delegations drew attention to the fact that in most Codex standards the term “sugars” and not “nutritive sweeteners” was used. It was pointed out that the nutritive sweeteners concerned were listed in the standard and that the term “nutritive sweetener” had been used in the standards for processed fruits and vegetables which had already been adopted by the Commission at Step 8 and advanced to Step 9. The Commission agreed that it would be desirable to have uniformity on this point in the standards.

b. Other Permitted Ingredients

The delegation of Poland reserved its position on the use of vinegar in canned pineapple.

c. Definition of Defects. Excessive Trim

The Commission noted a proposal of the delegation of the U.S.A. to amend the provision on excessive trim in such a way that there would be some objective measurement of the term “excessive”. The Commission decided not to amend the provision but thought that the reasons advanced by the delegation of the U.S.A. in favour of amending the provision should be brought to the attention of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables so that the Committee could consider whether an amendment of the standard would be necessary.

d. 2.3.8 - Acceptance

The Secretariat expressed the view that the meaning of the words “within each classification” did not appear to be entirely clear. The Commission, following an intervention by the delegation of the U.S.A., decided to delete these words from the standard but agreed that the Secretariat should confirm with the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables that the words had no significance.

e. Food Additives

The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland reserved their positions on the use of dimethylpolysiloxane in canned pineapple.

f. Contaminants

The Commission noted that the maximum level for tin contained in the standard had not been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives, and that it would be necessary to carry out a further study of the problem of tin in containers before any final conclusion could be reached. The Commission agreed to retain the figure of 250 mg/kg provisionally and to indicate by way of a footnote to the standard that the provision would be reviewed in two years' time. A considerable number of delegations thought that the level for tin was too high and that it should be reduced. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland and Yugoslavia reserved their positions on the level for tin in the standard. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Polish delegation that the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables should consider in addition to tin the subject of other contaminants in all their standards, including those which had been passed to Step 9.

g. Methods of Analysis

With reference to the provision on minimum fill of container, the Commission agreed to a proposal made by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its fifth session that there was a need for a precise method of determining the water capacity of containers and requested the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables to elaborate a suitable method, which would then be submitted to the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling for endorsement as a referee method. The Commission also agreed that a general method for determining the water capacity should be elaborated for all commodities being dealt with by the Commission. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling and views expressed by the delegations of Canada and Cuba, the Commission agreed that it was appropriate to retain in the standard the reference to the Sampling Plans for Prepackaged Foods as being suitable for processed fruits and vegetables. It was agreed that the reference in the standard should be to the Sampling Plans for Processed Fruits and Vegetables.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

72. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for Canned Pineapple to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards. The delegation of Cuba reserved its position on this decision in view of the absence of provisions on contaminants, and because of the doubts of a number of delegations regarding the suitability of the Sampling Plans.

Draft Standard for Olive Oil, Virgin and Refined and for Refined Olive-Residue Oil

73. The Commission examined the above standard which was contained in Appendix II of ALINORM 70/11. It was agreed that the following comments should be recorded and the following amendments were agreed upon:

Food Additives

74. It was noted that at the time when the addition of alphanatocopherol to fats and oils was considered by the Codex Committee on Food Additives, provision for this substance was not made in the above standard. As a result, olive oils were not included in the endorsement of alpha-tocopherol in fats and oils. The Commission agreed that it was reasonable to assume that this was only a formality and that the addition of this natural substance at levels intended only to replace the alpha-tocopherol destroyed during processing, was not in any way a hazard to health. It was also agreed to delete the words “natural and synthetic” since specifications existed for alpha-tocopherol and since the Codex Committee on Food Additives had agreed in principle that no distinction should be made between natural substances and their synthetic equivalents. It was further agreed that the limit of 200 mg/kg was in respect of the total alpha-tocopherol in the final product.

Labelling

75. The Commission agreed that, as far as the English text was concerned, the expression “refined residue olive oil” should be replaced by the expression “refined olive-residue oil”. This amendment would also be made wherever the expression “refined residue olive oil” occurred in the standard. In section VII.1(v), the expression “refined olive oil” was used in error. This would now read “refined olive-residue oil”. As regards the provision on country of origin, the Commission agreed that the reference to the product “undergoing processing in a second country which changes its nature” included the classification of olive oils set out in the provision entitled “Name of the Product”.

Methods of Analysis and Sampling

76. The Commission agreed to an amendment concerning the alumina to be used in the determination of the specific extinction in ultra-violet. As regards the interpretation of a doubtful colour reaction in the teaseed oil test, the Commission preferred and adopted the text elaborated by the International Olive Oil Council and proposed by the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils rather than that proposed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. As the provision in the standard was for a negative test, the Commission agreed that a note concerning a pink coloration was necessary and adopted the following text:

“Note

A pink colour shall be regarded as negative, since some olive oils yield this colour.”

The Italian delegation reserved its position on the range of limits in respect of the composition of olive oil, which it considered to be too wide. As regards the teaseed oil test, the Italian delegation stated that a pink colour should not be regarded as “negative” but as “doubtful”, and that the presence of teaseed oil must be confirmed by the determination of different steroids.

77. The Commission agreed that the method of determination of tocopherols adopted in the margarine standard should be considered by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling for endorsement in the Olive Oil Standard.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

78. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for Olive Oils to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards. The Commission agreed that when the standard was being sent out to governments for acceptance there should be a note in the introductory section of the document containing the standard, making it clear that the designations in Annex A to the International Olive Oil Agreement 1963 were not affected by the provisions of the standard. The representative of the IOOC put forward a text for this purpose and the Commission agreed that the Secretariat should take it into consideration in preparing the final note.

Draft Standard for Edible Mustardseed Oil

79. The Commission examined the above standard which was contained in Appendix III of ALINORM 70/11.

80. As regards the section of the standard on food additives, the Commission noted that the text which had been agreed to at its Sixth Session limiting the amount of colouring agents which may be added to this oil had been inadvertently omitted from the standard, and instructed the Secretariat to reinstate the text (see para. 146 of ALINORM 69/67). With regard to maximum level of use of the additives provided for in the standard, the Commission noted that the expression “not limited” meant in accordance with good manufacturing practice, as indicated in the Report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland, Portugal and Switzerland reserved their positions on the food additives section of the standard.

81. With reference to the provision requiring a complete list of ingredients in the labelling section of the standard, the Commission noted that although sub-section 3.2 (c) (i) of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods was not applicable in the case of the standard under consideration, it was necessary to attract the preamble of sub-section 3.2(c), since the authority for the use of class names in place of specific names of ingredients was contained in the preamble to this sub-section which read: “A specific name shall be used for ingredients in the list of ingredients except that ...”

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

82. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for Edible Mustardseed Oil to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Draft Standard for Quick-Frozen Guttled Pacific Salmon

83. The Commission considered the above standard which was contained in Appendix II of ALINORM 70/18, and agreed on the following amendments to the standard.

1. **SCOPE**

Insert the word “individually” before the words “quick-frozen”.

3.3.2(c) This sub-section should read as follows:

“Discoloured skin - readily discernible deviation from the normal characteristic colour of the species concerned.”

3.3.3(d) This sub-section should read as follows:

“Belly burn or loose belly bones - readily discernible enzymatic damage to the tissues in the area of the belly cavity, or loose belly bones in the abdominal cavity which have become detached from the flesh.”

3.4.3(d) Add the words “or loose belly bones” after “Belly burn”

5.1 This sub-section should read as follows:

“The name of the product is the name prescribed for the particular species under para. 5.2 with the words “quick-frozen” and the words “dressed headless” or “dressed head-on”, as appropriate. However, the term “frozen” may be applied on the national level in countries where this term is customarily used for the type of product processed in accordance with subsection 2.1(b).”

5.2 Add the words “or Keta Salmon” after the words “Chum Salmon”.

Add new 5.3

The Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling that the following provision should be included in the standard:

“In addition to the particulars in 5.1 and 5.2, the name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor of the food, and the country of origin shall be declared on the container or be given in the accompanying documents.”

84. The Commission agreed that the following points regarding the standard should be recorded in the Report:

- a. There was considerable discussion on the use of the term “quick-frozen” in the title and scope sections of the standard. A number of delegations considered that the standard should apply to the frozen product in general. Some of these delegations pointed out that the term “quickfrozen” was not in common use in their countries and that a product frozen in accordance with the process laid down in the standard would,

in their countries, be designated as a frozen product. Other delegations, which thought that the standard should apply to the frozen product in general, considered that if the standard applied only to the quickfrozen product, products frozen by other methods would not be subject to the provisions of the standard and this would not be in the interest of consumers. It was established that it was the intention of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products that the standard should apply to the quick-frozen product and that the product moving in trade was, almost entirely, quick-frozen in accordance with the provisions of the standard. It was also pointed out that the term “quick-frozen” indicated a special freezing process which resulted in a superior quality product to that which had been merely frozen. It emerged that the quick-freezing process was the only one currently in use on a commercial scale for the preparation of this product. The Commission agreed that the problem was essentially a labelling problem and that the standard defined the freezing process adequately. The Commission agreed therefore not to change the title of the standard and not to amend the scope section on this point. The delegations of the U.S.A., Canada, Denmark and Australia wished to go on record in support of the use of the term “frozen” in the scope section.

- b. Some delegations considered that the last sentence of subsection 2.1(b) of the standard was not sufficiently precise in describing the conditions of transport and storage. The Commission agreed that there should be a reference, either by way of a footnote to the standard or by way of a note in the introductory section of the publication containing the standard, to the code of practice which was in the course of development by the Joint ECE/Codex Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods indicating that more precise data regarding conditions of transport, storage and distribution would be drawn up in due course in that code. A similar reference would also be made to the Code of Technological Practice for Frozen Fish being developed by FAO. A number of delegations were not in agreement with this and thought that no reference should be made to codes either in a footnote to the standard or in the introductory section of the publication containing the standard. It was pointed out that the reference to the codes would not form part of the provisions of the standard and would be for information purposes only.
- c. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated, with reference to sub-section 3.3.1(c), that it was essential to remove blood not only from the surface of the fish and body cavities, but also from the veins. On the proposal of the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, the Commission decided that this request should be discussed at the next session of the Committee, but that the standard should not be amended.
- d. The Commission noted, with regard to section 5.1 of the standard that in the French version of the standard, the use of terms other than “surgelé” would not be permitted. The delegation of Canada wished to go on record as stating that the use of the term “frozen” should be permitted in designating the product.
- e. It was recognized that the standard comprised minimum requirements and that additional requirements were necessary in Japan because of consumer preference, marketing and further processing requirements.

- f. The Commission noted that the section on sampling and examination had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

85. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for QuickFrozen Guttled Pacific Salmon to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Draft Standard for Canned Shrimps or Prawns

86. The Commission considered the above standard which was contained in Appendix IV of ALINORM 70/18, and agreed on the following amendments to the standard:

1. SCOPE

Delete all that follows after the word “containers”.

2.1 Definition

(a) The first sentence of this provision should be re-worded to read as follows:

“Canned shrimps or prawns is the processed meat of shrimps or prawns of similar size in any combination of species of the families Penaeidae, Pandalidae, Crangonidae and Palaemonidae.”

(b) The Spanish translation of “packing media” should be amended here and wherever else it occurs in the standard.

2.2 Designation

Delete this provision.

4.1 Ingredients

This provision should be amended to read as follows:

“The packing medium may consist of water, salt, lemon juice and sugars only.”

4.2 Raw Material

Re-number 4.2 to read 4.1, and re-number 4.1 to read 4.2

4.3(b) Odour and flavour

(1) The word “objectionable” should be translated as “anormale” in the French version of the standard.

(2) The second sentence of this provision should be amended to read as follows:

“The natural odour and flavour reminiscent of iodoform is acceptable unless it is excessive.”

4.3(d) Peeling

Delete the word “nearly” in the expression “nearly free of shells. . .”.

4.3(f) Tolerances

Delete the word “other” in the expression “other defects”.

5. FOOD ADDITIVES

The last sentence in the food additive section should be expanded to make it clear that, in addition, colours or mixtures of colours may be added at the level provided for in the standard for the purpose of restoring colour lost in processing.

8.1 The Name of the Food

This provision should read as follows:

“The name of the product shall be “shrimp” or “shrimps” or “prawns”. Consequential amendments should be made in other parts of the standard.

8.3 Net Contents

The above heading should read “Quantity of Contents”.

10.1 Drained Weight

In 10.1(a), the word “nor” should read “or”. The Spanish version of this provision should be corrected to make it clear that the figure of 75°F is a maximum not a minimum temperature. The Commission agreed that it would be necessary to make a number of minor amendments in the section on the determination of drained weight (rounding off of temperatures in degrees C, specifications for circular sieves to be in conformity with ISO standards).

87. The Commission agreed that the following points should be recorded in the report of the session:

- a. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that a product processed by heat before being sealed in a container could not be regarded as having been fully preserved and that the shelf-life of such a product would be shorter than that of a product processed by heat after having been sealed in the container. Other delegations pointed out that modern methods of aseptic filling enabled an adequately preserved product to be prepared.
- b. The delegation of Spain requested that the ingredients section of the standard should provide for the use of vinegar and olive oil. The Commission agreed not to expand the ingredients section, as it considered that products prepared with such ingredients were specialty products. The delegation of Spain reserved its position.
- c. The Commission agreed that the additives listed in the standard could be added to the packing medium before filling. A number of delegations reserved their positions on various additives listed in the standard. The following delegations requested that their reservations be recorded. The delegations of Spain and Portugal reserved their positions on the use of calcium disodium EDTA and colours. The delegation of Italy also reserved its position on colours and on certain other additives, in particular, calcium disodium EDTA. The delegation of Portugal also reserved its position on the use of orthophosphoric acid. The delegation of Peru reserved its position since there were a number of additives listed which were not permitted to be used in Peru. The delegation of Japan reserved its position on the use of calcium disodium EDTA.

- d. The Commission agreed that there should be no reference in the standard to section 5.2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, dealing with irradiated foods. The use of ionizing radiation was excluded by the definition section of the standard, and there was the possibility that the attraction of section 5.2 of the General Labelling Standard might be construed to mean that the use of ionizing radiation was permitted.
- e. The Spanish delegation drew the Commission's attention to the generic name "camarones" (shrimps), stating that in the Spanish version of the standard, the word "camarones" could include various species, which in Spain and in other countries would need to be named specifically, in order to avoid confusion in international trade. The Spanish delegation gave the following list of species to the Secretariat. The Secretariat undertook to check whether all of the abovelisted species were intended to be covered by the standard.

Camarón	:	Leander serratus
Quisquilla	:	Changon grangon
Gamba	:	Penaeus longirostris
Langostino	:	Penaeus keraturus
Carabinero	:	Plesiopenaeus edwardsianus

- f. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany mad a general statement on date-marking of certain products of animal origin. In the Federal Republic of Germany, regulations requiring date-marking of such products had been in force for a number of years and had given satisfactory results. The delegation proposed that date-marking (either the date of manufacture or date beyond which the product should not be consumed) would be informative to the consumer. The delegation of Sweden supported this proposal in principle and indicated that Sweden would be introducing mandatory durability marking in 1971. The Commission decided, however, to make no change in the standard in this connection.
- g. The Commission was informed that the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling had taken the view that the provision on size determination did not warrant endorsement, and that this provision could be associated with section 4.3 (f) of the standard dealing with tolerances for defects. The Commission considered a proposal made by the French delegation to replace the method for the determination of water capacity of a container by an ISO method (ISO/R90) and agreed to leave the text unchanged, since the provision in the standard was strictly related to the method endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

88. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for Canned Shrimps or Prawns to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reserved its position on this decision, because they thought there were a number of points in the standard which required reconsideration.

Draft General Standard for Edible Fungi and Fungus Products

89. The Commission considered the General Standard for Edible Fungi and Fungus Products, which was contained in Appendix II of ALINORM 70/19. The Commission agreed on the following amendments to the standard:

I. SCOPE

This section should be amended to read as follows:

“This standard contains general requirements applicable to all edible fungi, whether fresh or processed, permitted for sale by the competent authorities in the consuming countries, except canned cultivated mushrooms of the genus Agaricus. Different requirements for the products covered by this standard may be laid down in group of products standards or in individual standards.”

II.1.2 “boletus edulis” should read “Boletus edulis”. The word “morels” should be replaced by the word “Morchella”

II.1.18 Add new sub-section 1.18: “Cakes or loaves of fungus mycelium”

II.2.4 This sub-section should be amended to read as follows:

“2.4 “Maggot damaged fungi” are fungi having holes caused by maggots.

2.4.1 “Seriously maggot damaged fungi” are fungi having four or more holes caused by maggots.”

In the French version of the standard, “maggot damaged fungi” should be translated as “champignons vermiculés”.

III.1.1 Insert the word “practically” before “clean”.

III.1.3.1(c) This provision should read as follows:

“Content of maggot max. 6% by weight of total damage including not more
damaged fungi - than 2% serious damage.”

III.1.3.2(c) This provision should read as follows:

“Content of maggot max. 1% by weight of total damage including not more
damaged fungi - than 0.5% serious damage.”

III.2.2.(e) “Refined vegetable oil” should read “refined edible vegetable oil”.

III.3.1.1(b) This provision should read as follows:

“Water content - max. 6% freeze-dried
 - max. 12% dried other than freeze-dried, except for
 Shiita-ke mushrooms for which the maximum water
 content shall be 13%.”

III.3.1.2(b) This provision should read as follows:

“Organic impurities of - max. 0.02%, except for Shiita-ke mushrooms for which
vegetable origin the maximum shall be 1%”

III.3.1.2(c) This provision should read as follows:

“Content of maggot - for wild growing fungi:

III.3.3.1 Add new sub-section (c) as follows:

“(c) Vinegar - max. 2% expressed as acetic acid.”

“Content of maggot
damaged fungi

- for wild growing fungi:
max. 6% by weight of total damage including not more
than 2% serious damage.
- for cultivated fungi: max. 1% by weight of damage
including not more than 0.5% serious damage.”

IV. FOOD ADDITIVES

VI.1.1 Minimum Fill

VI.1.2(b) Delete the provision “Sauce or oil packs” which was in square brackets []

VIII.1.1 The Name of the Food

“The method of processing to which the product has been subjected, e.g. “dried” or “sterilized” or “quick-frozen” shall be indicated on the label.”

VIII.1.6 Add the following sub-section VIII.1.6 which had been inadvertently omitted from the standard:

VIII.2 List of Ingredients

IX.3 Determination of Washed Drained Weight: Sauce Packs, in Oil

- a. The Commission agreed that the scope section should be amended to exclude canned cultivated mushrooms of the genus *Agaricus*, for which a standard was being developed by the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables. The representative of the Economic Commission for Europe requested that fresh cultivated mushrooms for which the ECE had adopted a Recommendation should be excluded from the scope of the standard. The delegation of Poland indicated that there was no conflict between this General Standard and the standard being developed by the ECE and the Commission decided not to exclude fresh cultivated mushrooms from the scope section of the standard.
- b. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany considered that the tolerance of 8% for organic impurities in the case of cultivated fungi was too high. The Commission noted that this was the figure which had been adopted in the ECE text for mushrooms in the lowest quality class (Class 2).
- c. With reference to section VIII.1.2 of the standard, the representative of the ECE drew attention to the fact that in the ECE text for fresh cultivated mushrooms, the Latin name of the species was not required to be declared. As the general standard required the declaration of the Latin name for fresh fungi, the representative of the ECE indicated his disagreement with the decision.
- d. The Commission was informed that the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling needed clarification on “mineral impurities which, after ashing, remain as insoluble residues in hydrochloric acid” as the two methods proposed, although both in conformity with this definition, dealt with different types of mineral “impurities” (sand, earth, but also mineral components of foods) and gave different results. The Commission was also informed that the figure inserted in the standard was generally based on results given after using the ISO/R 763 method and agreed that this question needed to be examined again by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. The delegation of Poland mentioned a document they had prepared on all methods of analysis (water, salt, sugars, etc.) for edible fungi. The Commission agreed that this document should be sent by the Secretariat to governments for comments and that the methods proposed should be examined by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its sixth session for endorsement. The Commission was informed that a method for the determination of washed drained weight had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its fourth session for edible fungi in sauce packs or in oil. This provision appeared in the standard for canned mushrooms being developed by the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables. The Commission decided to delete this provision from the general standard. It was pointed out by the delegation of Belgium that this method, based on washing with cold water, might be better replaced by a method using a solvent of oils. The Commission agreed that this question should be considered again by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its seventh session together with the document prepared by the delegation of Poland.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

91. The Commission agreed to advance the General Standard for Edible Fungi and Fungus Products to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Draft Standard for Dried Edible Fungi

92. The Commission considered the Standard for Dried Edible Fungi which was contained in Appendix III of ALINORM 70/19 and agreed on the following amendments to the standard:

End Product

- III.2. As a result of the decisions on the moisture content of dried fungi in the General Standard, consequential amendments should be made regarding moisture content for dried fungi in the standard.

Permitted Defects and Tolerances

- (a) To the words “a total of 25% by weight” the words “except for water content” should be added.
- III.3. The provisions on mineral impurities and organic impurities of vegetable
- 3.1 (b) origin should be in accordance with the provisions agreed upon in the General Standard.
- (c) In the French version of the standard “maggot damaged fungi” should be translated as “champignons vermiculés”.

VI.2. List of Ingredients

Delete this provision. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling that there was no need for a list of ingredients in this standard. **Official Control Stamp**

VI.6.

Delete this provision. The Commission agreed that as the provision headed “Official Control Stamp” was optional, it was covered by section 6.1 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

93. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for Dried Edible Fungi to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Draft European Regional Standard for Fresh Fungus Chanterelle

94. The Commission considered the above standard which was contained in Appendix IV of ALINORM 70/19 and agreed on the following amendments to the standard:

- II.1.4. “**Maggot damaged fungi**”. The provision should be amended to bring it into line with the provision agreed upon in the General Standard with respect to maggot damaged fungi.

VI.1. The Name of the Food

This provision should read as follows: “The product shall be designated both ‘chanterelle’ and ‘Cantharellus cibarius’.”

VI.5. Official Control Stamp

Delete this provision.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

95. The Commission agreed to advance the European Regional Standard for Fresh Fungus Chanterelle to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Regional Codex Standards.

General Comment on the Three Standards for Edible Fungi

96. The Commission expressed its appreciation of the excellent work done by the delegation of Poland and in particular Mr. Orlowski in the preparation of these three standards and in presenting them to the Commission. The Commission considered that it would be useful if a system of ‘rapporteurs’ could be applied in future to other standards coming before the Commission at Step 8 and asked the Executive Committee to consider what might be done in this regard.

Draft European Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters

97. The Committee had before it the above standard which was contained in Appendix V of ALINORM 70/19.

98. At the Seventh Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe the reference to “properties favourable to health” and “favourable physiological properties” in the definition of natural mineral waters proved, once again, to be a controversial subject. While the Coordinating Committee had recognized that such claims might be practicable on a national level, there was considerable doubt as to the validity of such claims on an international level. The Coordinating Committee for Europe had concluded that the Commission would require objective criteria substantiated by scientific evidence for any claims regarding properties favourable to health in order to evaluate the validity of such claims on an international level. The Coordinating Committee had been informed by a number of delegations that in their countries the competent national authorities had verified and sanctioned such claims. The Committee had requested the Secretariat, when issuing the report of the session of the Committee, to draw these matters to the attention of Member Governments. The Committee had further requested that those countries in which the national authorities had recognized specific natural mineral waters as having properties favourable to health should make available to the Commission the criteria on which such recognition had been given. In the meantime, the Committee had decided to make no change in the definition of natural mineral waters.

99. The Commission was informed by the Secretariat that none of the countries which had recognized specific natural mineral waters as having properties favourable to health had forwarded the criteria on the basis of which such recognition had been given.

100. The Commission also had before it a Secretariat note on the question of claims in respect of properties favourable to health. The Secretariat indicated that the views set out in the Secretariat note were those of FAO and WHO.

101. FAO and, in particular, WHO had questioned the validity of such claims on an international level and had given reasons for questioning such claims. The text of the Secretariat note, containing the views of FAO and WHO, was set out in document ALINORM 70/41.

102. The Commission noted that as Codex standards were published under the aegis of FAO and WHO, both FAO and WHO considered that they had an obligation to draw the attention of Member Governments to any provisions in any standard which the Organizations might find difficult to support or justify.

103. After a full exchange of views, the Commission agreed unanimously that the standard was not ready to be forwarded to Step 9. The Commission considered that no further progress could be made with the standard until those countries which had recognized specific natural mineral waters as having properties favourable to health were in a position to make available the criteria on which such recognition had been given. As soon as such criteria were sent to the Secretariat by the governments concerned, the Secretariat should prepare a paper containing (i) the criteria mentioned above, (ii) the Step 8 comments of governments on the standard, and (iii) the remarks of the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling. The Commission also agreed that medical opinion on claims would be required when the question was further discussed. The paper when prepared should be sent to governments for comment. When the comments had been received and summarized, the papers should be put before the Coordinating Committee for Europe for further consideration of the Standard at Step 7. It would be necessary for all the papers to be prepared and in the hands of Member Countries before the matter was further considered by the Coordinating Committee. The Commission agreed that the main point at issue was the definition of natural mineral waters. One delegation suggested that the definition of "mineral waters" should be carefully considered, because many countries which had not furnished comments might have waters that could be classified as "mineral waters", and which were consumed for health, religious and other reasons.

Draft Standard for Quick-Frozen Peas

104. The Commission considered the above standard which had been elaborated by the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick-Frozen Foods. The standard was contained in Appendix III of ALINORM 70/25. The following amendments to the text were agreed to:

1. SCOPE

In the second sentence the words “labelled as intended” were replaced by the words “indicated as intended”, to reflect accurately the decision of the Group of Experts.

2. DESCRIPTION

2.1 Product and process definition

Sub-paragraph 2.1(b) - The Commission agreed to alter the text as follows:

1. In the first sentence “an” was deleted.
2. So as to make it absolutely clear that only quickfrozen peas may be thawed and then re-packed, the last sentence was amended to read:

“The recognized practice of thawing and repacking quick-frozen products under controlled conditions followed by the reapplication of the quick-freezing process as defined is permitted.”

3. The Commission agreed that there should be a reference either by way of a footnote to the standard or by way of a note in the introductory section of the standard to the code of practice being developed by the Joint ECE/Codex Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick-Frozen Foods, indicating that more precise data regarding transport, storage and distribution would be drawn up in due course in that code. A number of delegations were not in agreement with this and thought that no reference should be made to a code either as a footnote to the standard or in the introductory section of the publication containing the standard. It was pointed out that the reference to the code would not form part of the provisions of the standard and would be for information purposes only.

2.2 Presentation

Sub-paragraph 2.2.1(b) - It was agreed that it would be useful to add a Latin American variety to the two examples of types of garden pea given in this section. In the Spanish version of the standard the word “arvejas” should be added after “guisantes”.

Sub-paragraph 2.2.2(b) (see also 3.3.3) - The Commission agreed to adopt the following text:

“If peas are size graded, they shall conform to one of the two following systems of specifications for the size names”.

While some delegates considered it desirable to make the size grades exclusive, whereby, with certain tolerances both downward and upward, the majority of the peas in a pack would have to be of the declared size, the Commission, after a full discussion, finally considered this unnecessary because of the self-regulating influence of the commercial value of the various

size grades of the product on packing practices. It was noted that in the standard no mention was made of a method of control for the size of grading.

3. ESSENTIAL COMPOSITION AND QUALITY FACTORS

3.1 Optional ingredients

The delegation of Poland was of the opinion that sugar should not be an optional ingredient. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany was opposed to the addition of sugar in any quantity. No change was made in this section of the standard.

3.2 Quality factors

3.2.1 Organoleptic and other characteristics

In the fifth item the words after “practically free from” were deleted so that the altered sentence reads: “practically free from foreign matter”.

3.2.2 Analytical characteristics

A number of delegations considered the limit set for alcohol-insoluble solids for garden peas at 19% m/m was too high. However, taking into consideration the effect of different climatic conditions and different quality requirements, the Commission decided not to reduce the limit.

3.3 Tolerances

3.3.2 Specification of defects

The delegation of Argentina expressed the view that in relation to “tolerances” the figures should read:

(b) Blemished peas	2% m/m
(c) Pea fragments	5% m/m

The majority of the Commission did not share this opinion, and no amendment was made to this section.

3.3.3 Tolerances for sizes (see also 2.2.2(b))

The Commission agreed to alter the text of this section to read:

“If size graded, the product shall contain at least 80% either by number or mass of peas of the declared size or of smaller sizes. It shall contain no peas of sizes larger than the next two larger sizes nor more than 20%, either by number or mass, of peas of the next two larger sizes, if such there be. Not more than one quarter of these peas either by number or mass, shall belong to the larger of the next two sizes.

5. CONTAMINANTS

The Commission decided to delete this section.

7.1 The name of the food

Taking into account the suggestion of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling at their fifth session, the above paragraph was re-edited in order to restrict the names to the designations given:

“The name of the product shall only include:

- a. The designation “peas”, except that where peas are presented in conformity with 2.2.1(b) the designation shall be “garden peas” or the equivalent designation used in the country in which the product is intended to be sold. The words “quick-frozen” shall also appear on the label, except that the term “frozen” may be applied in countries where this term is customarily used for describing the product processed in accordance with sub-section 2.1(b) of this standard.
- b. Where a characterizing flavouring or ingredient has been added, this shall be stated as “with X”, as appropriate.
- c. Where a statement of size is made, either the sieve size or the words “extra small”, “very small”, “small”, “medium” or “large”, as appropriate shall be indicated.

The Commission noted that in the French version of the standard the use of terms other than “surgelé” would not be permitted. The delegations of Australia, Canada, and the U.S.A. stated that the use of the term “frozen” should be permitted in the standard designating the product. The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany considered that a positive declaration of sugar as part of the name should be required in all cases where sugar was added to the product. It was pointed out that paragraph 7.1(b) would require the declaration of sugar, if it was regarded in a particular country as a “characteristic flavouring or ingredient”.

7.6 Additional provisions

The Commission deleted the sub-paragraphs (a) and (c), so that the paragraph now reads:

“The following additional specific provision applies to retail packs:

- a. there shall be information for keeping and thawing of the product.”

The delegation of Denmark, supported by a number of other delegations expressed its view that date-marking should be mandatory.

8. PACKAGING

Sub-paragraph 8(c) - The Commission agreed to add after the word “leakage” the words “as far as technologically practicable”.

Sub-paragraph 8(d) - in the French version of the standard the word “foreign” should be translated as “anormale”.

9. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

The Commission agreed to a general method of net weight determination in quick-frozen fruits and vegetables which had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its fifth session. The Commission was informed that this Committee had not considered thawing and cooking procedures as methods of analysis in the true sense needing endorsement and had referred them back to the Group of Experts with minor editorial amendments. The Commission agreed to the method for the determination of alcohol insoluble solids, noting however that it would be desirable for this method to be tested collaboratively at the levels prescribed in the standard (19–23%). In the light of the results obtained the method could be re-examined by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling in due course. The Commission was informed that no method had been proposed for the determination of sizing of quick-frozen peas and that standard laboratory sieves (e.g. ISO scale) conforming with the specifications in para. 2.2.2 did not appear to be available. The Commission agreed that no referee method was needed at this stage and that, should such a method be developed, this could be included in the Code of Practice for Quick-Frozen Foods to be elaborated by the Joint ECE/Codex Group of Experts on Quick-Frozen Foods.

105. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that in German “peas” and “garden peas” would be translated as “Palerbsen” and “Markerbsen”, respectively.

Advancement of Standard to Step 9

106. The Commission agreed to advance the Standard for QuickFrozen Peas to Step 9 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Draft Standards for Apricot, Peach and Pear Nectars, Apple Juice, Orange Juice, Lemon Juice and Grapefruit Juice

107. The Commission had before it the above draft standards which were contained in Appendices II to VI of ALINORM 70/14.

108. The Commission noted that the volume of government comments on the draft standards was very extensive and that a considerable number of the comments were on points of substance which had proved to be controversial in the Group of Experts and on which the Group of Experts had not reached a consensus of opinion. The Commission also noted a number of inconsistencies in the labelling provisions of some of the draft standards to which the Codex Committee on Food Labelling had drawn attention. In these circumstances, the Commission decided that the draft standards were not ready for advancement to Step 9, and agreed to proceed in accordance with the following proposals which had been put forward by the delegation of the United Kingdom:

1. The draft standards should be returned to the ECE/Codex Group of Experts on Fruit Juices for consideration at Step 7 and the Group of Experts should return them to the Commission for consideration at Step 8 if, in the opinion of the Group, they were ready for advancement to Step 9. The Group should, in any event, present a full report to the next session of the Commission on the specific points set out below.
2. The Group should be instructed to take particular note of the following observations and to report on them to the Commission and on any other matters, as appropriate. In considering the draft standards, the Group should also take into account the government comments at Step 8 (ALINORM 70/41 and Addenda), the decisions of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling at its fifth session (ALINORM 70/22, paragraphs 14–16 etc.) and of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its fifth session (ALINORM 70/23, paragraphs 19–47).
3. The Group should take into account the following points made by the Commission:
 - I. The labelling provisions should be consistent and reasons should be given in full for any proposed differences. Particular points on labelling are:
 - b. the need for a declaration of ingredients;
 - c. the name of the unsweetened and “natural” products and the inclusion in the name of the sweetened products, or elsewhere on the label, of a reference to “sweetened” or to the kind of sweetening;
 - d. the declaration of added water;
 - e. the description of products made from concentrates.
 - II. The addition of sugars to the juices should be reexamined. Particular points are:
 - b. should the addition of sugars be allowed without restriction, with a limit or not allowed at all;
 - c. what is the effect of added sugar on analysis and enforcement;
 - d. what is the effect on labelling.
 - III. Given the natural variations in the raw materials, the practices of blending juices and the use of adding concentrate, are products reconstituted from a concentrate different from other products and, if so, how different; can the difference be detected on the endproduct and is there a need for a labelling declaration, or can inspection of manufacturing facilities and knowledge of import practices be relied upon to control reconstitution?
 - IV. Should the standards be expressed on fruit solids or on total soluble solids; what should the levels be; how would they be expressed (see Methods of Analysis Report, paragraphs 22 and 41) and how would they be enforced?
 - V. The sampling provisions should be reconsidered in the light of decisions reached by the Commission (see paragraphs 122–125 of the Report of the Seventh Session).
 - VI. The question of separate standards as mentioned in the U.S.A. Step 8 comments (ALINORM 70/41, pages 23 and 35) should be examined, provided

that a working paper by the U.S.A. is distributed in time for it to be considered before the meeting of the Group.”

Tolerances for Pesticide Residues

109. The Commission examined a number of tolerances, temporary tolerances and practical residue limits contained in Appendix IV of ALINORM 70/24.

Diphenyl

110. A number of delegations considered that the proposed tolerance of 110 ppm was too high and that it should be reduced to 70 ppm. Other delegations pointed out that the proposed limit should not be reduced since it was necessary if diphenyl was to be used to protect citrus fruit during transit over long distances. It was also pointed out that levels of diphenyl tended to decrease on storage and that there was no evidence of hazard to health at levels of 110 ppm. The Committee agreed to advance the tolerance of 110 ppm of diphenyl to Step 9 of the Procedure while noting that a large number of delegations were in favour of a limit of 70 ppm.

Heptachlor

111. The delegation of the U.S.A. pointed out that meat from 13 countries imported in the U.S.A. had been found in certain cases to contain pesticide residues of up to 0.3 ppm on a fat basis. The delegation of the U.S.A. also stated that, although few lots were detected in excess of 0.2 ppm, the economic waste of destroying meat containing between 0.2 and 0.3 ppm would not be justified. The delegation of the Netherlands said that a similar survey in his country had shown no residues above 0.1 ppm. The Commission agreed that this practical residue limit should be returned to Step 7 of the Procedure so that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues could give further study to the evidence mentioned by the delegations of the United States and the Netherlands.

112. The Commission agreed to omit the residue limit for whole milk and to amend the practical residue limit for milk products to read “milk and milk products: 0.125 on a fat basis”. The delegation of the United Kingdom raised the question whether it was necessary to express the limit to three significant figures. The Commission decided not to amend the residue limit but to draw the point to the attention of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

113. The Commission agreed to advance the temporary tolerances and practical residue limits for heptachlor, with the amendments set out above, to Step 9 of the Procedure.

Hydrogen Phosphide

114. The Commission agreed to advance the tolerance of 0.1 ppm of hydrogen phosphide in raw cereals to Step 9 of the Procedure.

Inorganic Bromide

115. The delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that there was evidence that the breakdown of the organic brominated fumigants to inorganic bromide was often not complete. It would be prudent to return all tolerances above 50 ppm to the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues for further study. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany supported this view. A number of delegations pointed out that the limits above 50 ppm, expressed as inorganic bromide, were in foods which were consumed in relatively small amounts, that it was necessary to allow for residues naturally present in some foods, and that there was a high acceptable daily intake for inorganic bromide. Furthermore, the tolerances were temporary and were scheduled for review in 1970/71 by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

116. The Commission agreed to advance the temporary tolerances for inorganic bromide to Step 9 of the Procedure.

Piperonyl Butoxide

117. The Commission agreed to advance the temporary tolerances for piperonyl butoxide to Step 9 of the Procedure.

Pyrethrins

118. The Commission agreed to advance the temporary tolerances for pyrethrins to Step 9 of the Procedure.

General

119. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew attention to the fact that the rather large differences in legal tolerances in different countries might be explained by different systems of official control. They therefore suggested that all Codex tolerances should be reviewed when the subject became more clearly understood.

120. The Commission agreed that a statement should be included in the introduction to pesticide residue tolerances and limits sent out for acceptance at Step 9, pointing out that they were of a temporary nature and would be subject to review by the Commission.

121. The delegation of Cuba expressed concern that the consideration of methods of analysis to verify the limits for pesticide residues was being left in abeyance year after year. The delegation of India stated that unless suitable methods of analysis were elaborated, the tolerances recommended by the Commission would not have practical application to food control. The Secretariat pointed out that, wherever possible, the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues recommended suitable methods of analysis for the determination of pesticide residues. The delegation of India outlined the results of a study which had been made in 1968 on the effects of low and high dietary protein levels on the toxicity of pesticide residues. The

Secretariat drew the Commission's attention to the fact that a Group of Experts convened by WHO in 1966 had studied the toxicity of pesticide residues in relation to malnutrition.

PART IX

SAMPLING PLANS

122. The Commission decided to consider as a separate matter the question of the suitability of the Sampling Plans for Prepackaged Foods (ALINORM 69/27) in respect of the foods for which standards had been adopted at Step 9 or were before the Commission at Step 8. The Commission noted that the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling at its fifth session had not endorsed the proposed use of the Sampling Plans in the standards before the Commission at Step 8. However, at its fourth session, the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling had endorsed the use of the Sampling Plans in a number of standards for processed fruits and vegetables at Step 9. The Committee had expressed the opinion that the Sampling Plans did not appear to be suitable for enforcement purposes although not all Codex Commodity Committees had had an opportunity to express an opinion on the suitability of the Sampling Plans for the foods for which they were elaborating standards. The Danish delegation informed the Commission of the views of a Working Group of the Danish National Codex Committee. It was agreed that a paper which had been prepared by this Working Group should be sent to the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling and also that information copies should be made available to ISO/TC 34.

123. A number of delegations expressed views in accordance with the conclusions of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling and, in particular, that the Sampling Plans appeared to be more suitable for production quality control rather than enforcement purposes. The delegation of the U.S.A. informed the Commission that for many years Sampling Plans such as those contained in ALINORM 69/27 had been used satisfactorily for enforcement purposes in the U.S.A. In particular the Sampling Plans were quite appropriate for the checking of quality criteria and quality defects in products such as processed fruits and vegetables, fruit juices and other similar canned foods. The delegation of the U.S.A. further thought it would be essential that Codex Commodity Committees should be responsible for determining acceptance quality levels (AQL).

124. The Commission noted that Sampling Plans based on a 95% probability were available with AQLs from 0.15% to 15%, but the delegation of Canada pointed out that, in its opinion, this was not the correct statistical approach to the problem for enforcement purposes. Several delegations expressed doubt as to the suitability of the Sampling Plans in ALINORM 69/27 for all prepackaged foods and considered that it would be essential for Codex Commodity Committees to examine these plans with particular reference to determining appropriate AQLs for quality criteria and quality defects in individual foods. In addition, it was generally agreed that such plans might not be applicable to other criteria such as identity characteristics

and health or safety criteria, e.g. pesticide residues and food additives, and that different appropriate sampling plans might be required for enforcement control of such criteria.

125. The Commission agreed that in the case of the standards at Step 8 containing provisions relating to the Sampling Plans, these provisions should not be amended. The Commission decided to request the Executive Committee to consider at its next session whether or not a special session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis should be convened to examine the whole question of the Sampling Plans or whether any other action should be taken in the light of the observations of Codex Commodity Committees and their recommendations concerning appropriate AQLs.

PART X

CONSIDERATION OF STANDARDS AT STEP 5 OF THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS

126. The Commission considered the under-mentioned standards at Step 5.

(a) Cocoa Products and Chocolate

In the absence of information from governments on (a) values for the different categories of cocoa butter provided for in the standard and (b) the quality of substandard cocoa beans to be used for the manufacture of cocoa products and chocolate, and noting that there were a number of provisions in the standard on which the Committee had not yet taken a final position, the Commission decided to return the standard to Step 4 of the Procedure.

(b) Processed Fruits and Vegetables

The Commission agreed to advance the standards for processed raisins, processed tomato concentrate, canned pears and canned mandarin oranges to Step 6 of the Procedure. The delegations of Yugoslavia and Portugal reserved their positions regarding the provision permitting the use of certain colours in the draft standard for canned pears. The delegation of Yugoslavia reserved its position on the figure for SO₂ in the draft standard for processed raisins. The delegation of Japan stated that, while it agreed with the decision of the Commission to advance the above standards to Step 6, it would be necessary to make a few amendments and to correct an editorial error in the draft standard for canned mandarin oranges. The delegation of Japan expressed the wish that this be done at a later stage.

(c) Fish and Fishery Products

The Commission decided to advance the standards for (a) quickfrozen fillets of plaice and (b) quick-frozen fillets of ocean perch to Step 6 of the Procedure with an instruction that the

Committee should not advance them to Step 8 of the Procedure until it was satisfied that it had satisfactorily resolved the problems on defects. The delegations of Australia and Canada had reservations regarding the scope section of these standards and expressed the view that all frozen fillets of fish of these species should be required to comply with the standard.

(d) Processed Meat Products

The Commission decided to advance the standards for canned hams, canned corned beef, canned luncheon meat and canned chopped meat to Step 6 of the Procedure. The Commission noted that there were still a number of issues yet to be resolved, particularly the questions of the method of assessing the meat content of meat products and the methods of analysis to be used. The Commission instructed the SubCommittee that they should not advance these standards to Step 8 of the Procedure until they were satisfied that these issues had been satisfactorily resolved.

(e) Quick-Frozen, Spinach and Raspberries

The Commission, having noted that the standards for quick-frozen spinach and quick-frozen raspberries followed the pattern of the standard which had been adopted for quick-frozen peas, agreed to advance these two standards to Step 6 of the Procedure. The Commission agreed that the Joint ECE/Codex Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick-Frozen Foods should, when examining these two standards, pay close attention to the decisions which the Commission had taken regarding the standard for quick-frozen peas.

(f) Foods for Special Dietary Uses

The Commission decided to advance the standard for low sodium foods to Step 6 of the Procedure.

(g) Pesticide Residues

The Commission decided to advance the tolerances for pesticide residues set out in Appendix VII of ALINORM 70/24 to Step 6 of the Procedure. The Commission recommended that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should, when examining these tolerances, establish more precise definitions of the products in which residues were being controlled. The Commission directed the Committee's attention to the change which it had made in the wording of some of the Step 8 tolerances already adopted in respect of certain residues in milk and milk products.

(h) Hygiene

The Commission agreed to advance the Code of Hygienic Practice for Tree Nuts to Step 6 of the Procedure. The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago enquired whether the code applied to coconuts. The delegation of the U.S.A. stated that it was understood that the code did not apply to coconuts. The Commission agreed that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene

should reconsider the scope section to ensure that the extent of the application of the code was made absolutely clear.

(i) Meat - Descriptions of Cutting Methods of Commercial Units of Carcasses, Halves and Quarters in International Trade

The delegation of the Argentine stated that the draft descriptions of cutting methods contained a number of minor errors. The Commission decided to advance the descriptions of cutting methods to Step 6 of the Procedure. It noted that pistol cuts were not included in the draft descriptions before it but agreed that it would be open to the Committee to recommend that Steps 6, 7 and 8 be omitted in the case of pistol cuts which would enable the descriptions of cutting methods, including pistol cuts, to be adopted by the Commission at Step 8 at one and the same time.

PART XI

LABELLING PROVISIONS IN THE STEP 9 SUGARS STANDARDS

127. The Commission had before it ALINORM 70/40 which had been prepared by the Chairman of the Commission concerning the labelling provisions in the Step 9 sugars standards. A problem had arisen as to what was the intention of the sixth session of the Commission as to the labelling provisions in these standards.

128. There was no statement in the Report of the Sixth Session of the Commission to the effect that the provisions of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods should be attracted to the sugars standards. However, the labelling provisions of the General Standards had been attracted in the case of a number of other Step 9 standards which had been adopted by the Commission at its sixth session. The Chairman of the Commission indicated that it was his impression that it was the intention of the Commission to apply the provisions of the General Standard as finally approved by the Commission to all the commodity standards except where the Codex Committee concerned had positively decided otherwise and its decision had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling.

129. The Codex Committee on Sugars did not meet during 1969 but it was the Chairman's opinion that the final position of the Sugars Committee was that, apart from the special provisions on labelling which the Committee had included in its standards, it was ready to accept the final provisions of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods for inclusion in the standards in the form finally approved by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling and the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The major discrepancy so far as the sugars standards were concerned was the provision on country of origin, though the point of principle was a more general one. The Commission agreed with the Chairman's view and decided that the relevant provisions of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged

Foods should be attracted in the Step 9 sugars standards. As far as the declaration of country of origin was concerned, this would mean that such a declaration would not be mandatory.

CONSIDERATION OF THE NEED FOR A STANDARD FOR

POWDERED DEXTROSE

130. At the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on Sugars, held in London in September 1968, the question of a standard for powdered dextrose (icing sugar) was considered and Member Countries were asked to let the Secretariat know whether a standard was necessary, accompanied by information concerning national production and international trade. Information had been received from a number of countries. The Committee decided to refer to the Commission the question of whether a standard for powdered dextrose should be elaborated. A first draft of a standard for this product was attached as Appendix II to ALINORM 70/36.

131. The Commission agreed that a standard for powdered dextrose should be proceeded with. The Commission decided that the draft appearing in Appendix II to ALINORM 70/36 could be regarded as sufficiently satisfactory at Step 2 of the Procedure for it to be sent out to governments for comment at Step 3. The Commission instructed the Secretariat to draw the particular attention of governments to paragraphs 6 and 7 of ALINORM 70/36 regarding the quality criteria and the designation of the product. The comments received should be collated by the United Kingdom Secretariat of the Sugars Committee, who should advise the Commission on whether the nature of the comments made it seem possible and advisable for the Commission itself to deal with Steps 4 and 5 at its next session, or whether a further session of the Sugars Committee to deal with Step 4 was required.

PART XII

THE IDEA OF A GENERAL STANDARD

132. The Commission considered ALINORM 70/37 which contained government comments on a paper entitled "The Idea of a General Standard" which had been prepared by the delegation of the United Kingdom to the Codex Committee on General Principles.

133. A number of delegations said that they were in the process of drafting the general provisions of their food law and international agreement on the necessary general provisions would be helpful. It was pointed out that without such general provisions there would be a lacuna in the Codex Alimentarius, but that the differences in the legal structure in different countries would make it very difficult to accept the precise wording of any general standard. It might be better to regard the proposal as a general indication of the provisions which should

appear in any food law, to which Member Governments should be invited to express agreement in principle.

134. The Commission decided that further work should be done on the General Standard without taking any decision as to whether it should finally take the form of a Codex Standard or a code of practice or a general preamble to Codex standards.

135. The delegation of the United Kingdom undertook to revise the draft standard in the light of the comments received, and to prepare a paper which would include this redraft, together with any government comments for revision which had been taken account of in the revised draft. It would also reconsider those points of the paper on the General Principles of Food Legislation prepared by the French Secretariat for the First Session of the Codex Committee on General Principles (ALINORM 65/9) which had not been taken account of in the revised standard. The United Kingdom should submit the paper to the Secretariat so that it might be circulated for government comments at Step 3 of the Procedure. In the light of the comments received, the Secretariat, in consultation with the United Kingdom, should advise the Commission how it should proceed with the standard and in particular whether it should deal with Steps 4 and 5 itself or whether a further session of the General Principles Committee was required to deal with Step 4. It should also advise on whether the standard should be proceeded with as a Codex standard, a code of practice or as a preamble to the Codex Alimentarius.

PART XIII

DEFINITION OF “FOOD ADDITIVE”, “CONTAMINANT” AND “PROCESS”

136. The Commission had before it a working paper containing government comments on the definition of “food additive”, “contaminant” and “process” (ALINORM 70/38 and Add. 1).

137. The Commission decided that, as the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues had not been able to submit a definition for “pesticide residues”, it would not be practicable to examine the definitions for “food additive” and “contaminant” at this session. The Chairman emphasized that the purpose of the definitions was not to delineate the terms of reference of the Codex Committees on Food Additives and Pesticide Residues, but to define the terms used in the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius. The delegations of Japan and the Netherlands considered that the definition of food additives was not satisfactory and would have to be re-examined. This view was supported by the delegates of Belgium, Spain, France, Austria and Ireland. The Commission's attention was drawn to the work of Prof. E.J. Bigwood in this field. The Codex Committees on Food Additives and Pesticide Residues were requested to re-examine the question of definitions and to make recommendations to the next session of the Commission.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE USE OF FOOD ADDITIVES

138. The Commission had before it a working paper containing the General Principles for the Use of Food Additives (ALINORM 70/39). It was noted that only one country had sent a reply. The delegation of the U.S.A. considered that paragraph 1(i) of the General Principles should be deleted as it would be difficult for the responsible authorities to establish in each case whether the use of certain manufacturing practices, which were economically and technologically feasible, could replace the use of a proposed food additive. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany considered that some amendment might be made to paragraph 1(i) but that the substance of the section should be retained as in their opinion, food additives should not be permitted unless it could be demonstrated that their use was absolutely essential. The Commission noted that the English, French and Spanish texts of paragraph 1(i) were not identical. A number of delegations and the representative of the International Organization of Consumers Unions supported the retention of paragraph 1(i) as it appeared in the French text.

139. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed the addition of a new item concerning the justification of the addition to food of substances for special dietary purposes. The delegation of Ireland drew the Commission's attention to a deficiency in the wording of paragraph 1(e), since the level, i.e. quantity of a food additive used, was only one of the many aspects to be considered when evaluating the hazard to health of the consumer. Other delegations considered that the possibility of additive, synergistic as well as potentiating effects should also be taken into consideration in the wording of this paragraph. The delegations of Canada, Netherlands and U.S.A. were of the opinion that the General Principles for the Use of Food Additives as amended should be printed in the Procedural Manual for the guidance of Codex Commodity Committees.

140. The Commission agreed to the addition of the following sentence as a new paragraph 1(e): "to provide essential components for foods for special dietary uses". It was agreed to amend paragraph 1(i) as follows: "when the desired effect can be obtained by other manufacturing practices which are economically and technologically satisfactory".

141. The Commission adopted provisionally the amended General Principles for the Use of Food Additives as a guide for Codex Committees (see Appendix VI to this Report). It was agreed that governments should be requested to comment on this text and that these comments should be studied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives with the view to the submission of a final text to the Commission which might be printed in the Procedural Manual.

LIST OF FOOD COLOURS

142. The Commission had before it a list of food colours contained in Appendix XVI of ALINORM 70/12. This was an addition to the open list of food colours (Appendix X of the Report of the Sixth Session of the Commission) which had been sent to governments for

information. It was emphasized that it had not been intended to do more than send this list to governments for information and that, if the Codex Committee on Food Additives wished such lists to be sent to governments for comment (see paragraph 92 of ALINORM 70/12), they should request the Secretariat to circulate them at Step 3 of the Procedure.

143. The Chairman pointed out that if the Codex Committee on Food Additives were to produce an exclusive list on food colours, it would be necessary to pass it through all the Steps of the Procedure and to send it to governments for acceptance. Open lists could only be issued by the Commission for information and not as part of the Procedure.

144. Several delegations said that they considered that there would be little point in submitting the lists to governments for comments. Other delegations considered that the lists should not be given even the approval of the Commission on an information basis, without first being submitted to governments for comment. A number of delegations drew attention to the danger of the Codex Committee on Food Additives proceeding with open lists without considering the question of the harmonization of the provisions on permitted colours in the legislation of the various Member Countries. The delegations of Ghana and Trinidad and Tobago mentioned the equal importance of making available lists of prohibited colours to Member Countries.

145. The Commission agreed that the proposed list of colours should be printed as an Appendix to the Report for the information of Member Governments and Codex Commodity Committees. If any Member Country should wish to put forward comments on the list to the next session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives, they would have every opportunity to do so.

146. The Commission considered that the Secretariat might make available to the Codex Committee on Food Additives information on colours that should be prohibited. If such a paper was prepared, it would be circulated to Member Governments as a working paper for the Food Additives Committee.

PART XIV

CODEX GENERAL SUBJECT COMMITTEES

Report of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (ALINORM 70/13)

147. The Commission had before it the Report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, introduced by Mr. S.D. Fine (U.S.A.).

148. The delegation of Ghana stressed the potential importance of the work being done by the Committee to developing countries. Although the attendance by developing countries at the meetings of the above Committee was usually rather limited, the Ghanaian delegation considered that the Committee should give urgent attention to the specific problems of

developing countries in respect of hygiene. The Commission agreed that this point should be brought to the attention of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

149. The Commission discussed the proposal of an addition (paragraph (e)) to the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The original version of this proposal was contained on page 2, paragraph 5, of ALINORM 70/13. The proposal was revised at the 14th and 15th sessions of the Executive Committee (ALINORM 70/3 and 70/4). The following version was put before the Commission for consideration:

“The Committee may refer, where necessary, specific food hygiene problems, including, in particular, microbiological methodology and sampling, for consideration to FAO and/or WHO, to bodies set up by them and to other organizations recognized by FAO and WHO to be appropriate in respect of such reference.”

150. A number of delegations considered that such an amendment would give too great a scope to the Committee to refer matters to outside bodies without the knowledge and agreement of the Commission. The Commission agreed not to proceed with the amendment to the terms of reference but to instruct the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene to consult the Executive Committee when it wished to refer problems for study to bodies outside the normal ambit of the Commission.

151. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the United States of America.

Report of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (ALINORM 70/22)

152. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, introduced by Dr. D.G. Chapman (Canada). The Commission noted the views of the Committee as recorded in paragraph 3 of the Committee's report, and asked the Secretariat to circulate, for the information of the Chairmen of Codex Commodity Committees, the recommendations contained in Appendix III of the Report of the Fourth Session of the Committee (ALINORM 69/22).

153. The Commission considered further the need to amend the Committee's terms of reference so that it could consider advertisements, particularly in relation to claims in labelling. The Commission agreed to the following addition to the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling:

“(d) to study problems associated with the advertisement of food with particular reference to claims and misleading descriptions.”

154. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Canada.

Report of the Codex Committee on Food Additives (ALINORM 70/12)

155. The Commission had before it the Report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives introduced by Dr. P. Berben (Netherlands). The Committee had requested authority to elaborate specifications of purity for sodium chloride. The Commission noted that the Executive Committee had requested the Secretariat to examine in more detail the feasibility of elaborating standards for salt and to report to a future session of the Commission. The Commission agreed that the Codex Committee on Food Additives could elaborate specifications of purity for sodium chloride but it should not give the work a high priority.

156. The progress of the work on specifications for food additives was described to the Commission. The Codex Committee on Food Additives considered that no progress could be made until all the specifications were consolidated into a single working document on which governments could be asked to comment. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should investigate what was possible in this regard. The Commission further requested the Codex Committee on Food Additives to consider in what manner the specifications could be brought before the Commission for final approval.

157. The question was raised of the withdrawal of an endorsed additive from a completed standard. It was agreed that the Secretariat would immediately bring the recommendation to the attention of the Executive Committee in order to obtain authority to put it before Member Countries.

158. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew attention to the proposal of the Codex Committee on Food Additives to study additives in soft drinks. They saw grave dangers in the Codex Committee on Food Additives studying additives in a commodity for which there was no Codex Commodity Committee. The delegation of the United Kingdom thought that this was a point on which the Commission might need to give a directive to the Codex Committee on Food Additives. The delegation of France supported the views expressed by the delegation of the United Kingdom. The delegation of Canada pointed out that the intention of the Codex Committee on Food Additives was that this list of additives actually used in soft drinks would only be for information purposes, in order to enable the Committee to make a better estimate of the total load of food additives in the diet.

159. The Commission again emphasized that Codex Commodity Committees should carefully consider the technological need for the additives they inserted in their standards and should give a clear indication on the subject to the Codex Committee on Food Additives. The delegation of Switzerland proposed that the Commission should instruct the Codex Committee on Food Additives not to proceed with its work on flour treatment agents. The Commission decided by 18 votes to 5 with 6 abstentions not to accept the proposal of the delegation of Switzerland.

160. The Commission confirmed, under Rule IX.10, that the Codex Committee on Food Additives should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Netherlands.

Report of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (ALINORM 70/24)

161. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues introduced by Dr. P. Berben (Netherlands).

162. The Committee considered it essential to set up an ad hoc drafting group to consider the differences in national application of residue limits. The Commission agreed to authorize the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to set up an ad hoc working group. Meetings of the group would be subject to:

- a. the Directors-General being satisfied that the information required by the proposed ad hoc group was available;
- b. the session of the group being open to all Member Countries of the Commission who wished to attend;
- c. the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and the Directors-General being satisfied that it was preferable for the points at issue to be discussed in the ad hoc working group rather than in the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

163. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues raised the question of the acceptance of pesticide residues. The Commission reaffirmed the decision taken at its sixth session that there was no question of Codex tolerances for pesticide residues applying only to imported produce. It was pointed out that Codex standards applied to pesticide residues not to the use of pesticides. A Member Country accepting a Codex residue tolerance was not thereby prohibited from controlling the use of a pesticide. It was certainly not compelled to encourage the use of a pesticide that was not required within its territories. If a pest was not present in a country's agriculture, it was not required to permit a pesticide to control such a pest. However, the tolerance for the pesticide residue concerned would apply to all food distributed within the territorial jurisdiction of the country accepting the standard. Some delegations stated that, if the Committee thought there was merit in modifying the meaning of full acceptance for pesticide residues to provide for full acceptance of a Codex standard with a larger tolerance for imported products while banning the use of the pesticide entirely or applying a lower tolerance for domestically produced products, it should set forth its views and recommendations to the Commission.

164. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Netherlands.

Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (ALINORM 70/23)

165. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling which was introduced by the Chairman, Prof. R. Franck (Federal Republic of Germany).

166. The Commission agreed that section 13(c) of the Guidelines set out clearly the responsibilities of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling and the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene in respect of microbiological methods of analysis and sampling.

167. It was pointed out that the statement in respect of the amendment of the method of analysis for the determination of sulphur dioxide in sugars in paragraph 37 of the Report of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling was intended as a proposal to amend the standard, but that it was not intended to relate to the standard for white sugar (see paragraph 10(b) of the Report of the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on Sugars, ALINORM 69/21). It was agreed that it would be necessary for the information on the collaborative studies on sugars other than white sugar (Codex/Analys/ 69/C/5) to be made available to all Member Governments and that it should be included in a paper inviting government to consider the need for an amendment to the standards for sugars other than white sugar. The United Kingdom Secretariat of the Sugars Committee was asked to prepare the paper for distribution by the FAO Secretariat and subsequently to summarize the government comments.

168. The Commission examined a proposal made by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling to replace, in the Recommended European Regional Standard for Honey at Step 9, the method of determination of hydroxymethylfurfural content by a spectrophotometric method which had undergone adequate collaborative studies. The Commission considered that this should follow the normal practice of the relations between Commodity Committees and General Committees (Guidelines for Codex Committees, paragraph 13(c) (i) of the Procedural Manual) and therefore be returned to the originating Committee for consideration.

169. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Codex Committee on General Principles

170. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on General Principles should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of France.

PART XV

CODEX COMMODITY COMMITTEES

Report of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils (ALINORM 70/11)

171. The Commission had before it the Report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils introduced by the Chairman, Mr. J.H.V. Davies (United Kingdom).

172. It was noted that the work of the Committee had been completed for the time being and that it had agreed to meet again not before the end of 1973. The Chairman expressed the thanks of the Committee to the Spanish Government for the excellent facilities provided at the last session of the Committee in Madrid.

173. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the United Kingdom.

Reports of the:

- Codex Committee on Meat and Meat Products (ALINORM 70/15)**
- Sub-Committee I on Cutting Methods and Cuts of Carcasses (ALINORM 70/1)**
- Sub-Committee IV on Processed Meat Products and Consumer Packaged Meat (ALINORM 70/16)**

174. The Commission received reports from the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and from the Chairman of Sub-Committee IV, Dr. V. Enggaard (Denmark).

175. In the discussion on the Report of Sub-Committee I (ALINORM 70/17), the delegations of New Zealand, France and the Argentine, brought to the attention of the Commission the fact that the contents of paragraph 14 of the Report, and consequently the Proposed Draft Codification of Carcasses of the Species Ovis (ALINORM 70/17, Appendix III) did not correspond with their notes of the meeting. In their view, the following amendments were required in ALINORM 70/17:

- a. Paragraph 14 of the Report, to read: "The working group (ad hoc group) pointed out that one delegation recommended a further ..."
- b. Appendix III to read in paragraph A.2:

"Lamb Carcasses of lamb up to one year" (subdivision and relevant footnote to be deleted)

The Commission requested the Secretariat to bring these points to the attention of Member Countries and the Codex Committee on Meat.

176. The Commission agreed to establish Sub-Committee IV on Processed Meat Products and Consumer Packaged Meat as a Committee in its own right and agreed that it should be named Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products. The Commission further agreed on the following terms of reference for the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products:

"To elaborate world-wide standards for processed meat products, including consumer packaged meat, but not including poultry products."

177. The Commission agreed to rename the Codex Committee on Meat and Meat Products as the Codex Committee on Meat and also agreed on the following terms of reference:

“To elaborate world-wide standards and/or codes of practice as may seem appropriate, for:

1. classification and grading of carcasses and cuts of beef, lamb, mutton, pork and veal;
2. meat hygiene, excluding poultry hygiene.”

178. The question of liaison and relationship between the Codex Committees on Meat and on Processed Meat Products concerning meat hygiene would need further consideration and possibly amendments to the Guidelines. The Commission agreed that this should be considered by the Executive Committee at its next session.

179. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Meat and Sub-Committee I on Cutting Methods and Cuts of Carcasses should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

180. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products should be under the chairmanship of the Government of Denmark.

Report of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses **(ALINORM 70/26)**

181. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses introduced by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. H.P. Mollenhauer (Federal Republic of Germany).

182. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Report of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate **(ALINORM 70/10)**

183. The Commission had before it the Report of the Seventh Session of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate, introduced by the Chairman, Mr. J. Ruffy (Switzerland).

184. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Switzerland.

Report of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables **(ALINORM 70/20)**

185. The Commission had before it the Report of the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables, introduced by Mr. G.R. Grange (U.S.A.)

186. The Commission agreed that the proposed amendment to the standard for canned peaches to include green peaches which had been submitted by the delegation of Austria should be sent, as soon as possible, to governments for comment at Step 3 so that it could be considered at Step 4 by the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables at its next session.

187. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the United States of America.

Report of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (ALINORM 70/18)

188. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products introduced by the Chairman, Dr. O.R. Braekkan (Norway). The Chairman indicated that good progress had been made by the above Committee and that the Committee had examined a code of technological practice for fresh fish elaborated by the Fisheries Department of FAO. In view of the importance of codes of practice in supplementing the standards elaborated by the Committee, an accelerated procedure was needed so that these codes of practice could be finalized and adopted as recommendations of the Commission, without delay.

189. The Chief of the Fishery Products and Marketing Branch of FAO Fisheries Department, Dr. R. Kreuzer, informed the Commission about the state of the elaboration of the following codes:

- Code of Technological Practice for Fresh Fish
- Code of Technological Practice for Frozen Fish
- Code of Technological Practice for Canned Fish
- Codes of Technological Practice for Retail Handling Smoked, Precooked, Breaded and Fried Fishery Products, including Shrimps

Dr. Kreuzer described the procedure according to which the codes published by FAO had been elaborated. It was noted that Member Governments of FAO as well as those of the Commission had ample opportunity to comment on the draft codes and that these codes were examined and adopted by ad hoc consultations consisting of experts from approximately ten countries.

190. The Commission agreed that the codes of technological practice for the production and handling of various types of fish and fishery products were being elaborated by FAO in such a way as to ensure that they represented current international opinion in this field. It was therefore agreed that such codes, if adopted by the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, could be submitted to the Commission for adoption as recommendations of the Commission at Step 8 of the Procedure.

191. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Norway.

Codex Committee on Sugars

192. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Sugars should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the United Kingdom.

Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters

193. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Switzerland.

Report of the Coordinating Committee for Europe (ALINORM 70/19)

194. The Commission received a report from the delegation of Austria. The Committee had now largely completed its work and proposals regarding future work of this Committee are dealt with in paragraphs 103 and 208–210 of this Report.

Report of the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Fruit Juices (ALINORM 70/14)

195. The Commission noted that there were no specific points on which the Group of Experts had requested guidance from the Commission. The significant issues emerging from the report had been considered by the Commission when it examined the draft standards at Step 8 and the action decided upon by the Commission is contained in paragraphs 107 and 108 of this Report.

Report of the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick-Frozen Foods (ALINORM 70/25)

196. The Commission noted that there were no specific points in the report on which the Group of Experts had requested guidance from the Commission. The standards being developed by the Joint Group of Experts would follow the general pattern and layout of the standard which had been adopted by the Commission for quick-frozen peas at Step 8. The Commission noted that it was the intention of the Group of Experts to develop a detailed code of practice for quick-frozen foods and that this code of practice would contain detailed recommendations regarding the transport, storage and distribution of quick-frozen foods.

PART XVI

Report of the Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products

(CX 5/70 - 12th S.)

197. The Commission had before it the above report together with document ALINORM 70/21 (A) which indicated the present status of work and summarized the results of the Twelfth Session of the Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products.

198. The Commission reviewed several aspects of the work of the Committee, in particular the problems connected with the establishment of a multiplicity of individual cheese standards, the redrafting of compositional standards in the Codex format, and the draft standards for processed cheese products. Some delegations expressed the view that the classification of cheese varieties into broad groups might help to overcome the difficulties encountered in establishing too great a number of individual cheese standards for similar varieties.

199. The question was raised whether the Milk and Milk Products Committee in establishing standards took account of the criteria for the establishment of standards which had been laid down by the Commission. It was pointed out that all Committees had been informed of these criteria.

200. The delegation of Ghana drew attention to the importance which was attached to nutritional questions concerning skimmed milk with added vegetable fat (filled milk) and imitation milk in the developing countries of Africa.

Governing Paragraph for the FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products on the relationship between the Commission and the Committee

201. The Commission had before it a paper prepared by the Secretariat setting out the replies of governments to the specific questions posed by the Commission at its Sixth Session in connection with the Milk and Milk Products Committee's redraft of the governing paragraph. The Commission also had before it the Report of the Fifteenth Session of the Executive Committee containing the recommendations of the Executive Committee on the subject. The Commission noted the comment of the Executive Committee that much of the apparent divergence of views expressed in the replies to the questions posed was due to the different interpretations of the words used in the governing paragraph.

202. The Commission had a full exchange of views on the points at issue and heard a statement from Dr. Ballester (Spain), in his capacity as First Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Milk and Milk Products, in which he explained the Milk Committee's reasons for wishing to retain the text as redrafted by that Committee. Some delegations expressed the view that it would be premature to make a change in the method of accepting standards for milk and milk products until such time as practical experience had been obtained of the Codex methods of acceptance. The delegation of Denmark was of the opinion that the question of changing the method of acceptance should have been submitted to governments for their comments before the Commission took a decision. The delegation of Denmark was somewhat concerned about the possible effect on the standards already adopted for milk and milk products if the Codex acceptance methods were to be fully extended to these standards.

203. There was general agreement that the opening sentence of the Milk Committee's redraft was satisfactory. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Executive Committee that the governing paragraph should not state that the Committee had full competence, since many of its decisions were subject to endorsement by Codex Subject Committees. The Commission also agreed that the governing paragraph should not state that only final decisions of the Milk Committee were subject to review by the Commission, since the Commission had the right to review any decision of any of its subsidiary bodies. In agreeing to delete the reference to final decisions, the Commission noted that it would not normally expect decisions of the Milk Committee to be reviewed by the Commission and that, in all probability, such review by the Commission would, in practice, concern standards which had been finalized by the Committee. The Commission agreed that the points of substance at issue were (a) should it be the function of the Commission or the Committee to deal with acceptances of milk product standards, (b) should the procedure for the acceptance of milk product standards be the same as that for standards for other products, and (c) if the Codex acceptance procedure were to apply to standards for milk products, should the procedure come into operation immediately or at a later stage.

204. The Commission agreed that the Committee should consider acceptance of milk product standards in the light of the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius and that the Committee should report on them to the Commission. The Commission agreed that it would then be a matter for the Commission to decide, in the light of these acceptances, whether the standard concerned should be published in the Codex Alimentarius as a world-wide standard.

205. The Commission agreed that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should continue to deal with pesticide residues in milk and milk products.

206. The following amended version of the governing paragraph was agreed to by the Commission:

“The Commission decided that the FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products would be considered as a Committee under Rule IX.1(a) of the Rules of Procedure. The Committee would be competent to consider and elaborate all codes and standards concerning milk and milk products, and pass them, as

appropriate, through all the steps of the Procedure for the Elaboration of International Standards for Milk Products. It would cause them to be submitted to governments for acceptance, except that decisions of the Committee, whether on standards or not, would be subject to review by the Commission at the request of a Member of the Commission. The Committee will consider the acceptances received in the light of the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius and will report on these acceptances to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Commission will decide in the light of these acceptances whether the standard shall be published in the Codex Alimentarius as a world-wide standard. Those provisions of standards formulated by the Committee of Government Experts which relate to additives, labelling and hygiene would be subject to the procedure for endorsement by the appropriate Codex General Subject Committees as laid down in paragraph 13 of the Guidelines for Codex Committees (Procedural Manual, Second Edition, PP. 54, 55 and 57). Methods of analysis and sampling formulated by the Committee of Government Experts would not, however, be subject to endorsement by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.”

207. The delegation of New Zealand indicated that it was in agreement with the amended version of the governing paragraph, but considered that in applying the Codex acceptance procedures to standards for milk and milk products, the only minor deviations that should be allowed were those of a more stringent nature. The delegation of Denmark supported the New Zealand delegation's view of the application of the Codex acceptance procedures. The Commission considered that its amendment to the governing paragraph involved an amendment to Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards and the inclusion of a new Step 9. The Commission agreed the following amended text for Step 8 of the Procedure and the following text for a new Step 9:

“Step 8:

The recommended standard is published as a standard in the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products when the Committee determines that it is appropriate to do so in the light of the acceptances received.”

“Step 9:

The recommended standard is published as a standard in the Codex Alimentarius when the Codex Alimentarius Commission determines that it is appropriate to do so in the light of the acceptances received.”

The Commission agreed that the changes which it had made in the governing paragraph and the Procedure for the Elaboration of Standards did not in any way affect the status of the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products, nor acceptances of the Code. The Commission did not regard the Code as being in the nature of a standard.

Edible Ices

208. The Commission had before it a paper prepared by the Secretariat (ALINORM 70/34) dealing with international trade in and national legislation on edible ices. The paper indicated that there was not a very substantial international trade in these products but that there was a significant trade in them at the European regional level. The delegation of Sweden reiterated its readiness to take responsibility for a Committee on the subject. The Commission noted that the Milk and Milk Products Committee, which was already developing a standard for edible ices based on milk fat, had indicated its willingness to develop also standards for edible ices based on non-milk fat, and that the coordinating Committee for Europe was willing to undertake the task of elaborating standards for edible ices on a European regional basis. The opinions expressed by various delegations reflected different views as to which body might eventually be best suited to elaborate standards for edible ices.

209. A number of delegations expressed doubts whether the product was one that justified urgent attention in view of the Commission's workload and the more important questions which required its attention. Other delegations considered that this was a product which could easily be made the subject of standardization, at least on a regional basis.

210. The Commission agreed that:

1. there was no need at the present to proceed with the elaboration of standards on a world-wide basis;
2. the delegation of Sweden should be requested to prepare a proposed draft standard and reproduce it in the Codex format, taking account of government comments, the summary of national legislation (ALINORM 70/34) and the views expressed in the Commission;
3. the Committee on Milk and Milk Products should be instructed to cease work on milk ices;
4. the Swedish paper should, when completed, be sent to the Secretariat for transmission to the Coordinating Committee for Europe to consider and advise the Commission whether it would be profitable to proceed with the draft standard as a European regional standard.

The delegation of Denmark objected to the decision at (3) above.

PART XVII

SOUPS AND BROTHS

211. The Commission had before it document ALINORM 70/29 and Addenda containing the views of governments on the question whether it would be desirable to establish standards for soups and broths.

212. The delegation of Switzerland stated that, as indicated at the last session of the Commission, the Government of Switzerland was willing to accept responsibility for the Chairmanship of a Codex Committee to elaborate world-wide standards for soups and broths. The Commission noted that the Coordinating Committee for Europe was also willing to undertake the elaboration of standards for these products on a regional basis.

213. The delegation of the United States proposed that the question of establishing a Committee on Soups and Broths should be postponed until 1973 and that meanwhile the Codex Committees on Food Hygiene and Food Additives should consider whether any provisions on soups and broths were required within their spheres of activity. A number of delegations pointed out that it would be difficult for these subjects to be dealt with without a Codex Commodity Committee to consider the general compositional factors to which hygiene and additive provisions would have to be related.

214. A number of delegations supported the views put forward by the United States delegation and considered that work on soups and broths was not urgent. Other delegations thought that work should be started as soon as possible and that advantage should be taken of the offer of the delegation of Switzerland to set up a Committee as soon as was reasonably possible.

215. In view of this difference of opinion, the Commission agreed that:

1. the delegation of Switzerland, in consultation with the Secretariat, should prepare first drafts of standards for soups and broths with the right to consult, as they should deem necessary, after consultation with the Secretariat, the Codex Committees on Food Hygiene, Food Additives and Food Labelling;
2. the Secretariat should inform the Executive Committee as necessary of any action they took in regard to the preparation of the draft standards and generally of the progress of the work;
3. the delegation of Switzerland should present to the Tenth Session of the Commission a paper containing draft standards and the Commission should then decide whether a Codex Committee on Soups and Broths should be set up.

CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT TEN YEARS

216. The Commission had before it ALINORM 70/35 and Addenda dealing with a possible programme of work for the Commission over the next ten years. The paper covered:

- a. continuation of existing work of subsidiary bodies of the Commission;
- b. proposals as to possible new subjects for consideration by the Commission;
- c. the views and recommendations of the 14th session of the Executive Committee on these proposals;

- d. suggestions of governments regarding possible future work for the Commission, and
- e. suggestions of governments regarding possible future work for the Coordinating Committee for Europe which had now completed its current work.

217. As regards possible future activity of the Commission, a number of African countries again drew attention to the desirability of setting up a Coordinating Committee for Africa (future action in connection with this subject is dealt with in paragraphs 38–47 of this Report).

218. Some African delegations requested the Secretariat to consider whether any further steps could be taken to strengthen the position of Codex Contact Points in Africa with regard to the dissemination of information on the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. It was also stated that pesticide residues posed a serious threat in Africa and that it would be useful if regional reference laboratories could be set up in Africa by FAO/WHO to analyse samples collected from different parts of the continent. This would enable African countries to have uniform techniques. The Commission considered that the setting up of regional reference laboratories was a matter for both Organizations.

219. A number of delegations from African countries thought that it would be necessary during the course of the next ten years to give some technological guidance to the food industries in Africa and to make food manufacturers in the continent more aware of the work of the Commission.

220. A number of delegations from tropical countries thought that it would be desirable to develop standards for tropical foods, taking into consideration any information available from food technology research institutions in the tropics or elsewhere which might be relevant. It was indicated that work had already commenced in this field within the framework of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables and the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Standardization of Fruit Juices.

221. A number of delegations drew attention to the desirability of arranging for the exchange of information on the toxicity of food additives. The Commission agreed that this would be desirable and requested WHO to examine whether arrangements could be made to facilitate the exchange of toxicity data on an international basis.

222. Dr. M. Autret, Director of the Nutrition Division of FAO, outlined the work that had been going on on protein-rich foods for a number of years, particularly in the field of preparing guidelines for manufacture and standards. It was hoped that within the next one to two years specifications would be finalized for a number of foods which might then be submitted to the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses. The Commission noted the work being done on this subject by the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, but thought that, apart from this, no further work should be contemplated for some years.

223. The Secretariat indicated that in addition to the papers which it was preparing on cereal products and on tropical tubers it was preparing a paper on coffee and was collecting material to form the basis of a paper on alcoholic beverages. The Secretariat had not been in a

position to start work on a paper dealing with pulses but would do so as soon as possible. The Secretariat also indicated that it had been collecting information on soft drinks. As regards eggs and egg products, the Commission noted that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene was developing a code of hygienic practice for these products and that the international trade in eggs in shell did not appear to warrant work being commenced on this product at this time.

224. A number of delegates strongly supported the proposal that cereal products should be the subject of future work by the Commission.

225. The Commission recognized that it would be difficult to proceed with further work in the next two or three years in view of the present workload. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should continue to work on the basis of the proposal made by the Executive Committee in the Report of its Fourteenth Session, taking into account the points made by the delegations during the present discussion. The Secretariat should put the papers they prepared on the products concerned before the Commission as seemed most appropriate in the light of the then existing workload of the Commission. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should take note of the work of ISO in the fields covered by the proposed papers. As regards spices and condiments, the Commission noted the need for work to be undertaken on hygienic practices, in addition to the work being done by ISO on spices.

226. The Commission noted a suggestion by the delegation of France on the possibility that developing countries might be able to accept Codex standards in respect of their imports while applying less rigorous standards to their home production. Several delegations considered that there were serious difficulties in this suggestion. The Commission decided not to proceed with this suggestion until such time as the acceptance procedure came to be reviewed.

227. Several delegations drew attention to the importance of the harmonization of the general principles on which food legislation was established. The Commission considered that further attention might need to be given to this subject by the Codex Committee on General Principles at a future session. In the meantime, the Secretariat should continue with the activities outlined in paragraph 44 of this Report, in assisting developing countries to establish sound basic food legislation to enable these countries to be in a better position to accept Codex standards.

PART XVIII

TIMETABLE OF CODEX SESSIONS

1970/71

228. The Commission had before it a timetable of Codex sessions for 1970/71 as set out in document ALINORM 70/27. The Commission noted that most of the dates given in the timetable were firm dates.

229. The delegation of the Netherlands stated that the date shown for the forthcoming sessions of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (28 September - 6 October) could be regarded as being a firm date at this time, although the question was raised as to whether a meeting of this Committee could profitably be held before a meeting of the ad hoc group referred to in paragraph 162. The date shown for the meeting of the Codex Committee on Food Additives (12–16 October) was a firm date.

230. The delegation of Norway stated that the date given for the next session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products would present serious difficulties from the point of view of hotel accommodation and that the Norwegian authorities had fixed the date 5–10 October. This date should be regarded as a firm date.

231. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the dates given for the sessions of the Codex Committees on Foods for Special Dietary Uses (30 November - 4 December) and Methods of Analysis and Sampling (25–30 January 1971) were firm dates. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany also stated that the date suggested by the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Meat Hygiene for the next session of the Codex Committee on Meat (16–20 November) was acceptable. It had been the intention of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany to devote one day in that week to a meeting of Sub-Committee I on Cutting Methods and Cuts of Carcasses, but in view of the fact that many delegations had expressed the wish that the meeting should be devoted entirely to the subject of meat hygiene, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that it would arrange this accordingly, and would also enquire into the possibility of arranging for the meeting to continue into Saturday of that week. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that all the above meetings would be held in Cologne.

232. In view of the decision taken by the Commission on the Step 8 standards for fruit juices, the Secretariat was requested to consider whether the date given in the timetable for the next session of the Group of Experts on Fruit Juices would still be a suitable date. The Secretariat was asked to satisfy itself that whatever date was fixed would be one which would enable the Group of Experts to deal with the points raised by the Commission. The Commission noted that, in view of the desire of some overseas delegations that sessions of the Groups of Experts on Fruit Juices and Quick Frozen Foods should be held in consecutive weeks, any change in the date of the meeting of the Fruit Juice Group would affect the date for the next session of the Group of Experts on Quick-Frozen Foods.

233. The delegation of Austria stated that it was willing to hold the next session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe in Vienna from 5–10 October 1970. The Commission considered that the next session of the Coordinating Committee should be held when the papers on the subjects which had been assigned to the Committee were available.

234. As regards the date fixed for the next session of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate, the Commission noted that the Secretariat was doubtful as to whether the necessary documentation could be prepared and distributed in good time for consideration before the session.

235. The Commission agreed that it was essential that governments have adequate time to consider comments on standards at Step 8 and decided that the next session of the Commission should be held not earlier than May and preferably in June 1971.

236. The Commission agreed that the Secretariat should consider and report to the Executive Committee on the possibility of making arrangements for the meetings of Codex Committees over a period of at least two years and also on the need to increase the period between sessions of the Commission to more than one year.

237. The Commission drew the attention of host governments to paragraph 5 of the Guidelines concerning the responsibility of Codex Committee Secretariats for the preparation of the draft report.

PART XIX

OTHER BUSINESS

238. The delegation of Mexico drew attention to the fact that, as Mexico had participated for the first time in the Sixth Session of the Commission, it had not been possible for Mexico to submit amendments to the European Regional Standard for Honey. The Mexican delegation stated that their country had requested a period of at least one year to consider accepting the above standard. The Mexican authorities were carefully examining the standard in accordance with Step 9 and would reply concerning the acceptance of the Standard for Honey indicating their decision. The delegations of Argentina, Canada, Cuba, New Zealand, Venezuela, Peru and Israel associated themselves with the point of view of the Mexican delegation, since, in their opinion, the standard contained provisions which should be resolved on a world-wide basis.

PART XX

239. Mr. G. Weill (France), on behalf of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, expressed the appreciation of the Commission and of its Members to the retiring Chairman, Mr. J.H.V. Davies (United Kingdom). The Commission gave Mr. Davies a standing ovation for his leadership and active support of the Commission since its establishment in 1962.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS *

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

MEMBRES DE LA COMMISSION

MIEMBROS DE LA COMISION

* The Heads of Delegations are listed first; Alternates, Advisers, and Consultants are listed in alphabetical order.

Les chefs de délégations figurent en tête et les suppléants, conseillers et consultants sont énumérés par ordre alphabétique.

Figuran en primer lugar los Jefes de las delegaciones; Los Suplentes, Asesores y Consultores aparecen por orden alfabético.

ALGERIA	M. Mamadache
ALGERIE	S/Directeur de la Répression des Fraudes
ALGELIA	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Réforme Agraire
	S/Direction de la Répression des Fraudes
	12 Bd. Colonel Amirouche
	Alger
	M. Abdellaoui
	Inspecteur divisionnaire
	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Réforme Agraire
	S/Direction de la Répression des Fraudes
	12 Bd. Colonel Amirouche
	Alger
	M. Belal
	Délégué général - Europe
	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Réforme Agraire
	12 Bd. Colonel Amirouche
	Alger
	A. Fasla
	Secrétaire d'Ambassade
	Ambassade d'Algérie
	Rome (Italy)
	M. Khemissa
	Conseiller Commercial
	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Réforme Agraire

(OFLA)

Alger

ARGENTINA

ARGENTINE

Ing. J.H. Piazzì

Secretaría de Comercio Exterior

Diagonal Julio A. Roca 651 - 5° Piso

Buenos Aires

Dr. M. Piñeiro Pearson

Medico Veterinario

Avenida del Libertador 1160

Buenos Aires

J.C. Vignaud

Representante Permanente Suplente

Embajada de Argentina

Piazza dell'Esquilino 2

Rome (Italy)

AUSTRALIA

AUSTRALIE

I.H. Smith

Assistant Secretary

Department of Primary Industry

Canberra A.C.T. 2600

Dr. R.H. Cosgrove Fleming

Commonwealth Department of Health

Canberra A.C.T.

J.L. Smith

Executive Officer

Department of Primary Industry

Canberra A.C.T.

Dr. P. Scott Woodruff

Director General of Public Health,

South Australia

Department of Public Health

158 Rundle St.

Adelaide

AUSTRIA

AUTRICHE

Dr. R. Wildner

Coordinator for Europe

Regierungsgebäude

Vienna I

Dr. G. Bancalari
Fachverband Mineralquellen
Bundswirtschaftskammer
Hoher Mark 3
A 1010 Vienna

Dr. L. Blaschek
Federal Chamber of Commerce
Stubenring 12
A 1010 Vienna

Dr. H. Ettl
Ministerialrat
Ministry of Social Affairs
Stubenring 1
A 1010 Vienna

Dr. H. Hauße
Ministerialrat
Bundesministerium für Handel, Gewerbe und Industrie
Stubenring 1
A 1010 Vienna

Dr. R. Seuchs
Director
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Stubenring 1
A 1010 Vienna

Dr. H.F. Wohlmeyer
Director
Fachverband der Nahrungs und Genussmittelindustrie
Österreichs
Zaunergasse 2
1030 Vienna

Dr. H. Woidich
Lebensmittelversuchsanstalt
Blaasstrasse 29
A 1190 Vienna

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE

C.M.L. Kestens
Inspecteur-chef de service

BELGICA

Ministère de la Santé Publique
Centre Administratif de l'Etat
Quartier Vésale
1010 Bruxelles

M.P.V. Fondu
Fédération des Industries Alimentaires Belges
Borrewaterstraat
Merksem NV UNION

R. Linden
Ingénieur, Chef de travaux
Gembloux

J. Ruwet
Inspecteur Principal
Direction Industrie de l'Alimentation
Ministère des Affaires économiques
23 Square de Meeus
Bruxelles

J.L. Verlinden
Ingénieur Principal - Chef de service
Ministère de l'Agriculture
10, rue du Méridien
Bruxelles

BRAZIL
BRESIL
BRASIL

Mrs. Marina de Barros-Vasconcellos
Counsellor of the Brazilian Embassy in Rome and
Resident Representative to FAO
Brazilian Embassy
14, Piazza Navona
Rome (Italy)

BULGARIA
BULGARIE

H.A. Djorev
Chef de division
Ministère du Commerce extérieur
rue Sofiiska Comuna No. 12
Sofia

Prof. D.V. Dekov
Premier Secrétaire
Ambassade de la République populaire de Bulgarie
Via, Sassoferrato 11

Rome (Italy)

Dr. S. Stamenoff
Entrepris d'Etat "Rodopa"
Sofia

CANADA

Dr. D.G. Chapman
Director
Food Advisory Bureau
Food and Drug Directorate
Dept. of National Health and Welfare
Ottawa, Ontario

G.G. Anderson
Assistant Director
Inspection Branch
Dept. of Fisheries and Forestry
Ottawa, Ontario

Dr. D.M. Smith
Office for International Standards
Food Advisory Bureau
Food and Drug Directorate
Dept. of National Health and Welfare
Ottawa, Ontario

H.W. Wagner
Chief, Food Division
Standards Branch
Dept. Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario

CHILE
CHILI

Mrs. Maria Llona
Consejero de Embajada
Embajada de Chile
Via Panisperna 207
Rome (Italy)

Dr. V. H. Olguín
Segundo Secretario
Embajada de Chile
Via Panisperna 207
Rome (Italy)

CHINA CHINE	<p>Dr. R. Chung Tao Lee Chief, Animal Industry Division Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction 37 Nanhai Road Taipei, Taiwan</p> <p>H. Cheng Cheng Deputy Director Department of Health Administration Ministry of Interior Taipei, Taiwan</p> <p>Teh-Shu Chu Senior Food Technologist National Bureau of Standards Ministry of Economic Affairs No. 1, 1st Street, Pei Men Road Tainan, Taiwan</p> <p>Shiu Lee Senior Food Technologist Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction 37 Nanhai Road Taipei, Taiwan</p>
COLOMBIA COLOMBIE	<p>H. Ruiz Varela Representante Permanente ante la FAO Embajada de Colombia Via G. Pisanelli, 4 Rome (Italy)</p>
CONGO, DEM. REP.	<p>R. Bewa Docteur Vétérinaire Laboratoire Vétérinaire B.P. 8842 Kinshasa</p>
CUBA	<p>Dr. Armando Paradoa Alvarez Jefe del Grupo de Nutrición e Higiene de los Alimentos Instituto Nacional de Higiene Infanta y Crucero La Habana</p>

C.E. García-Díaz
Jefe del Departamento de Normalización y Control de
Calidad
Ministerio de la Industria Alimenticia
Ave. 41, No. 4455
La Habana

M. Gómez Perera
Director, Laboratorio Central de Tecnología y Control
Instituto Nacional de la Pesca
Oficio No. 558 - 5° Piso
La Habana

E.F. Hechavarría Fernández
Jefe del Departamento de Laboratorios Generales
Ministerio de la Industria Alimenticia
Ave. 41, No. 4455
Marianao
La Habana

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

E. Mortensen
Head of Division, Ministry of Agriculture
Slotsholmsgade 10
DK- 1216 Copenhagen K

Dr. V. Enggaard
Acting Director, Danish Meat Products Laboratory
Howitzvej 13
DK-2000 Copenhagen F

Dr. S.C. Hansen
Head of Division, National Food Institute
19 Morkhoj Bygade
Soborg

Dr. C. Herforth
Director, Palsgaard
7130 Juelsminde

I.S. Jensen
Secretary of the Danish Codex Committee
Ministry of Agriculture
Slotsholmsgade 10
DK-1216 Copenhagen K

P.F. Jensen
Director
Inspection Service for Fish Products
Ministry of Fisheries
Dronningens Tvaergade 21
DK-1302 Copenhagen K

T. Johansen
Commercial attaché
Via XX Settembre 1
00187-Rome (Italy)

M. Kondrup
Food Technologist
Chief of Secretariat
ISALESTA
H.C. Andersens Blvd. 18
DK-1553 Copenhagen V

Mrs. A. Lou
Food Technologist
Danish Meat Products Laboratory
Howitzvej 13
2000 Copenhagen F

E.B. Stilling
Sectional Engineer
FDB Centrallaboratorium
Roskildevej 65
Albertslund

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

V. Aalto
Chief Inspector on Foods
Ministry of Commerce and Industry
Aleksanterinkatu 10
Helsinki 17

Dr. E. Timonen
Valio Finnish Cooperative Dairies' Association
Kalevankatu 56 B
Helsinki 18

FRANCE

G. Weill

FRANCIA

Secrétaire général du Comité interministériel de
l'Alimentation et de l'Agriculture
Ministère de l'Agriculture
78, rue de Varenne
Paris 7ème

C. Castang
Service de la Répression des fraudes et du contrôle de
la qualité
Ministère de l'Agriculture
42bis, rue de Bourgogne
Paris 7ème

Prof. C. Flachet
Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire
2 quai Chauveau
Lyon 9ème

G. L. Jumel
Délégué de l'Association Nationale des Industries
agricoles et alimentaires
3, rue de Logelbach
Paris 17 ème

GERMANY, FED. REP. OF
ALLEMAGNE, REP. FED.
ALEMANIA, REP. FED.

Dr. D. Eckert
Ministerialrat
Ministry for Youth, Family and Health
53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg
Deutschherrenstrasse 87

Dr. R. Frank
Berkärstr. 15
Berlin 33

Dr. H. Johannsmann
Oberregierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und
Forsten
53 Bonn

Dr. Elizabeth Lünenbürger
Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Verbraucherverbände
Prinz-Georg-Str. 44
4 Düsseldorf 10

H. P. Mollenhauer
Regierungsdirektor
Federal Ministry for Youth, Family and Health
Deutschherrenstr. 87
53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Dr. H. B. Tolkmitt
Rechtsanwalt
33, Schwanenwik
2 Hamburg 33

Dr. F. Schulte
Ministerialrat
Ministry for Youth, Family and Health
Deutschherrenstr. 87
Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Dr. W. Schultheiss
Geschäftsführer
Verband diätetische Lebensmittelindustrie
Frankfurt/Main
Eschersheimerlandstr. 7

GHANA

Dr. N.A. de Heer
Nutrition Division
Ministry of Health
P.O. Box M 78
Accra

A.A. Laryea
Chief Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box M 37
Accra

GREECE GRECE GRECIA

G. Eliopoulos
Chemist of the General State Laboratory
General State Laboratory
16, Anas. Tsocha Str.
Athens (606)

C. Tsibouris
Agricultural Attaché

	Embassy of Greece Viale Liegi, 33 00198-Rome (Italy)
GUATEMALA	I. Penedo Representante suplente de la Embajada ante la FAO Embajada de Guatemala Via Archimede, 35 Rome (Italy)
HUNGARY HONGRIE HUNGRIA	A. Miklovicz Director Ministry of Food and Agriculture Budapest 55, PF 8 J. Szilagyi Chief of Department Ministry of Food and Agriculture Kossuth L. - tér. 11 Budapest V Dr. R. Tarján University Professor Institute of Nutrition Gyáli ut. 3 Budapest IX
ICELAND ISLANDE ISLANDIA	Dr. S. Petursson Head of Department Icelandic Fisheries Laboratories Reykjavik
INDIA INDE	Dr. K. Bagchi Assistant Director-General of Health Services Ministry of Health, Govt. of India New Delhi P.K. Dhingra Deputy Technical Adviser Department of Food, Govt. of India New Delhi
IRAQ IRAK	Dr. A.A. Chalabi Director-General of Health Inspection

	Ministry of Health Baghdad
IRELAND IRLANDE IRLANDA	P. Griffin Principal Officer Department of Agriculture Upper Merrion Street Dublin 2 J.F. Brown Director Food Sector Confederation of Irish Industry 9, Ely Place Dublin 2 Dr. J.H. Walsh Medical Inspector Department of Health Custom House Dublin
ISRAEL ISRAEL	L.B. Mor Chief Food Technologist Food Control Service Ministry of Health Jerusalem
ITALY ITALIE ITALIA	R. Andreotti Professore in Tecnica della Conservazione degli Alimenti Stazione Sperimentale Conserve Parma S. Annunziata Chef chimiste Ministero della Sanità - D.G.I.A.N. Piazza Marconi Rome - EUR G. Bilotti Ministero dell'Agricoltura e delle Foreste Direzione Generale Tutela Prodotti Agricoli Via XX Settembre, 20 Rome

Dr. G.P. Borasio
Segretario Generale Società Plasmon
Corso Garibaldi 97
Milan

F. Bucci
Primo Ricercatore Chimico
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
Rome

Dr. C. Callipo
Secrétaire général
Fédération italienne des eaux minérales
Viale Liegi 52
Rome

Mrs. D. Candilio
Unione Nazionale Consumatori
Via Andrea Doria, 48
Rome

Dr. P. Caruso
Capo Divisione Acque Minerali
Ministero della Sanità
Rome

Miss M. Cipolletta
Consigliere I Classe
Ministero della Sanità
Rome

F. Cotta-Ramusino
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
Rome

A. De Ciampis
Medico Provinciale Capo
Direttore di Divisione
Ministero della Sanità
Rome

G. De Felip
Ricercatore
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
Rome

A. De Minerbi
Associazione Italiana Industriali Prodotti Alimentari
(A.I.I.P.A.)
Via dei Tizi, 10
Rome

P. Di Gregorio
Direttore Divisione
Ministero dell'Agricoltura
Direzione Alimentazione
Via Sallustiana 10
Rome

S. Dimitri
Chimico
Ministero della Sanità
Direzione Generale Alimenti e Nutrizione
Rome

N. Di Pillo
IRVAM
Via Castelfidardo, 43
Rome

N. Gandolfo
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena, 299
Rome

G. Giordano
Veterinario Provinciale
Ministero della Sanità
Direzione Generale Igiene Alimenti e Nutrizione
Rome

Dr. A. Hribal
Associazione Italiana Lattiero-Casearia
Via Boncompagni, 16

Rome

C. Landone
IRVAM
Via Catelfidardo, 43
Rome

Dr. G. Luft
Dirigente Industriale in rappresentanza AIIP
Via P. Verri, 8
Milan

Miss O. Mancini
Consigliere di III Classe
Ministero della Sanità
Rome

G. Mantovani
Professore Università
Via Scantiana, 25
44100-Ferrara

R. Monacelli
Capo Laboratorio Chimica Sostanze Grasse
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena, 299
Rome

Prof. L. Montanari
UNOLEARIA
Via Don Minzani, 4
Imperia

F. Paolini
Ispettore Generale
Laboratorio Chimico Dogane
Ministero delle Finanze
Via della Luce, 35
Rome

U. Pellegrino
Capo Divisione
Ministero della Sanità
Direzione Generale per l'Igiene degli Alimenti

Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

Dr. P.F. Polli
A.I.I.P.A.
Via P. Verri, 8
Milan

M. Proja
Direttore Divisione
Ministero della Sanità
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

Dr. C. Ragusa
Medico Provinciale Superiore
Ministero della Sanità - D.G.I.A.N.
Divisione IV
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

C. Ranucci
Consigliere
Ministero della Sanità - D.G.I.A.N.
Marco Aurelio, 42
Rome

A. Rolli
Managing Director
Campbell's Soups S.P.A.
Felegara (Parma)

P. Savi
Ispettore Generale
Ministero della Sanità
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

F. Sofia
Direttore Divisione
Ministero della Sanità
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

Mrs. A.M. Spina
Ispettore Generale Chimico
Ministero della Sanità - D.G.I.A.N.
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

Prof. A. Stacchini
Ricercatore Aggiunto
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena, 299
Rome

M. Ticca
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Città Universitaria
Rome

Dr. S. Valvassori
Federvini
Corso Umberto, 76
Torino

Dr. G. Verardi
Ministero della Sanità - D.G.I.A.N.
Divisione IV
Piazza Marconi
Rome - EUR

JAPAN
JAPON

K. Ando
Counsellor and Resident Representative to FAO
Embassy of Japan
Rome (Italy)

J. Atsuya
Assistant Chief of General Affairs Section
Embassy of Japan
Rome (Italy)

S. Kaneda
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Japan
10, Avenue de Badé
Genève (Switzerland)

Y. Kawai
Assistant Chief of the Premium and Representation
Section
The Fair Trade Commission
1-1-4 Uchisaiwaicho
Chiyoda-Ku
Tokyo

Dr. K. Mori
President of Association
Federation of Japan Shii-take Agricultural Cooperative
Association
2nd Mitsui Bld.
1-2 Muromachi Nihonbashi
Chuo-Ku
Tokyo

Dr. S. Oshifuchi
Chief of Food Sanitation Section
Environmental Sanitation Bureau
Ministry of Health and Welfare
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
Tokyo

Y. Sato
Consumer Division, Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
Tokyo

T. Takei
Head, Resources Division
Planning Bureau
Science and Technology Agency
3-4 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
Tokyo

M. Yamamoto
Chief, Fisheries Section
Tokyo Export Commodities Inspection Institute
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

	4-7, 4 Chome, Konan Minatoku, Tokyo
KUWAIT KOWEIT	S. Dawood Kuwait Municipality Kuwait
	Adb El Wahab Motawi Kuwait Municipality Kuwait
MALTA MALTE	V. Gatt Senior Industrial Chemist Standards Laboratory Industrial Estate Marsa
MEXICO MEXIQUE	Ing. J. Renteria Director General de Normas Secretaría de Industria y Comercio Av. Cuauhtemoc 80 México D.F.
	J. F. Bustamante Iriarte Asesor de Asuntos Internacionales Cámara Nacional de las Industrias Azucarera y Alcoholera y Sociedad Nacional de Productores de Alcohol Balderas No. 36 - 4° y 10° Pisos México, D.F.
	R. Delgado Carmona Comité Consultivo de Alimentos de la D.G.N. Monte Albán 569 México 13, D.F.
	Mrs. I. Loyola Primer Secretario Embajada de México Rome (Italy)
	Ing. E. R. Méndez Chairman Food Standards Committee P.O. Box 24-322

México D.F.

Ing. E.E. Mora
Jefe del Departamento de Industrias
Escuela Nacional de Agricultura
Chapingo

MOROCCO
MAROC
MARRUECOS

Ing. A. Janah
Chargé du Bureau de la Réglementation et de
Technologie - Service des Fraudes
Ministère de l'Agriculture
Rabat

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

P. Berben
Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health
Dr. Reyersstraat 10
Leidschendam

Dr. C. Nieman
172 Joh. Verhulststraat
Amsterdam

M.J.M. Osse
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Dept. of Industries and International Trade
1 v.d. Boschstraat 4
Den Haag

Dr. L. J. Schippers
Hoofdproduktschap Akkerbouw
Stadhoudersplantsoen 12
Den Haag

Dr. G.F. Wilmink
Cabinet Adviser in General Service of the Ministry of
Agriculture and Fisheries
1 v.d. Boschstraat 4
Den Haag

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

E.J. Stonyer
Chief Advisory Officer
Department of Agriculture
Box 2298

Wellington

I.G. Forbes
Chief Advisory Officer
Box 1500
Wellington

Dr. A. Ginsberg
Veterinary Adviser (Meat Hygiene)
N.Z. High Commission
Haymarket
London S.W.1 (U.K.)

I. Willis
Senior Dairy Inspector
N.Z. High Commission
Haymarket
London S.W.1 (U.K.)

E. R. Woods
Second Secretary (Commercial)
New Zealand Embassy
Rome (Italy)

NIGERIA

G.O. Niyi
Commercial Secretary
Permanent Mission of Nigeria
44, rue de Lausanne
1201 Geneva (Switzerland)

NORWAY
|NORVEGE
NORUEGA

K. Sunnanaa
Director-General of Fisheries
Radstupl. 10
Bergen

Dr. O.R. Braekkan
Government Vitamin Laboratory
Box 187
Bergen

P. Haram
Counsellor
Ministry of Fisheries
Oslo-Dep.

A. Löchen
Secretary-General
National Nutrition Council
Box 8139
Oslo-Dep.

H. Simonsen
Director
Ministry of Agriculture
Oslo-Dep.

Dr. A. Skulberg
Member of Parliament
Stortinget
Oslo 1

O. Tvete
Director of Food Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture
Gladengvn 3^{vi}
Oslo 3

PERU
PEROU

Mrs. S. Le Roux
Chief of the Standardization Programme
INANTIC (National Standards Institute)
Avda. Rep. de Chile 698
Lima

PHILIPPINES
FILIPINAS

J.J. Hormillosa
Minister
Philippine Embassy
San Valentino, 12
Rome (Italy)

L. Serrano
Attaché
Philippine Embassy
San Valentino, 12
Rome (Italy)

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

J. Kuziemski
Director Quality Inspection Office
Ministry of Foreign Trade

Stepinska 9
Warsaw

F. Morawski
Chief of Section
Quality Inspection Office
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Stepinska 9
Warsaw

W. Orlowski
Expert of Quality Inspection Office
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Stepinska 9

Warsaw
J. Serwatowski
MH2 Wicjska 14
Warsaw

PORTUGAL

F. A. de Alcantara-Carreira
Président du Comité portugais du Codex
Av. Berne 1
Lisboa

F. Cruz de Campos
Directeur du Service Technique de l'Hygiène de
l'Alimentation et Bromatologie
Direction générale de la Santé Publique
Ministère de la Santé et Assistance
Place du Commerce
Lisboa

I. Costa Netto
Directeur du Laboratoire de la Répression des Fraudes
du Ministère de l'Economie
Rua Caes de Santarem 15
Lisboa

M.E. Silva Graça
Chef du Laboratoire de Bromatologie
Instituto de Higiene
Campo Martires de Patria
Lisboa

SAUDI ARABIA
ARABIE SAOUDITE
ARABIA SAUDITA

Dr. H. Salih Dabbagh
Director General
Preventive Medicine
Ministry of Health
Riyad

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

Dr. Ing. Agrónomo P. Ballester
Subdirección General de Industrias Lácteas
Ministerio de Agricultura
Paseo Infanta Isabel 1
Madrid

Dr. C. Barros
Comisión Interministerial para la Ordenación
Alimentaria
Serrano 150
Madrid

Ing. J. Carballo
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
Agronómicas
Ministerio de Agricultura
Avenida Puerta de Hierro 4
Madrid

Ing. R. Forns García
Dirección General de Industrias Textiles, Alimentarias y
Diversas
Ministerio de Industria
Madrid

Dr. J. Royo-Iranzo
Calle Alvaro de Bazán 3
Valencia

SUDAN
SOUDAN

Dr. S. A. Suliman
Agricultural Attaché
Embassy of the D. R. of Sudan
Via dei Monti Parioli, 48
Rome (Italy)

SWEDEN
SUEDE

G. Bhörkman
Director General

SUECIA

National Veterinary Board
Fack S-10360
Stockholm 3

O. Ågren
Chief of Section
National Veterinary Board
Fack S-10360
Stockholm 3

B. Augustinsson
Secretary General of the
Swedish Food Law Committee
Kungl. Socialdepartementet
Fack S-10310
Stockholm 2

A. Danielsson
Chief of Section
National Veterinary Board
Fack S-10360
Stockholm 3

Dr. K.G.A. Edhborg
Federation of Swedish Industries
AB Findus
S-26700 Bjuv

T. Petrelius
Veterinary Counsellor
National Veterinary Board
Fack S-10360
Stockholm 3

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

J. Ruffy
Président du Comité national suisse du Codex
Alimentarius
Haslerstrasse 16
3008 Berne

Dr. E. Ackermann
Monbijoustr. 36
3000 Berne

Dr. W. Hausheer
Grenzacherstr. 124
4000 Basel

Prof. O. Högl
Grüneckweg 12
3000 Berne

Dr. H. Liebster
Geigy S.A.
Basel

E. Matthey
Chef du Contrôle des denrées alimentaires
Service fédéral de l'Hygiène publique
Haslerstrasse 16
3008 Berne

Prof. H. Mohler
Oskar Biderstrasse 10
8057 Zurich

H.U. Pfister
Chef de Section
Régie fédéral des alcools
Langasstrasse 31
3000 Berne

Dr. G.F. Schubiger
Société Assistance Technique Produits Nestlé
1814 La Tour de Peilz

THAILAND
THAÏLANDE
TAILANDIA

Prof. Y. Bunnag
Under Secretary of State
Ministry of Industry
Rama VI Street
Bangkok 4

A. Bhumiratana
Director
Institute of Food Research and Product Development
Kasetsart University
P.O. Box 4-170
Bangkok 4

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO TRINITE ET TOBAGO TRINIDAD Y TABAGO	Dr. M. G. Lines Chemistry and Food and Drugs Division 115 Frederick St. Port-of-Spain
TUNISIA TUNISIE TUNEZ	Dr. S. Miladi Head Food Technology National Institute of Nutrition 120 Avenue de la Liberté Tunis
TURKEY TURQUIE TURQUIA	S. Toksoy Assistant Commercial Attaché Turkish Embassy Via Palestro, 28 Rome (Italy)
UNITED KINGDOM ROYAUME-UNI REINO UNIDO	J.H.V. Davies <u>*</u> Assistant Secretary Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Whitehall Place London S.W.1 Dr. R.J.L. Allen Group Research Director Beecham Group Ltd. Brentford Middlesex H.F. Bamford Chief Chemist (John Mackintosh) Rowntree Mackintosh Ltd. Chapelfield Works Norwich L.C.J. Brett Unilever House Blackfriars London E.C.4 Dr. V.L.S. Charley Consultant Beecham Products U.K.

Brentford
Middlesex

J.K. Foreman
Senior Superintendent
Environmental Chemistry
Laboratory of the Government Chemist
Cornwall House, Stamford St.,
London S.E.1

K. J. Gardner
Mars Ltd.
Dundee Road Training Estate
Slough, Bucks

R. F. Giles
Assistant Secretary
Food Standards, Science and Safety Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London S.W. 1

H.M. Goodall
Senior Executive Officer
Food Standards, Science and Safety Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London S.W. 1

L.G. Hanson
Chief Executive Officer
Food Standards, Science and Safety Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London S.W. 1

A.W. Hubbard
Superintendent Food, Drug, Agriculture Div.
Laboratory of the Government Chemist
Cornwall House
Stamford Street

London S.E.1

F. J. Lawton
Director
Food Manufacturers' Federation
4 Lygon Place
London S.W.1

I.R. Reid
Manager, Technology and Product Development
Campbell's Soups Ltd.
King's Lynn
Norfolk

J.A. Wilén
F.M.F.
2 Lygon Place
London S.W.1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	G.R. Grange
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE	Deputy Administrator
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA	Consumer and Marketing Service
	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Washington, D.C. 20250

S.D. Fine
Associate Commissioner for Compliance
Food and Drug Administration
200 "C" Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204

Dr. C.M.B. Gooding
American Oil Chemists' Society
785 Lamberts Mill Rd.
Westfield NJ 07090

M.M. Hoover
Chemical Engineer
Manufacturing Chemists Association
1825 Connecticut Ave.
Washington, D. C. 20009

J.R. Ives
Vice-President

American Meat Institute
59 East van Buren Street
Chicago, Illinois

E.F. Kimbrell
Assistant Codex Coordinator
Consumer and Marketing Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

R.C. Liebenow
President
Corn Refiners Association Inc.
1001 Conn. Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

L.K. Lobred
National Cannery Association
1133 20th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Michael F. Markel
Markel, Hill & Byerley
Munsey Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

J. J. Mertens
Director, Overseas Department
National Cannery Association
32, Oudaan
Antwerp (Belgium)

D. M. Mounce
V. P. Technical Administration
Campbell's Soups Co.
375 Memorial Ave.
Camden, New Jersey 08101

A. Nagel
Coordinator of Food Standards
General Foods Corp. Technical Center
250 North St.
White Plains
N.Y. 10602

J.W. Slavin
Assistant Director for Utilization
and Engineering
U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries
Washington, D.C.

Dr. H.C. Spencer
Biochemical Research Laboratory
The Dow Chemical Company
Midland, Michigan 48640

Dr. J. Bryan Stine
V.P. Regulatory Compliance
Kraft Foods
500 Peshtigo Ct.
Chicago 111, 60690

Donald R. Thompson
European Representative
California-Arizona Citrus Industry
52, rue du Progrès
1000 Brussels (Belgium)

URUGUAY

C. Pérez del Castillo
Embajador ante la FAO
Via Appia Antica 280
Rome (Italy)

VENEZUELA

M. Cols Paez
Jefe Sección Registro de Alimentos
Ministerio de Sanidad
Centro Simón Bolívar
Caracas

L.H. Vivas
Médico Adjunto al Director
Dirección de Salud Pública
Ministerio de Sanidad y Asistencia Social
Centro Simón Bolívar
Caracas

YUGOSLAVIA YOUGOSLAVIE

R. Pasajlić
Inspecteur fédéral principal adjoint du marché

Secrétariat fédéral d'économie
Novi Beograd, I Boulevard 104
Belgrade

Dr. B. Briski
Chief, Division for Laboratory Food and Food Additives
Analyses
Republic Institute of Public Health of Croatia
7, Rockefeller
Zagreb

Dr. G. Niketić
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Nemanjina 6
Beograd-Zemun

B. Parać
Economic Adviser
"Jugoriba" Export-Import
Nehajska 15
Zagreb
Dr. S. Stosić
Inspecteur fédéral sanitaire pour l'Hygiène et
l'Alimentation
Rue Brankova 25
Beograd

Prof. Dr. B. Vajic
Miramarska 13-C
Zagreb

OBSERVER COUNTRIES
PAYS OBSERVATEURS
PAISES OBSERVADORES

CONGO (Brazzaville)

J.P. Leke
Conseiller Economique
Ambassade du Congo
Via Tagliamento, 39
Rome (Italy)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Prof. Dr. A. Wolf
Ustav Hygieny
Srobarova 48

Praha 10 - Vinohrady

EL SALVADOR

F. Meléndez
Representante Permanente ante la FAO
Embassy of El Salvador
Rome (Italy)

LIBYAN ARAB REPUBLIC
REPUBLIQUE ARABE LIBYENE
REPUBBLICA ARABE LIBIA

A. Khalil
Counsellor for FAO Affairs
Libyan Embassy
Via Nomentana 365
Rome (Italy)

NICARAGUA

E. Matamoros
Representante Permanente ante la FAO
Embajada de Nicaragua
Via Nicolás Porpora, 12
Rome (Italy)

B. Matamoros
Representante Alterno ante la FAO
Embajada de Nicaragua
Via Nicolás Porpora, 12
Rome (Italy)

SOUTH AFRICA
AFRIQUE DU SUD
SUDAFRICA

A.B. Du Toit
Commercial Secretary
South African Embassy
Piazza Monte Grappa, 4
Rome (Italy)

INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS
INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES
INTERNACIONALES

ASSOCIATION DES INDUSTRIES
DES ALIMENTS DIETEIQUES DE
LA CEE (IDACE)

E. de Linières
Secrétaire général
5, Rue Hamelin
Paris XVIe (France)

COCOA PRODUCERS' ALLIANCE
(COPAL)

S. Kamga Djeumou
Secrétaire général adjoint

	P.O. Box 1718 Lagos (Nigeria)
COMITE DE LIAISON DE L'AGRUMICULTURE MEDITERRANEENNE (CLAM)	Dr. J. Royo-Iranzo Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas c/o Alvaro de Bazán 3 Valencia-10 (Spain)
COMITE INTERNATIONAL PERMANENT DE LA CONSERVE (CIPC)	G.L. Jumel 3, Rue de Logelbach Paris 17e (France)
COMMISSION DES COMMUNAUTES EUROPEENNES (CEE)	Dr. H. Steiger Conseiller principal 200, Rue de la Loi 1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)
	P. Bourgeois Administrateur 200, Rue de la Loi 1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)
	E. Gaerner Administrateur principal 200, Rue de la Loi 1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)
COMMISSION INTERNATIONALE DES INDUSTRIES AGRICOLES (CIIA)	G. Weill 18, Avenue de Villars Paris 7e (France)
CONSEIL DES COMMUNAUTES EUROPEENNES	D.M.R. Obst Administrateur près du Secrétariat général 2, Rue Ravenstein Bruxelles 1 (Belgium)
	A. Sacchetti Conseiller Adjoint au Service Juridique 2, Rue Ravenstein Bruxelles 1 (Belgium)
COUNCIL OF EUROPE (PARTIAL AGREEMENT) (CE)	O. Messer Chef de Service F67 Strasbourg (France)

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (ECE) L.W. Jacobson
Economic Affairs Officer
ECE/FAO Agriculture Division
Palais des Nations
Geneva (Switzerland)

EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF IMPORTERS OF DRIED FRUITS, PRESERVES, SPICES AND HONEY (FRUCOM) J.J. Mertens
Vice-President
30, St. Amelbergalei
B-2120 Schoten (Belgium)

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES PRODUCTEURS DE JUS DE FRUITS (FIJU) G.d'Eaubonne
Secrétaire générale
10, Rue de Liège
Paris 9e (France)

J.P. Roclore
Vice Président
10, Rue de Liège
Paris 9e (France)

GROUPEMENT EUROPEEN DES SOURCES D'EAUX MINERALES (GESEM) Dr. G. Bancalari
Vice-Président
24, Rue du IV Septembre
Paris 2e (France)

P. Bordier
Vice-Président
24, Rue de IV Septembre
Paris 2e (France)

Dr. C. Callipo
Délégué GESEM
52, Viale Liegi
Rome (Italy)

R. Germain
24, Rue de IV Septembre
Paris 9e (France)

INSTITUT EUROPEEN DE CANCEROLOGIE E.G. Peeters
Secrétaire général
24 bis Rue des Fripiers

1000 Bruxelles (Belgium)

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SEED CRUSHERS (IASC) L.C.J. Brett
1, Watergate
London E.C.4 (United Kingdom)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF GLUCOSE INDUSTRIES (IFG) Dr. R. Bauer
Secretary General
AAM, 29, Passage International
1010 Brussels (Belgium)

P. Karl
Director
246, Meadowbrook Road
Wyckoff, N.J. (U.S.A.)

E.G. Rapp
Attorney
29, Passage International
1010 Brussels (Belgium)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF MARGARINE ASSOCIATIONS (IFMA) Dr. P.F.M. Van der Weijden
Raamweg 44
The Hague (Netherlands)

INTERNATIONAL OLIVE OIL COUNCIL (IOOC) M. Cassotta
Directeur adjoint - questions techniques
Juan Bravo 10
Madrid 6 (Spain)

B. Rekik
Chef de Service
Juan Bravo 10
Madrid 6 (Spain)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION (ISO) Dr. R. Tarján
Hungarian Office for Standardization
P.O. Box 24
Budapest 9 (Hungary)

A. Miklovicz
Director
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
P.O. Box 8

Budapest 55 (Hungary)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION Miss D. Grose
OF CONSUMERS UNIONS (IOCU) Chief Librarian

Consumers' Association
14, Buckingham Street
London W.C. 2 (United Kingdom)

LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES
(ASMO)

Dr. M.M. Salama
Secretary General
Arab Organization for Standardization and Metrology
P.O. Box 690
Cairo (United Arab Republic)

Z.A. Zaher
Foreign Relations Officer
Arab Organization for
Standardization and Metrology
P.O.Box 690
Cairo (United Arab Republic)

OFFICE INTERNATIONAL DE LA
VIGNE ET DU VIN (OIV)

P. Jaulmes
Professeur à la Faculté de Pharmacie de Montpellier
11, Rue Roquepine
Paris 8e (France)

OFFICE INTERNATIONAL DU CACAO ET DU CHOCOLAT (OICC)
G.F. Schubiger
Président, Commission des Experts
Case Postale 88
1814 La Tour de Peilz (Switzerland)

UNION DES ASSOCIATIONS DE BOISSONS GAZEUSES DES PAYS
MEMBERS DE LA CEE (UNESDA) R.L. Delville
26, Rue du Lombard
Bruxelles (Belgium)

UNION INTERNATIONALE DES SCIENCES DE LA NUTRITION (UISN)
A. Gérard (délégué par le Prof. Bigwood)
Centre de recherches sur le droit de l'Alimentation
Institut d'Etudes européennes
39, Ave. F.D. Roosevelt
Bruxelles 5 (Belgium)

COMMISSION DES INDUSTRIES AGRICOLES ET ALIMENTAIRES DE LA CEE (UNICE - CIAA)
Dr. G. Heinicke
Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Ernährungsindustrie
Am Hofgarten 16

53 Bonn (Federal Republic of Germany)

Miss R. Maroncelli
Confindustria
Piazza Venezia 11
Rome (Italy)

L. Sciapli
Confindustria
Piazza Venezia 11
Rome (Italy)

*) Chairman of the Commission
Président de la Commission
Presidente de la Comisión

OTHER OBSERVERS
AUTRES OBSERVATEURS
OTROS OBSERVADORES

INTER-AMERICAN BAR
ASSOCIATION

F.M. Depew
Co-Chairman
Food and Drug Law Committee
206 East 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017 (U.S.A.)

JOINT SECRETARIES
CO-SECRETARIES
COSECRETARIOS

Dr. C. Agthe
Senior Scientist
Food Additives
World Health Organization
Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 (Switzerland)

G.O. Kermode
Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
00100 Rome (Italy)

WHO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE L'OMS
PERSONAL DE LA OMS

Dr. Z. Matyas
Food Hygienist, Veterinary Public Health
World Health Organization

Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 (Switzerland)

Dr. S. Shubber
Legal Officer
World Health Organization
Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 (Switzerland)

AO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE LA FAO
PERSONAL DE LA FAO

H.J. McNally
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, Rome

Ing.(M.S.) H. Barrera-Benitez
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, Rome

W.L. De Haas
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, Rome

J.P. Dobbert
Legal Officer
FAO, Rome

Dr. C. Jardin
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, Rome

Dr. L. G. Ladomery
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, Rome

R. K. Malik
Chief, Food Standards, Additives and Regulations
Section, ESN
FAO, Rome

Dr. F. Winkelman
Meat and Milk Group
FAO, Rome

APPENDIX II

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Report of the Fifteenth Session, Rome, 3 April 1970

Introduction

1. The Executive Committee held its Fifteenth Session at FAO Headquarters, Rome, on 3 April 1970. The Committee was presided over by the Chairman of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Mr. J.H.V. Davies (United Kingdom), and in the presence of the three ViceChairmen, Mr. I.H. Smith (Australia), Mr. E. Mortensen (Denmark) and Professor Dr. O. Hogl (Switzerland). The following representatives from the geographic locations mentioned were present: for Africa, Dr. N.A. de Heer from Ghana; for Asia, Mr. K. Ando from Japan; for Europe, Mr. J. Serwatowski from Poland; for Latin America, Ing. J.H. Piazzzi from Argentina; for North America, Mr. G.R. Grange from the U.S.A.; for South-West Pacific, Mr. E.J. Stonyer from New Zealand. The Coordinator for Europe, Dr. R. Wildner (Austria) was also present. The Secretariat consisted of Dr. C. Agthe and Dr. S. Shubber (WHO), and Mr. G. O. Kermode and Mr. H. J. McNally (FAO).

Adoption of the Agenda

2. The Committee adopted the Provisional agenda.

Rule XII.3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission

3. The Executive Committee had before it document ALINORM 70/8-Part I and Addendum I, which had been prepared by the Secretariat and which dealt with Rule XII of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. The Executive Committee decided to consider first the section of the paper relating to the proposal made by the Argentine delegation at the Sixth Session of the Commission that Rule XII 3 be amended so that English, French and Spanish would be Mandatory working languages in subsidiary bodies of the Commission set up under Rule IX.1 (b) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. The Executive Committee noted that countries hosting Codex Committees had, in general, indicated that, while they appreciated the desire of the Spanish-speaking countries to have Spanish provided as a third working language in Codex Committees, there were both financial and practical difficulties in the way of undertaking an obligation to provide full facilities in the three languages. It was pointed out that it should not be taken as axiomatic that all Codex Committees would always select English and French as the languages in which they would work. In general, host countries had said they would find great difficulty in meeting the additional financial burdens of providing a third language. There were also considerable practical difficulties, particularly for those countries where the mother tongue was not one of the languages of the Commission.

4. It seemed clear therefore that, in view of the replies of host governments, the only means of implementing the proposal of the Argentine delegation would be for funds to be made available out of the budget of the Commission. This would require a considerable increase in the budget and the Executive Committee did not think it would be right to recommend such an increase at the present time.

5. The representative of Latin America did not think that the arguments put forward by the host governments were convincing and restated the arguments in favour of the use of Spanish as set out in paragraph 7 of ALINOLRM 70/8-Part I. He considered that there could never be full participation in the work of the Commission by Spanish-speaking countries unless all the working documents, simultaneous interpretation and the draft reports of Codex Committees were provided in Spanish. Most of the Spanish-speaking countries were developing and the provision of Spanish could be regarded as in the nature of assistance in the field of food standards to the developing countries by the developed countries. He considered that an amendment to Rule XII.3 to make Spanish mandatory in all Codex Committees was essential. He did not, however, think that such a provision was essential in respect of Coordinating Committees.

6. The Executive Committee decided that, in view of the attitude of host governments and the financial implications, it could not recommend to the Commission an amendment to Rule XII.3. The Executive Committee, however, reiterated its view on the importance of Spanish for the work of the Commission and urged host governments to make every effort to provide for Spanish in Committees for which they were responsible. The Executive Committee thought that it might be useful if the Directors-General of FAO and WHO were to write to host governments stressing the particular importance of at least providing simultaneous interpretation in the three languages of the Commission. It was noted that the cost of providing simultaneous interpretation and facilities for the translation of the draft report into Spanish at a Codex Committee session would be of the order of \$ 2,000 and that therefore the cost of providing simultaneous interpretation only would be somewhat less than this figure. The Executive Committee also thought that the Spanish-speaking countries should write to the Secretariat indicating the relative importance which they attached to the following:

- a. translation of working documents for a session into Spanish;
- b. simultaneous interpretation;
- c. translation of the draft report of the session and other documents of the session into Spanish.

7. The Executive Committee also considered that the Directors-General should consider doing what they could to provide as many working documents as possible in Spanish for Codex Committee sessions.

Rule XII

8. The Executive Committee considered the section of document ALINORM 70/8-Part I, which dealt in particular with Rule XII.1. Having noted the reasons advanced by the Secretariat for

amending this Rule, The Executive Committee considered the amended version of the Rule proposed by the Secretariat. The Executive Committee considered that the text was not entirely satisfactory and agreed to a number of amendments; it agreed to recommend the following version of the Rule to the Commission for adoption:

1. The languages of the Commission and of its subsidiary bodies set up under Rule IX.1(a) shall be not less than three of the working languages, as shall be determined by the Commission, which are working languages both of FAO and of the Health Assembly of WHO.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 above, other languages which are working languages either of FAO or of the Health Assembly of WHO may be added by the Commission if
 - a. the Commission has before it a report from the Directors-General of FAO and WHO on the policy, financial and administrative implications of the addition of such languages; and
 - b. the addition of such languages has the approval of the Directors-General of FAO and WHO.”

9. As a consequence of the proposal to amend Rule XII.1, in the way indicated above, the Executive Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission for adoption the following amended versions of Rule XII.2 and Rule XII.3, which will become Rule XII.3 and Rule XII.4 respectively:

“Rule XII.3

3. Where a representative wishes to use [another] a language other than a language of the Commission he shall himself provide the necessary interpretation and/or translation into one of the [working] languages of the Commission.”

“Rule XII.4

4. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 3 [2] of this Rule, the [working] languages of subsidiary bodies set up under Rule IX.1 (b) shall include at least two of the [working] languages of the Commission.”

Rule VI.3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission

10. The Executive Committee took note of the contents of document ALINORM 70/8-Part II, which had been prepared by the Secretariat as a consequence of a suggestion put forward by the 15th Session of the FAO Conference that the “Codex Alimentarius Commission should re-examine, at its next session, the principles governing the elaboration of standards for regions or groups of countries, as reflected in Rule VI.3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.”

11. While the Executive Committee thought that the report of the Conference was not entirely clear as to what principles underlying Rule VI.3 were to be examined, it noted that the Member Country which had raised this question in the Conference, was specifically concerned with ensuring that the Commission should “remain fully master of its work programme”. The Executive Committee recalled that a proposal put by it to the last session of the Commission which would have had the effect of requiring the approval of the majority of all the Member Countries of the Commission before a regional standard was elaborated, had failed to gain the required two-thirds majority in the Commission. The Executive Committee also recognized that there were legitimate differences of opinion on this question and further that no additional regional standards were presently contemplated by the Commission. The possibility of inadequately considered proposals for regional standards had been greatly reduced by the introduction by the Commission of strict criteria which had to be fulfilled before a standard could be elaborated. In the light of the foregoing, the Executive Committee thought that no useful purpose would be served in reconsidering Rule VI.3 at the 7th session of the Commission and took the view that any reconsideration of this Rule should await further developments.

Governing Paragraph for the FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products and relationship between the Commission and the Committee

12. The Executive Committee had before it documents ALINORM 70/9 and Addenda 1 and 2, containing the replies of governments to the specific questions posed by the Commission at its Sixth Session in connection with the Milk and Milk Products Committee's redraft of the governing paragraph. The representative of North America conveyed to the Executive Committee the reply of Canada to the questions posed. The written reply of Canada had not been received by the Secretariat.

13. The replies revealed that there was a considerable divergence of opinion between governments on the points raised in the questions posed. The Executive Committee considered that much of the apparent divergence of views was due to the different interpretations of the words used in the governing paragraph. Mr. Mortensen pointed out that there might be differences between the milk standards and other Codex standards because the milk standards had been deliberately drafted as minimum standards; he thought that this was a point which required investigation.

14. The Executive Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the Commission that (a) the governing paragraph should not state that the Milk and Milk Products Committee had full competence, since many of its decisions were subject to endorsement by Codex General Subject Committees; (b) the governing paragraph should not state that only final decisions of the Milk and Milk Products Committee were subject to review by the Commission, since the Commission had the right to review any decision of any of its subsidiary bodies.

15. The Executive Committee was unanimously of the view that the acceptance procedure for milk product standards should be brought into line with that for other Codex standards. Some

Members of the Executive Committee thought that steps to this end should be taken immediately, while others thought that it would be more advisable to deal with this matter at a later stage. The Executive Committee agreed that the integration of the acceptance procedure under the Code into the Codex acceptance procedure should not apply to standards already sent out for acceptance by the Milk and Milk Products Committee unless these standards were substantially amended after the time of integration.

Proposed Amendment to the Terms of Reference of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene

16. The Executive Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission the adoption of the following addition to the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, as proposed by the Secretariat:

“The Committee may refer, where necessary, specific food hygiene problems, including, in particular, microbiological methodology and sampling, for consideration to FAO and/or WHO, to bodies set up by them and to other organizations recognized by FAO and WHO to be appropriate in respect of such reference.”

Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

17. The representative of North America pointed out that ALINORM 70/21 did not contain any reference to the question of setting up a sub-committee of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues though this would need to be considered by the Commission. Mr. Smith pointed out that the question of what constituted a sub-committee under paragraph 8 of the Guidelines was not an easy one and it might be that this paragraph needed clarification.

18. The Executive Committee agreed that the question of a subcommittee under the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (paras. 26–27 of ALINORM 70/24) would need to be discussed at the Seventh Session of the Commission. It asked the Secretariat to consider whether any clarification of paragraph 8 of the Guidelines was required and to submit a paper on this matter to the next session of the Executive Committee including, if that seemed desirable, a draft amendment to the paragraph.

Other business

19. The representative of North America was of the opinion that clarification was needed of the Commission's view concerning provisions in Codex standards which were not enforceable by examination of the end product. The Executive Committee recalled an interpretation by the Commission at its 5th session (paras. 26–27, ALINORM 68/35) of the meaning of quality criteria, according to which Codex standards could include provisions on the quality of the raw material used. The Executive Committee agreed that wherever possible, verifiable and product specifications were preferable, but that Codex standards could contain provisions such as those relating to conditions of manufacture and raw materials used, which cannot be determined by the examination of the end product. The Executive Committee also agreed that this principle applied equally to aspects of Codex standards other than quality criteria.

APPENDIX III

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF REFERENCES FOR CODEX

DOCUMENTS

1. The series of references set out in paragraph 2 hereunder for the various Codex Committee have been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission at its seventh session. This system of referencing Codex documents is to be regarded as an interpretation of that portion of paragraph 9(e) of the Guidelines for Codex Committees concerning the need to assign consecutive reference numbers in suitable series to all documents of Codex Committees. The other information required in paragraph 9(e) of the Guidelines, which reads as follows, should also be given:

“9(e) Committee chairmen should assign consecutive reference numbers in suitable series to all documents of Codex Committees. The reference number should appear at the top right-hand corner of the first page together with a statement of the language in which the document was prepared and the date of its preparation. A clear statement should be made of the provenance (origin or author country) of the paper immediately under the title. The text should be divided into numbered paragraphs.”

CODEX/SUBJECT CODE REFERENCE+ YEAR
OF SESSION /CONSECUTIVE NUMBER OF
DOCUMENTS

Codex Alimentarius Commission working documents and reports	- CX/ALINORM 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
---	-------------------------------

Executive Committee (identified also by session number following the year)	- CX/EXEC 69/14/1, 2, 3, etc.
--	-------------------------------

Coordinating Committee for Europe	- CX/EURO 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products	- CX/MDS 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
---	---------------------------

General Subject Codex Committees

Food Additives	- CX/FA 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
----------------	--------------------------

Pesticide Residues	- CX/PR 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
--------------------	--------------------------

Methods of Analysis and Sampling	- CX/MAS 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
----------------------------------	---------------------------

Food Labelling	- CX/FL 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
----------------	--------------------------

Food Hygiene	- CX/FH 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
--------------	--------------------------

General Principles	- CX/GP 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
--------------------	--------------------------

Codex Commodity Committees

Cocoa Products and Chocolate	- CX/CPC 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Sugars	- CX/S 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Processed Fruits and Vegetables	- CX/PFV 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Fats and Oils	- CX/FO 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Fish and Fishery Products	- CX/FFP 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Meat	- CX/M 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Sub-Com. I. on Cutting Methods and Cuts of Carcasses	- CX/M-SC I/CMCC 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Processed Meat Products	- CX/PMP 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
Foods for Special Dietary Uses	- CX/FSDU 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
ECE/Codex Group of Experts on Fruit Juices	- CX/FJ 69/1, 2, 3, etc.
ECE/Codex Group of Experts on Quick Frozen Foods	- CX/QFF 69/1, 2, 3, etc.

NOTE

It will be seen from the above that, in referencing Codex documents, CX, which standards for Codex, should appear first, followed by the subject code reference, followed by the year in which the session will be held (i.e. not necessarily the year in which the document is prepared), and finally followed by the consecutive number of the document.

APPENDIX IV

REPORT TO THE FAO CONFERENCE ON RULE VI.3 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

1. The Codex Alimentarius Commission has noted that the present Rule VI.3 and Rule XIII.1, which lay down that a two-thirds majority of the votes cast is required for an amendment to the rules, have been approved by the Directors-General of FAO and WHO and confirmed by the appropriate procedures of the two Organizations. The wording of Rule VI.3 was very thoroughly discussed at the Sixth Session of the Commission in 1969 and the amendment to the Rule proposed by the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which would have reserved the decision on the elaboration of regional standards to the Commission as a whole and not simply to Member Countries belonging to the region concerned, was not carried on a roll-call vote, the vote being 22 for, 14 against and 1 abstention. The required two-thirds majority was thus not obtained.

2. The majority of the Members of the Commission considered that this amendment was necessary for the Commission to be fully master of its own programme of work within the limits of the budget. They thought that it should not be possible for a majority of the countries of a region to embark on a regional standard even though a large majority of the Commission was in favour of a world-wide standard and even if a world-wide standard was in course of preparation.

3. The Members opposing the amendment considered that it was perfectly possible for the Commission to remain master of its work programme without depriving countries of a region of the right to elaborate regional standards when they themselves wanted to do so. The elaboration of regional standards has always been accepted as one of the functions of the Commission and the possibility of elaborating regional standards should be facilitated and not hampered by the Rules of Procedure.

4. It is not easy to isolate any basic principles that underlie the procedure for elaborating regional standards. Respectable arguments can be adduced both for the view that the undertaking of any work under the aegis of the Commission - no matter what its scope - should require the approval of a majority of the Members and for the view that the elaboration of a regional standard can be of such importance for the members of that region that their wishes should not be open to frustration by the votes of members of other regions. The Commission does not therefore at present appear to be unanimous on the principles which should govern the elaboration of regional standards.

5. In view of this divergence of view, it would not, in the opinion of the Commission, be sensible to return to this issue at each session of the Commission. The question, however, remains open and if there is a change in the views of member countries in the light of experience, it will be reconsidered under the procedures of the Commission but it is submitted that the time for reconsideration is best judged by the Commission itself and its Executive Committee. They will certainly keep in mind that this is an issue to which the FAO Conference attaches importance.

APPENDIX V

ARGENTINE AND UNITED KINGDOM STATEMENTS

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF THE ARGENTINE

"We wish to state that the Malvinas Islands, mentioned in ALINORM 70/31, Annex I, page 4, as an independent territory, form part of the Argentine Republic and are included in its domain and sovereignty.

Due to the fact that in the English and French versions of the mentioned document the United Nations nomenclature for these Islands was not observed, in accordance with the resolution of December 16th, 1965, and published in FAO's terminology bulletin No. 250, April 1, 1969^{*},

we request that the above-mentioned document be modified and that the United Nations disposition be applied in accordance.”

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

“I am bound to state that Her Majesty's Government have no doubts as to their sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (and/or Falkland Islands Dependencies)*. If the statement of the Argentine delegation is recorded in the Report of the Session, I request that my present statement shall also be recorded.”

* U.N. TERMINOLOGY BULLETIN No. 250, 1 April 1969

<u>ENGLISH:</u>	FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)
<u>FRENCH:</u>	ILES FALKLAND (MALVINAS)
<u>SPANISH:</u>	ISLAS MALVINAS (FALKLAND ISLANDS)

APPENDIX VI

GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE USE OF FOOD

ADDITIVES

1. The use of food additives is justified only when it serves one or more of the following purposes:
 - a. to maintain the nutritional quality of a food;
 - b. to enhance the keeping quality or stability of a food;
 - c. to make a food attractive to the consumer;
 - d. to provide aids in producing, manufacturing, packing, processing, preparing, treating, packaging, transporting or holding food;
 - e. to provide essential components for foods for special dietary uses.

The use of food additives is not justified:

- f. if the proposed level of use constitutes a hazard to the health of the consumer;
 - g. when it causes a substantial reduction in the nutritive value of a food;
 - h. when it disguises the faulty qualities of a product or the use of processing and handling techniques which are not permitted;
 - i. when it deceives the consumer;
 - j. when the desired effect can be obtained by other manufacturing practices which are economically and technologically satisfactory.
2. The levels of use of food additives should not exceed the level reasonably required to achieve the desired technological effect under good manufacturing practice.

3. Food additives should be in conformity with an approved standard of purity.
4.
 - f. All food additives, whether actually in use or being proposed for future use, should be subjected to adequate toxicological evaluation.
 - g. Permitted food additives should be subject to continuing observation for possible deleterious effects and should be re-appraised whenever necessary in the light of changing conditions of use and new scientific information.
5. Approval of temporary approval for the inclusion of a food additive in a permitted list should, as far as possible, be limited to specific foods for specific purposes and under specific conditions.
6. When a food containing additives is consumed mainly by some special groups in the community, the approval to use the additives should be based on knowledge of the intake by such special groups concerning the food in question.
7. Contaminants must not exceed levels that are both safe and technologically feasible.

APPENDIX VII

LIST OF FOOD COLOURS WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN AN

ADI

OR TEMPORARY ADI

<u>Substance</u>	<u>Colour Index Number</u>
Amaranth	16 185
Anatto Extracts *	75 120
Beta-Apo-8'-Carotenal	-
Beta-Apo-8'-Carotenoic acid, methyl and ethyl esters	-
Beta-Carotene	-
Brilliant Blue FCF	42 090
Canthaxanthine	-
Chlorophyll	75 810
Chlorophyllin copper complex	75 810
Chlorophyllin copper complex, sodium and potassium salts	-
Erythrosine *	45 430
Fast Green FCF	42 053
Indanthrene Blue RS *	69 800

Indigotine *	73 015
Patent Blue V *	42 051
Ponceau 4R *	16 255
Quinoline Yellow *	47 005
Riboflavin	-
Sunset Yellow FCF	15 985
Tartrazine	19 140
Titanium dioxide	77 891
Turmeric *	75 300
Wool Green BS *	44 090

* The substances marked with an asterisk have been given only a temporary ADI by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives.