



REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION Rome, 29 March - 9 April 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Issued by the Secretariat of the
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Rome
Ref. No. ALINORM 76/44, August 1976

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

Introduction

Address by the Deputy Director-General of FAO

Adoption of Agenda and Timetable

Election of Officers of the Commission

PART II

Executive Committee - Report on the Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Sessions

Proposed GATT Code of Conduct for Preventing Technical Barriers to Trade

PART III

Membership of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

Progress Report on Acceptances of Recommended Codex Standards and Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues

PART IV

Activities within FAO and WHO of interest to the Codex Alimentarius Commission

Information on the Activities of other International Organization working on the Standardization of Foods and Related Matters

PART V

Income and Expenditure of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme for 1974/75 and Proposed Programme of Work and Budget for 1976/77

PART VI

Codex Committee on General Principles

Codex Committee on Food Labelling

Codex Committee on Food Additives

- Specifications for Food Additives

- Principle relating to the Carry-Over of Additives into Foods

- Changes to the Status of Endorsement of Food Additive Provisions in Step 9 Codex Standards

- Provisions for Contaminants in Codex Standards

Codex Committee on Food Hygiene

- Consideration of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products at Step 8

- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Molluscan Shellfish at Step 5

- Matters arising from the Reports of the 11th and 12th Sessions of the Committee. Terms of Reference of the Committee

Report of the Ad Hoc Consultation on Pesticides in Agriculture and Public Health

Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

- Maximum Residue Limits at Step 8

- Amendments to Maximum Residue Limits at Step 9

- Maximum Residue Limits at Step 5

- Non-substantive changes to Maximum Residue Limits at Step 9

- Scheduling of Sessions of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

Codex Committee on Method of Analysis and Sampling

- Sampling for the Determination of Net Content

- Role of Referee Methods

PART VII

Coordinating Committee for Africa

Coordinating Committee for Latin America

Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Regional Conference for Asia

- Establishment of a Coordinating Committee for Asia

Coordinating Committee for Europe and Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters

Boneless Meat

Codex Coordinating Committees

PART VIII

Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate

- Draft Standard for Cocoa (Cacao) Beans, Cocoa (Cacao) Nibs, Cocoa (Cacao) Mass, Cocoa Press Cake and Cocoa Dust (Cocoa Fines) for Use in the Manufacture of Cocoa and Chocolate Products at Step 7

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Cocoa Butter at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Chocolate at Step 8

Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables

- Reconsideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft General Standard for Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft General Standard for Citrus Marmalade at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Mature Processed Peas at Step 8

- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Canned Tropical Fruit Salad at Step 5

- Proposed Amendments to the Recommended International Standard for Canned Peaches

- Inclusion of Contaminants Provision in Standards

Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Standardization of Fruit Juices

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Grape Juice at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standards for Concentrated Grape Juice and Sweetened Concentrated Labrusca Type Grape Juice at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Pineapple Juice at Step 8

- Proposed Draft Standard for Non-Pulpy Blackcurrant Nectar at Step 5

- Amendments to Step 9 Standards

Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Peaches at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Bilberries at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Spinach at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Code of Practice for the Processing and Handling of Quick Frozen Foods at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat at Step 8

- Proposed Draft Standards for Quick Frozen Foods at Step 5

- Method for Checking Temperature of Quick Frozen Foods at Step 5

- Amendments to Standards at Step 9 of the Procedure

Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene

- Consideration of Draft Code of Ante-mortem and Post-mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals at Step 8

Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products

- Consideration of Draft Standard for Canned Corned Beef at Step 8

- Consideration of Standard for Luncheon Meat at Step 8

- Consideration of Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products at Step 8

Codex Committee on Meat

Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Fillets of Flat Fish at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Crab Meat at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns at Step 8

- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standards for Quick Frozen Lobsters, Rock Lobsters, Spiny Lobsters and Slipper Lobsters and Canned Sardines and Sardine-Type Products at Step 5

- Consideration of Draft Codes of Practice for Fresh Fish and for Canned Fish at Step 5

- Consideration of Proposed Draft Code of Practice for Frozen Fish at Step 5

Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Infant Formula at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods at Step 8

- Consideration of the Draft Standard for Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Children at Step 8

- Methods of Analysis for Foods for Infants and Children

- Modified Starches to be included in the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods

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

- Procedure for Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards

- Progress at 17th Session

- Hygienic Requirements for Milk and Milk Products

- Imitation Milk Products

- Labelling Provisions for Standard for Yogurt and Sweetened Yogurt

- Acceptance Forms

Codex Committee on Edible Ices

- Consideration of Proposed Draft Standard for Edible Ices and Ice Mixes at Step 5

Codex Committee on Fats and Oils

- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Low Fat Spreads at Step 5

- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Low Erucic Acid Rapeseed Oil at Step 5

- Matters arising from the Report of the 8th Session of the Committee

Codex Committee on Sugars

- Draft Standard for Fructose at Steps 4 and 5

Codex Committee on Soups and Broths

- Matters arising from the Report of the Committee

PART IX

International Standards for Food Contaminants - Scope and Magnitude of work

[Vinegar](#)

[Salt](#)

[Tea](#)

[Coffee and Coffee Products](#)

[Cereals](#)

[PART X](#)

[Provisional Timetable of Codex Sessions in 1976/77](#)

[Provisional List of Codex Sessions in the 1978/79 biennium](#)

[Date and Place of the Twelfth Session of the Commission](#)

[PART XI](#)

[Other Business](#)

[Vegetable Proteins](#)

[Possible Relocation of the Joint Office of the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme](#)

[Valediction](#)

APPENDICES

[Appendix I - List of Participants](#)

[Appendix II - Opening Address by the Deputy Director-General of FAO](#)

[Appendix III - Country Positions as at 9 April 1976 regarding Acceptance of Recommended Codex Standards and Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues](#)

PART I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Eleventh Session of the Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission was held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, from 29 March to 9 April 1976. The session was attended by 310 participants, including the representatives and observers of 60 countries and observers from 29 international organizations (see Appendix I for the List of Participants).

2. The Commission was presided over by the Chairman, Dr. D.G. Chapman (Canada) and by two of its three Vice-Chairmen, Dr. E. Matthey (Switzerland) and Dr. T. Ndoeye (Senegal). The third Vice-Chairman, Dr. E. Méndez (Mexico) could not be present for the entirety of the session. The Joint Secretaries were Mr. G.O. Kermode and Mr. H.J. McNally (FAO) and Dr. F.C. Lu and Dr. L. Reinius (WHO).

Address by the Deputy Director-General of FAO

3. The Eleventh 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 the Directors-General, with a speech of welcome by Mr. Roy I. Jackson, Deputy Director-General of FAO. Amongst other things, Mr. Jackson referred to the expanding interest shown by Member Governments of FAO and WHO in the work of the Commission, the shift in emphasis in FAO and WHO to what might be described as country-focus activities and its relationship to the work of the Commission, and the increasing attention being paid by the Commission to the needs of the developing countries. He also paid tribute to the retiring Chairman of the Commission, Dr. D.G. Chapman (Canada) and expressed the appreciation of WHO and FAO to those governments which had undertaken the task of chairing and hosting meetings of the Commission's subsidiary bodies. The full text of Mr. Jackson's address is contained in Appendix II to this report.

Adoption of Agenda and Timetable

4. The Commission adopted the provisional agenda with a slight re-arrangement in the order of items to be discussed.

Election of Officers of the Commission

5. During the session, the Commission elected Dr. E. Matthey (Switzerland) as Chairman of the Commission to serve from the end of the 11th to the end of the 12th session of the Commission and also re-elected Dr. T. Ndoeye (Senegal) and elected Dr. D. Eckert (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. W.C.K. Hammer (Australia) as Vice-Chairmen of the Commission to serve from the end of the 11th to the end of the 12th 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 11th to the end of the 13th session of the Commission in accordance with Rule III. 1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission: Africa - Kenya; Asia - Thailand; Europe - Czechoslovakia; Latin America - Brazil; North America - U.S.A.; South West Pacific - New Zealand.

PART II

REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN ON THE TWENTY-FIRST AND TWENTY-SECOND SESSIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

7. The Commission received reports concerning the 21st and 22nd sessions of the Executive Committee held in Geneva from 17 to 19 June 1975 and in Rome on 23 and 24 March 1976, respectively. The reports of these two sessions of the Executive Committee were contained in ALINORM 76/3 and ALINORM 76/4. In introducing and reviewing the reports, the Chairman indicated that all but one 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 following matter was dealt with under this item of the agenda.

Proposed GATT Code of Conduct for Preventing Technical Barriers to Trade

8. The proposed GATT Code of Conduct for Preventing Technical Barriers to Trade had been discussed by the Commission at its Tenth Session (ALINORM 74/44, paras 15 and 16) and by the Executive Committee at its Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Sessions (ALINORM 76/3, paras 15-17 and ALINORM 76/4, paras 17-20).

9. The representative of GATT was invited to speak on the proposed Code. He referred to correspondence between the GATT Secretariat and the Codex Secretariat concerning the proposed Code, the substance of which had been conveyed to the Members of the Commission in circular letter CL 1975/10, April 1975. There had been very recent correspondence between the two Secretariats and the Executive Committee at its Twenty-Second Session took note of a communication from GATT summarizing developments concerning the proposed Code.

10. The communication indicated that in March 1975 it had been agreed that negotiations should commence initially on a range of non-tariff measures and in this regard the Sub-Group Technical Barriers to Trade had been established to draw up general rules in the area, inter alia, of standards. The Sub-Group Technical Barriers to Trade had agreed that the proposed Code of Conduct for Preventing Technical Barriers to Trade should be used as the basis for its work. A great deal of work had been done on the text of the proposed Code. This work, which also related to problems in the area of packaging and labelling, was continuing (for example, the Sub-Group had been examining specific drafting suggestions and had also examined the applicability to the proposed Code of the definitions drawn up by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the International Organization for Standardization). So far, the question of the applicability of this work to agricultural product standards had yet to be taken up by the relevant negotiating bodies established within the framework of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations to treat tariff and non-tariff measures relating to agricultural products.

11. In reply to an enquiry from Dr. T. Ndoeye (Senegal), Vice-Chairman, as to whether UNCTAD was associated with GATT in this area of activity, the representative of GATT indicated that there were close working relationships with a number of interested international organizations in this area, including UNCTAD.

12. The Commission endorsed the view of the Executive Committee which had re-emphasized the need for the Secretariat to maintain the closest liaison with the GATT Secretariat and for the work in GATT on the proposed Code and in other areas of possible interest to the Commission to be followed very closely. In this connection, the Executive Committee had re-stressed the desirability that the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission should be invited to attend these GATT meetings in an observer capacity. The Secretariat undertook, within the limits of its travel budget, to try and be represented at these meetings, assuming that they were not restricted meetings.

13. The Executive Committee had also reiterated the view which it had expressed at its Twenty-First Session that delegates attending sessions of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should get in touch with their counterparts in other Ministries in their countries attending the GATT meetings on this subject, so that the representatives attending the GATT meetings might be more closely acquainted with the objectives and working procedures of the Commission in the matter of international food standards.

PART III

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND ACCEPTANCE OF CODEX STANDARDS

14. The Commission had before it a list of Members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The membership as at 9 April 1976 is set out below. The Commission noted that since its last Session, membership had increased by nine countries and that 114 countries were now Members of the Commission. The nine new Members of the Commission were as follows: Bangladesh, Bénin - People's Republic of, Burma, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guinée-Bissau, Nepal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Western Samoa.

AFRICA

1. Algeria
2. Bénin, People's Rep. of *
3. Burundi
4. Cameroon
5. Central African Rep.
6. Congo, People's Rep. of
7. Egypt, Arab Rep. of
8. Ethiopia
9. Gabon
10. Gambia
11. Ghana
12. Guinea-Bissau *
13. Ivory Coast
14. Kenya

15. Liberia
16. Lybian Arab Rep.
17. Madagascar
18. Malawi
19. Mauritius
20. Morocco
21. Nigeria
22. Senegal
23. Sudan
24. Swaziland
25. Tanzania, United Rep. of
26. Togo
27. Tunisia
28. Uganda
29. Upper Volta
30. Zaire, Rep. of
31. Zambia

ASIA

32. Bangladesh *
33. Burma *
34. Cambodia *
35. India
36. Indonesia
37. Iran
38. Iraq
39. Japan
40. Jordan
41. Korea, Rep. of
42. Kuwait
43. Lebanon
44. Malaysia
45. Nepal *
46. Oman, Sultanate of
47. Pakistan
48. Philippines
49. Qatar
50. Saudi Arabia
51. Singapore
52. Sri Lanka
53. Syrian Arab Rep.
54. Thailand
55. United Arab Emirates
56. Viet-Nam

57. Yemen, People's Dem. Rep. of

EUROPE

- 58. Austria
- 59. Belgium
- 60. Bulgaria
- 61. Cyprus
- 62. Czechoslovakia
- 63. Denmark
- 64. Finland
- 65. France
- 66. Germany, Fed. Rep. of
- 67. Greece
- 68. Hungary
- 69. Iceland
- 70. Ireland
- 71. Israel
- 72. Italy
- 73. Luxembourg
- 74. Malta
- 75. Netherlands
- 76. Norway
- 77. Poland
- 78. Portugal
- 79. Romania
- 80. Spain
- 81. Sweden
- 82. Switzerland
- 83. Turkey
- 84. United Kingdom
- 85. U.S.S.R. *
- 86. Yugoslavia

LATIN AMERICA

- 87. Argentina
- 88. Barbados
- 89. Bolivia
- 90. Brazil
- 91. Chile
- 92. Colombia
- 93. Costa Rica
- 94. Cuba
- 95. Dominican Republic

- 96. Ecuador
- 97. El Salvador *
- 98. Guatemala
- 99. Guyana
- 100. Jamaica
- 101. Mexico
- 102. Nicaragua
- 103. Panama
- 104. Paraguay
- 105. Peru
- 106. Trinidad and Tobago
- 107. Uruguay
- 108. Venezuela

NORTH AMERICA

- 109. Canada
- 110. U.S.A.

SOUTH-WEST PACIFIC

- 111. Australia
- 112. Fiji
- 113. New Zealand
- 114. Western Samoa *

* New Members since the Tenth Session of the Commission.

Progress Report on Acceptances of Recommended Codex Standards and Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues

15. The Commission took note of the contents of documents ALINORM 76/6, Parts I, II, III, IV and V and LIM 2, which were introduced and reviewed by the Secretariat. Document ALINORM 76/6, Part I, contained a detailed comparison which had been made by Japan, between many of the Recommended Codex Standards and Recommended Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues and Japanese national standards. The differences between the Codex recommendations and the Japanese national standards were set forth in detail in the document.

16. Document ALINORM 76/6, Part II, contained details of the deviations notified by the U.S.A. in connection with its Acceptance with Specified Deviations of the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and the Recommended Standard for Quick Frozen Peas. The U.S.A. also set forth in a summary document (LIM 2) - which as a conference Room document did not receive full distribution prior to the Commission's session - its position on several Recommended Codex Standards and Recommended Maximum

Limits for Pesticide Residues. The U.S.A. had completed its rule-making procedure including publication of Recommended Codex Standards in the Federal Register for comments on 21 Recommended International Codex Standards. In addition, the U.S.A. had completed action on the Recommended European Regional Standard for Honey. Included in the actions to-date was the establishment of eight new regulations for products not previously covered in U.S. regulations. Official notification of the U.S. action had been prepared on the appropriate form supplied by the Secretariat and these completed forms were in the process of being formally transmitted to the Secretariat by the U.S. Government.

17. The U.S.A. had given Acceptance with Specified Deviations to the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and to 12 Recommended Commodity Standards (canned Pacific salmon, margarine, canned grapefruit, canned applesauce, canned sweet corn, canned plums, quick frozen peas, dextrose anhydrous, dextrose monohydrate, glucose syrup, dried glucose syrup and lactose). The U.S.A. reaffirmed its previous advice to the Secretariat that it did not accept the Recommended International Standards for edible soya bean oil, edible arachis oil, edible cottonseed oil, edible sunflowerseed oil, edible rapeseed oil, edible maize oil, edible sesameseed oil, edible safflowerseed oil and mustardseed oil. However, as there did not appear to be any provisions in the above Recommended International Standards which would be in conflict with the basic requirements of the U.S. food laws and regulations, those oils, other than rapeseed oil, complying with the Recommended Codex Standards would not be barred because of any specifications or requirements therein from entering the U.S. or moving freely in U.S. domestic commerce. Only hydrogenated rapeseed oil had been used for food in the U.S.A. and there would be some question of the acceptability of untreated rapeseed oil until the significance of its erucic acid content and toxicity had been more fully explored.

18. The summary paper prepared by the U.S.A. (LIM 2) reiterated that while the U.S. did not accept the Recommended European Regional Standard for Honey, the U.S. would permit honey that fully complied with the standard to be distributed in the U.S.A. The summary paper also indicated that Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues had been accepted by the U.S.A. The commodity definitions differed slightly from those recommended by the Commission, and for this reason, the applicable commodities had been identified. The list of Recommended Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues accepted by the U.S.A. has been reproduced in document ALINORM 74/6-part IV Addendum.

19. Document ALINORM 76/6, Part III, set forth the position of Canada concerning the acceptance of certain Recommended Codex Standards and also concerning the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues. Canada had given Acceptance with Specified Deviations to the Recommended Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and to 16 Recommended Commodity Standards, as listed in the document mentioned above. Canada had decided to give non-acceptance in the case of one Recommended Commodity Standard. The details of the position of Canada with regard to each of the 18 Recommended Standards including full details of specified deviations, were set forth in the eighteen completed forms for the declaration of acceptance or non-acceptance, which formed part of ALINORM 76/6, Part III.

20. Document ALINORM 76/6-Part III also set forth in detail the position of Canada regarding acceptance or non-acceptance of every Recommended Codex Maximum Limit listed in the publication "Recommended International Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues (Fourth Series)". Each and every food product listed in that publication had been covered in the Canadian reply. This information was set forth in the required completed forms which also formed part of document ALINORM 76/6-Part III. It was noted that Canada had been able to give Full Acceptance to a very substantial number of the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues.

21. Document ALINORM 76/6-Part IV contained information supplied by Singapore. Singapore had completed the form relating to acceptance or non-acceptance of the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and also the form relating to the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues (Fourth Series). Singapore had given Acceptance with Specified Deviations to the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and had specified the deviations. As regards the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues, Singapore had given Full Acceptance to a number of them, but, in the main, its position was one of non-acceptance on the grounds that most of the recommended maximum limits were above the tolerance levels permitted in Singapore.

22. Document ALINORM 76/6-Part V, contained replies from 20 countries (Bahrein, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Honduras, Iran, Republic of Korea, Madagascar, New Zealand, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Thailand, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen Arab Republic and Zaire. Five of the above countries (Costa Rica, Ghana, Honduras, Thailand and the Yemen Arab Republic) had given Full Acceptance to certain of the Recommended Codex Standards. Two countries (Costa Rica and Egypt) had given Acceptance with Specified Deviations to some of the standards and six countries (Bahrein, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda and Zaire) had given Target Acceptance to a number of the Standards. Other countries listed in the document indicated their respective positions, including action being taken by them in regard to the standards.

23. Replies had also been received from the Netherlands, Portugal Switzerland and the United Kingdom, but they arrived too late to enable them to be published and put before the Commission. The Secretariat gave a verbal resumé of these replies.

24. The Netherlands, as host country for the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and, therefore, conscious of a special responsibility in this field, had sent to the Secretariat a very detailed reply with reference to all of the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues contained in the Fourth Series publication (CAC/RS 65-1974), in order to furnish an idea of how the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits related to existing tolerances and tolerances to be developed in the Netherlands. The main purpose of the response of the Netherlands was to indicate whether products conforming with the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits could or could not be imported into the Netherlands. In its reply, the Netherlands had indicated that it had to take account of developments in this field in the European Economic Community. The Netherlands had also indicated that it had found that

there was a need for some more headings in the form (Form 3) than those which had been devised by the Secretariat.

25. Portugal had indicated that it gave Full Acceptance to the following Recommended Standards: canned tomatoes, canned peached, canned grapefruit, canned pineapple, edible dried fungi, fresh fungus Chanterelle, quick frozen peas, tomato juice and apple juice. Portugal had also given Acceptance with Specified Deviations to the Recommended Standards for canned green beans and wax beans, canned applesauce and canned sweet corn. The deviations, which were few, and concerned mainly the sections on food additives in the standards would have to be complied with for the products to be permitted to be distributed freely in Portugal. Portugal also accepted the Recommended Methods of Analysis for Processed Fruits and Vegetables.

26. Switzerland had completed the form concerning acceptance or non-acceptance of the Recommended Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues (Form 3) in respect of the maximum limits listed in the Fourth Series publication. In Switzerland legislation was currently being considered with respect to pesticide residues, in order to achieve some harmonization with the Codex recommendations. It was not known yet, however, whether the revised legislation would be adopted. The information given in the completed form by Switzerland

was for information purposes only. The information showed what Switzerland intended to accept when the amendments to Swiss legislation came into force. As soon as this took place, there would be an official communication from the Swiss Government. For the moment, the law in Switzerland laid down that only residues from those pesticides permitted to be used in Switzerland would be tolerated on imported foods. The intention of Switzerland, as expressed in the markings in the completed form, indicated a number of Full Acceptances and Non-Acceptances. In many cases, where there was a marking under Non-Acceptance, there was an indication that the intention would be that products complying with the Recommended Maximum Limits would be allowed to be distributed freely in Switzerland.

27. The Swiss response also covered the acceptance procedure in Switzerland for Recommended Codex Standards. All the Recommended Standards that had been issued to Governments for acceptance had been evaluated by the Swiss National Codex Committee for the purposes of incorporation in Swiss legislation. The Swiss National Codex Committee had transmitted them, with its recommendations, to the Federal Health Service, Division of Foodstuffs Control. The Federal Health Service had the task of incorporating the standards in Swiss law. The legal texts on the following were in the course of revision: labelling, quick frozen foods, margarine and fruit juices. As soon as the proposed amendments came into force in Swiss legislation, Switzerland would be in a position to give either Full Acceptance or Acceptance with Specified Deviations to the Recommended Standards on the above subject and commodities. All other standards would be gradually incorporated into Swiss law in accordance with the same procedure. Switzerland was of the opinion that a world-wide harmonization of food laws had a great priority and hoped that other Governments as well as international agencies would be guided by the same philosophy.

28. The United Kingdom had given a response in respect of all of the Commodity Standards which have been adopted so far by the Commission and also in respect of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. The U.K. had indicated that it had no specific compositional or labelling regulations for any of the products covered by the Recommended Codex Standards and, for this reason, was unable to accept any of the Recommended Codex Standards at this time. The U.K. added that it was not possible to allow the free circulation of products conforming to the Recommended Codex Standards, because of differences between the U.K. general labelling laws, which apply to all of these products, and the Recommended Codex International Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, the provisions of which are attracted to the Recommended Commodity Standards.

29. The U.K. pointed out that the European Economic Community had adopted Directives covering several of the products for which there were Recommended Codex Standards, namely:

- Apricot, Peach and Pear Nectars
- Orange Juice
- Grapefruit Juice
- Lemon Juice
- Apple Juice
- Concentrated Apple Juice
- Concentrated Orange Juice
- White Sugar
- Dextrose Anhydrous
- Dextrose Monohydrate
- Glucose Syrup
- Dried Glucose Syrup
- Honey (Codex European Regional Standard)

The U.K. had indicated that consideration was being given to the extent to which the U.K. law implementing the Directives, when made, would be consistent with some form of acceptance of the Recommended Codex Standards for these products.

30. For certain other products covered by Recommended Codex Standards, namely:

- Powdered Sugar (Icing Sugar)
- Soft Sugars
- Lactose
- Powdered Dextrose (Icing Dextrose)

the U.K. had indicated that compositional and labelling regulations were being drafted. When these came into force, and when the results of the ICUMSA review of methods of analysis for these sugars were known, further consideration would be given to the extent to which the U.K. was able to notify some form of acceptance of the Recommended Codex Standards for these products.

31. As regards all other products for which there were Recommended Codex Standards, the U.K. indicated that it was currently involved in a major domestic review of its general labelling law and was involved in continuing discussion with other Member States of the European Economic Community on the harmonization of general labelling laws in the Community. The U.K. would be reconsidering the replies to the questions set forth in the form for the declaration of acceptance or non-acceptance of Recommended Codex Standards, when these exercises had been completed.

32. As regards the Recommended International Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, the U.K. also indicated its position on the form for the acceptance or nonacceptance of this standards (Form 2). The U.K. indicated that it was not yet in a position to accept this standard, because it was, at the present time, involved in a major review of all its general labelling law. It was also involved in continuing discussions with other Member States of the EEC on the harmonization of general labelling laws in the Community. The U.K. pointed out that this Standard was playing an important part in the preparation of the proposed Community general labelling law. It was for these reasons that the U.K. could not, at present, accept the Recommended Codex Standard and that the differences which exist between the standard and corresponding U.K. labelling law had not been listed at this time.

33. During the course of the discussion that followed the presentation and review of the papers on acceptances which had been prepared by the countries mentioned above, several delegations indicated what action was being taken in their countries concerning acceptance of the Codex recommendations.

34. The delegation of Norway referred to the administrative and legal procedures that had to be followed in Norway in giving consideration to the Recommended Standards and of the need for ensuring the fullest coordination with all the interests involved. The delegation of Norway stressed the importance of the Recommended Standards as forming the foundation on which fair practice in world-wide food trade was based. Norway hoped to be in a position to notify a number of acceptances in the not too distant future.

35. The delegation of Australia referred to difficulties in giving acceptances, arising from Australia's constitutional arrangements. However, Codex work was being followed very closely in Australia and Australia hoped to be in a position before too long to communicate its position on acceptances of the Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues.

36. The delegation of Nigeria indicated that there was great interest in Codex work in Nigeria. A new Food Law had come into force on 10 February 1976. One of the basic principles of the new law was that where Nigeria did not have a national standard for a particular food product, it would use the Recommended Codex Standards. As the application of national standards developed, Nigeria would, in the event of there being differences between the national standards and the Recommended Codex Standards, review its acceptances of the Recommended Codex Standards.

37. The delegation of Senegal indicated that it was hoped to establish shortly in Senegal a National Codex Committee. The establishment of such a Committee, working in conjunction with the 'Comité Scientifique de la Commission du Contrôle des Produits Alimentaires', would hasten the process of considering the Recommended Codex Standards with a view to acceptance. Senegal expected that it would, in due course, be able to give Target Acceptance to many of the Recommended Codex Standards, and, where appropriate, Full Acceptance to certain of them.

38. The delegation of Malaysia indicated that Malaysia was in the process of revising its food and drug regulations. When this work was completed Malaysia expected to be in a position to communicate its position concerning acceptance of the Recommended Standards to the Commission.

39. The representative of the Commission of the European Economic Community gave a brief outline of developments within the EEC in this field. He indicated that within the Community there was a positive attitude to the acceptance of the standards passed to Step 9 which are covered by Community rules. The procedure and form in which such an attitude is to be expressed were currently being examined.

40. The Commission expressed satisfaction at the progress being made concerning acceptance of the Recommended Codex Standards and Recommended Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues. The latest position on acceptances is summarized in tabular form on a standard by standard basis in Appendix III to this report. The Commission noted that the Secretariat hoped to be in a position to institute a "drive" on acceptances and would be giving attention to how best and in what format to report periodically to Governments on replies received.

PART IV

ACTIVITIES WITHIN FAO, WHO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

41. The Commission had before it document ALINORM 76/33, section A of which contained a report by FAO and section B a report by WHO on activities in the two Organizations of interest to the Commission.

42. In introducing section A of the document, the FAO Secretariat pointed out that, while FAO activities on food control and consumer protection were not an integral part of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the activities were directly related and complementary to the Commission's work. Mention was made of activities in the areas of food additives and contaminants, such as the FAO/WHO Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives and the FAO/WHO Symposium on Anabolic Agents. With regard to mycotoxins, the ongoing UNEP supported FAO programme was mentioned, which was designed to promote action on a

national level in control of mycotoxins and included a Joint FAO/UNEP/WHO Conference, which would be held during 1977.

43. The FAO Secretariat mentioned various Joint FAO/WHO activities being carried out under a UNEP supported project to assist the Codex Alimentarius Commission in the area of contaminants in food and FAO and WHO in strengthening food control capabilities. Work under this programme had been done with regard to (i) methods of analysis and sampling for contaminants, (ii) microbiological specifications, (iii) a publication on Guidelines for Developing an Effective National Food Control System, and (iv) review of the work done by the Codex Alimentarius Commission in the field of pesticide residues. Further work on the project would include the development of a Manual for Food Inspectors.

44. It was pointed out that the FAO Programme of Food Control Assistance operated both at the national and regional levels and included advice on food legislation, the training of inspectors, laboratory personnel and food control administrators and on the setting up of laboratories, and that in carrying out this programme, the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had been utilized. Country and regional projects and surveys were mentioned. Training was being given the highest priority in this programme and valuable support had been received from UNEP in this regard. Emphasis was placed on the fact that food control was a developmental activity and not merely a system for policing.

45. The FAO Secretariat referred to a number of other FAO activities which were related to overall development of effective food control services at a national level. Mention was made of the FAO programme which provided advice on the carrying out of food consumption surveys in developing countries. The work of the units in FAO in the field of food hygiene and quality control, covering fisheries and animals was also described. With regard to fisheries, it was mentioned that there were a number of projects on fish inspection. Reference was also made to the work on the development of codes of technological/hygienic practice for fish handling to ensure food quality and safety, and also to work on other related topics.

46. The FAO Secretariat also referred to the work of the Animal Production and Health Division of FAO, which covered inter alia a Meat Development Programme; codes of meat hygiene practices; projects on meat inspection, including the hygiene aspects, in slaughterhouses; seminars on meat hygiene; and the development of materials for use in training on meat hygiene. Reference was made to a Meat Inspection Training Centre for English-speaking countries of Africa, a project supported by DANIDA, located in Nairobi, Kenya. Information was also given on the work done by the Plant Production and Protection Division in assisting developing countries in the use and control of pesticides, in order to minimize pesticide residues in food, and in strengthening pesticide laboratory facilities and the carrying out of environmental impact monitoring surveys with regard to pesticides.

47. The WHO Secretariat, in introducing section B of document ALINORM 76/33, referred to the close working relations between WHO and FAO, for example the FAO/WHO Guidelines for Development of an Effective National Food Control System. He stated that the objective of WHO's Food Safety Programme was to collaborate with Member States in their efforts to

develop or strengthen their food safety control programmes and/or services. This objective was to be achieved by two main approaches. One was the provision of various types of food safety information and the other the promotion of national food safety control programmes. Most of the latter, i.e. food safety control was in the form of country projects or inter-country projects which were handled by WHO's six regional offices, located in Washington, Copenhagen, Brazzaville, Alexandria, New Delhi and Manila. There was a more limited number of inter-regional projects which were handled by the Headquarters of WHO. There were about 100 such projects. Most of these projects were initiated at the request of government agencies.

48. The above-mentioned projects were either financed from WHO's regular budget or from extra-budgetary funds and covered various aspects of food control including (i) the assessment of national needs, (ii) the provision of training courses and fellowships for personnel engaged in various facets of food safety control, and (iii) the provision of other services as required (e.g. WHO had provided expert assistance in two very recent food poisoning episodes, and had offered facilities for analysis of foodstuff suspected of being contaminated). The WHO Secretariat also pointed out that the projects mentioned in document ALINORM 76/33 (4.3.2 and 4.3.3) were examples only. A complete list was given in WHO's Official Record # 220 - Programme and Budget Estimates.

49. The other main approach involved the provision of food safety information. It included (1) the collection or generation of information, (2) the evaluation of health hazards of additives, pesticides and microbiological and chemical contaminants, (3) collaboration with Member States in the elaboration of food standards within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and (4) the preparation of food safety manuals, guidelines, etc.

50. The WHO Secretariat described a few recent activities and activities that were in preparation. The Joint FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme, supported by UNEP, had completed a number of activities and it was expected that additional activities would be undertaken, including the preparation of guidelines for national food monitoring systems, designation of collaborating centres and collaboration with Member States.

51. The Expert Committee on Irradiated Foods would be jointly sponsored by FAO and IAEA and would take place in Geneva from 31 August to 7 September 1976. There would be two sessions of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives in the biennium 1976/77. However, there was provision for only one session of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

52. In June 1976 there would be an Expert Consultation on the subject of ceramic foodware safety as a follow-up to the International Conference held in Geneva in 1974. The proceedings of the 1974 Conference should be available in the very near future; the undue delay was the result of a fire accident which destroyed the original manuscript.

53. With respect to the Conference on Anabolic Agents held in November 1974, the WHO Secretariat stated that the report of the Conference has been distributed by FAO and WHO

and that the papers presented at the Conference would be published in their entirety in the near future.

54. The WHO Secretariat indicated that since the last session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the work in WHO in the field of food microbiology had continued and developed, following the general recommendations made by the Governing Bodies of the Organization and the more specific recommendations of meetings of experts, convened to review progress and make suggestions for future work.

55. Particular attention had been paid to the development of microbiological and related methodologies for use in food hygiene programmes, with special emphasis on international standardization of these methods, as a step towards the setting of internationally acceptable microbiological specifications for foods. This work had largely been based on results from research coordinated and supported by WHO. The International Commission for Microbiological Specification for Foods, in particular, had generated useful information on sampling, and identification and enumeration of microorganisms in foods. That Commission had recently initiated a comprehensive study to cover the field of food spoilage caused by microorganisms.

56. An important step in the long-term programme for the development of microbiological specifications for foods had been taken a year ago when a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Microbiological Specifications for Foods had been convened. This had been done with financial support from UNEP. The Consultation had discussed, in great detail, the various aspects of microbiological specifications for foods and had come to the conclusion that there would be an increasing demand for international specifications of this kind. The Consultation made specific recommendations for egg products, on sampling, microbiological methods and microbiological limits, for inclusion in the relevant code under preparation by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The next Expert Consultation on Microbiological Specifications was planned to be held in late 1976 or early 1977. This, like the earlier Consultation, was being organized together with FAO and in close collaboration with the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. This Codex Committee had decided, as early as 1972, to intensify its activities in the field of food microbiology.

57. A WHO Expert Committee on Public Health Aspects of Food Microbiology had been convened in March 1976 in Geneva. This Committee dealt with recent scientific developments in the whole field of food microbiology, with a view to assessing the usefulness of new findings in the work for the further improvement of existing national and international food hygiene programmes. The Committee paid particular attention to providing background information for the further development of microbiological specifications for foods, for consideration within the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. This was done, with due consideration being given to the cost-benefit aspects related to microbiological testing of foods, as a part of food control and food hygiene programmes.

58. The WHO Food Virology Programme had now reached the stage when it could provide services to its users, which means that it makes available, on request, specific information on

viruses in foods and their public health implications, using an automatic retrieval system for the collected data. This service was intended for the use of food control authorities, epidemiologists dealing with food-borne outbreaks and research and laboratory workers in the field of food virology and food hygiene.

59. The WHO Secretariat concluded by indicating that a Consultation on Post-Graduate Training in Food Microbiology had been convened in November 1975 in collaboration with FAO, to review existing international courses in food microbiology in relation to future needs. The recommendations of this Consultation would be used as guidance for the Organizations in their efforts to coordinate and support ongoing and planned international training activities, in order to respond, in particular, to the needs of developing countries.

60. A number of delegations, in discussing this agenda item, commended FAO and WHO for their efforts to date in assisting Member Countries, particularly developing countries, in strengthening their food control services. They pointed out that there needed to be much more work done by the international agencies in developing systems which would enable the development of truly effective food control infrastructures at a national level. The need for developing training programme for food inspectors covering all foods was stressed and, in this connection, it was pointed out by one delegation that there might be a possibility for FAO to extend the scope of the Meat Inspection Training Centre in Kenya to cover all foods. A point was made by one delegation that it might not always be equally useful to depend upon the advice of a short-term consultant or adviser, and stress should rather be laid, where appropriate, on better utilization of existing national institutions and national consultations by specialists.

61. Some delegations underlined the need for assistance in developing vital basic information on the intake of contaminants from foods and other sources; the monitoring of pathways of pesticides in the environment and the assessment of pesticide residue problems; and determining the impact of FAO food control activities in developing countries. One delegation emphasized the particular importance of the work of developing a positive list of food additives, stating that, in its opinion, too many additives were being used in food, some of which had not been adequately evaluated and had not been proved to present no health hazards.

62. The Nigerian delegation made a reference to the role of the FAO Senior Agricultural Advisers at country level and stated that very often their time was fully occupied in their work in liaison with Ministries of Agriculture. As nutrition and food control activities cut across the activities of the Ministries of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry, Health, and other agencies, the delegation urged that further emphasis should be given to briefing the FAO Country Representatives suitably, so that they could be more effective in maintaining a meaningful dialogue with the national authorities concerned with regard to the development of these activities.

63. A number of delegations pointed out that the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission was very valuable to developing countries, but could only be wholly utilized if FAO and WHO

increased their assistance to developing countries in strengthening food control services. One delegation urged that the Director-General of FAO should do everything possible to promote the development of food control infrastructure in the developing countries to enable them to be in a position to participate more meaningfully in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and to implement the Commission's recommendations.

64. With regard to training, it was pointed out that the Coordinating Committee for Africa had emphasized the value of regional training institutes for food control inspectors and analysts.

65. A point was also made regarding the need for the Commission to take appropriate follow-up action on some of the recommendations of the International Conference on Ceramic Foodware Safety. The importance of creating consumer awareness in this regard was mentioned.

66. The FAO Secretariat indicated that efforts were being made by the agencies to develop an integrated approach in the area of food control, including food inspector training and the training of industry personnel in food quality control, so that food control would provide consumer protection and at the same time assist in the development of the food industry and trade and protection of food supplies. The various valuable comments made during the discussion would be kept in mind by the Secretariat when implementing the various activities.

67. In the area of food hygiene, the delegation of France referred to the "Guide to Shellfish Hygiene" which was currently being printed in WHO and inquired when it was likely to be available. It was noted that it was expected to be available later this year. The WHO Secretariat indicated that there was already a WHO document available on shellfish hygiene - No. 550 in the WHO Technical Series. As regards microbiological limits, it was noted that an FAO/WHO Expert Consultation had made a proposal for the consideration of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene concerning a uniform world-wide Salmonella methodology. The WHO Secretariat further indicated that a Food Inspection Manual was being drawn up which covered food in general.

Information on the Activities of other International Organizations working on the Standardization of Food and Related Matters

68. The Commission had before it the following documents:

ALINORM 76/34-Part I

- Food Standards work of the Working Party on the Standardization of Perishable Produce of the Economic Commission for Europe - Committee on Agricultural Problems.

ALINORM 76/34-Part II

- Report on the activities of the Council of Europe.

ALINORM 76/34-Part III

- Progress report on the activities of the Arab Organization for Standardization and Metrology (ASMO) in the field of Food Standards Control.

ALINORM 76/34-Part IV

- Report on the activities of Technical Committee ISO/TC 34 - Agricultural Food Products which was introduced by the representative of ISO.

ALINORM 76/34-Part V

- Harmonization of legislation on food products in the European Economic Community, a summary of which was presented by the representative of the EEC.

69. The representative of ISO stated that fruitful collaboration had already been established between ISO and the Commission, on the one hand, and between ISO and other international organizations concerned with methods of analysis, etc., for food commodities, on the other. In order to render these measures even more efficacious, a meeting had been organized in Budapest at the end of 1975, which was attended by representatives of the Codex Secretariat, AOAC and ISO. This first meeting decided to adopt a simplified system for putting in final form, in collaboration with all concerned, international standards for methods of sampling, testing and analysis, which Codex Commodity Committees might have need of. The representatives at this first meeting had formulated a concrete proposal concerning the questions to be dealt with during the course of the discussions envisaged and concerning the procedure to be followed, as indicated in document ALINORM 76/34-Part IV.

70. The Commission also took note of a report presented by the representative of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) on the activities of the CMEA Standing Commission on Food Industry in the Field of Standardization of Food Products. Reference was made to the constant attention given to the activities of the Commission in the field of standardization, to the use of Codex Standards within the framework of the activities of CMEA and to the readiness of the CMEA to continue their cooperation with the Commission to improve the constructive cooperation of countries in the field of standardization of food products.

71. The delegation of Malaysia spoke of the activities of the Asian Standards Advisory Committee (ASAC) in the field of standardization of food items. ASAC, which was a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), held its Fourth Session in Malaysia in December 1974. The Malaysian delegation further stated that the Fifth Session might be held in Iran, which had tentatively offered to host the meeting.

PART V

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS
PROGRAMME FOR 1974/75 AND PROPOSED PROGRAMME OF WORK AND BUDGET
FOR 1976/77

72. The discussion on the above item took place in the presence of Mr. Roy I. Jackson, Deputy Director-General, FAO, and Mr. E.M. Ojala, Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Policy Department, FAO. The Commission took note of the section of document ALINORM 76/8 dealing with income and expenditure in 1974/75, which had been considered by the Executive Committee at its 22nd Session (ALINORM 76/4, paras 3 and 4).

73. As regards the proposed programme of work and budget for 1976/77, the Commission had before it document ALINORM 76/8 together with the reports of the 21st and 22nd sessions of the Executive Committee, which had considered this matter.

74. Before the Commission entered into a discussion on the proposed budget for the Programme for the current biennium and its implications for the work of the Programme, the Deputy Director-General outlined the relevant background in FAO. He indicated that the Director-General had a mandate from the FAO conference, held in November 1975, to review programmes, activities, staffing and the general organization of FAO and to make his recommendations on these matters to the Council of FAO, which would meet from 12 to 21 July 1976. After formulating his recommendations, it would be necessary for the Director-General to submit them to the FAO Programme Committee and the FAO Finance Committee who would forward their views to the FAO Council. Thus, the Director-General's proposals had not yet been finalized. The proposals which had been the subject of study, were now in draft form. The final decision in this matter rested with the Council of FAO.

75. The Deputy Director-General referred to guidelines which had been given to the Director-General by the FAO Conference. These guidelines emphasized the need for programmes and activities in FAO to be more responsive to the needs of developing countries: in particular, the need for maximum assistance in furtherance of food production in the developing countries. The Director-General had also been requested by the FAO Conference to review and evaluate meetings, publications, travel, new posts and up-gradings and, as far as possible, to reduce them.

76. The FAO Conference had approved a budget of \$167 million for the Organization for 1976/77 without dissent, but on the understanding that there would be an obligation on the Director-General to carry out the review. Every part of the FAO Programme of Work and Budget for 1976/77 was subject to review.

77. The Deputy Director-General indicated to the Commission that it was in the setting described above that the Commission had before it the budget and programme of work outlined in document ALINORM 76/8. It would, however, be open to Member Governments of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to make known their views on this matter through their representatives to the FAO Council in July 1976.

78. The Chairman reported that the proposed budget for the Programme for 1976/77, including the two lists of Codex meetings, had been considered by the Executive Committee at its 22nd session and that it had made a number of observations on this matter. The Commission noted that it was being asked to examine closely its own priorities, given the difficult financial situation and the overall priorities and general direction set by the Governing Bodies of the two Organizations. It was also being asked to fit its work programme for 1976/77 into a budget drawn up on the 1974/75 base plus mandatory cost increases for 1976/77. The Chief of the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme reported that, as with FAO, WHO had also been faced with a difficult financial situation in relation to its overall priorities and the Director-General of WHO had been unable to provide for a programme increase for the Food Standards Programme. WHO would, however, contribute, as in the past, 25% of the joint budget of the Programme and would provide also for mandatory cost increases. On the basis of the present budgetary proposals for 1976/77, the cost sharing arrangement for the joint budget of the Programme would be maintained (FAO 75% - WHO 25%).

79. As regards the reduction in the number of Codex meetings from 41 to 27 in the biennium, the Commission noted that the Executive Committee, in the light of explanations which had been given by the Secretariat, was generally satisfied that, except for a full session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling which had not been listed in the Director-General's proposals for the biennium, the choice of sessions represented, on balance and in the circumstances, probably the most satisfactory arrangement that could be made, from the point of view of the need to ensure the overall advancement of the work of the Programme.

80. In view of the important subject matters to be considered by the above Committee and having regard to its endorsing functions, which affected all draft standards, the Executive Committee considered it important that a full session of this Committee be held in the current biennium. Accordingly, the Executive Committee had taken steps towards obtaining the addition of a meeting of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling to the list of 27 Codex meetings envisaged for the biennium. As an alternative, in the event of there being difficulties about this, the Executive Committee had proposed that a session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products could be deleted from the list of sessions envisaged for 1976/77 and substituted by a session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling.

81. During the course of the discussion, several delegations stressed the uniqueness of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. The Programme was unique because a major share of the financial burden of running the Programme was borne by Host Governments. The great majority of Codex meetings were meetings hosted by Member Governments, who had undertaken to bear the costs of providing meeting facilities, interpretation and translation facilities - in most cases in the three languages of the Commission (English, French and Spanish) - and also a considerable amount of documentation. The delegation of the USA which hosts two Codex Committees, indicated that the cost to the U.S. of participation in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission was of the order of half-a-million dollars per annum.

82. All delegations speaking on this issue, both from the industrialized countries and from the different developing regions of the world, stressed the importance of the work of the Commission. The work was important because it was aimed principally at protecting the consumer against health hazards in food and against fraud and at achieving the greatest possible measure of uniformity in food laws and standards, in order to facilitate the freer movement of foods in world trade. There was growing emphasis being placed on the work of the Commission for the developing countries, mainly through the Regional Codex Coordinating Committees which were concerned in the first instance with the development of modern food laws on a concerted regional basis and with other aspects of food control infrastructure.

83. Concern was generally expressed lest FAO and WHO should ascribe a lower priority to the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, as this would be most unfortunate at a time when the Commission was showing very positive results in its work.

84. Some delegations from the developing regions stressed the importance of the development of food control infrastructure and one delegation expressed the view that this was where the emphasis should be laid, even if it meant a reduction in the number of Codex meetings. Other delegations from developing countries thought that it should be possible to strengthen the work on food control infrastructure without reducing the number of Codex meetings.

85. The following points were also made:

- a. the savings achieved through the reduction in the size of the Codex budget for 1976/77 were very small in relation to the overall budgets of FAO and WHO;
- b. governments themselves must budget for the work of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and there must be some continuity in the Commission's programme of work, so that governments can budget in an orderly way;
- c. the extending of the period between sessions of the Commission and Codex Committees had a bad effect on continuity: continuity of personnel was important for the work of the Commission because of the nature of the work and the ramifications of the Commission's activities. Some delegations expressed disquiet at the fact that a period of two years would now elapse between the 11th and 12th sessions of the Commission; under its Rules of Procedure, the Commission should, in principle meet each year.

86. The need for no slowing down in the frequency of meetings of General Subject Committees, including in particular, the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and also the Codex Committees on Food Labelling, Food Additives, and Food Hygiene was also stressed by a significant number of delegations. In connection with the work of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, it was noted, with disquiet, that it appeared to be the intention to provide in this biennium for only one session of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues - an expert panel whose highly specialized work was essential to the progress of the work of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues. A delegation from the region of Africa

stated that the Codex Committees on Pesticide Residues and Food Additives were very important sources of information on these subjects.

87. One delegation from a developing country enquired whether the use of consultant services, which was now provided for in the re-structured budget for the Food Standards Programme in 1976/77 was as economical and as effective as having the work done through Codex Committees. The Secretariat explained that consultant services were needed to review and analyse the situation in the developing countries concerning the present state of food legislation and other aspects of food control infrastructure. The work of the consultants was complementary to the work of the Codex Committees, which were essentially inter-governmental negotiating bodies: it would provide a very important input into the regional inter-governmental Codex committees operating in the developing regions, but the business of reaching agreement on texts which would have implications for trade and consumer protection was a matter for discussion and negotiation in the Codex committees, both world-wide and regional. A number of delegations pointed to the value of specialized documents that could be prepared by consultants for consideration in Codex committees. A delegation from the region of Latin America stressed the need for ensuring that the budget for the Programme provided for the availability of all Codex documents in Spanish, pointing out that in some Codex committees the documents were available only in English and French.

88. A delegation from the region of Asia expressed disappointment at the fact that only one session of the Coordinating Committee for Asia had been provided for in the biennium.

89. The Deputy Director-General, who had been able to be present for only part of the discussions, indicated to the Commission that he would report to the Director-General on the views which had been expressed by the Commission, particularly in regard to its request that a full session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling be held in this biennium.

90. The Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Policy Department, FAO, who had been present for the entirety of the discussions on this subject, stated that he appreciated the opportunity to hear the views of delegations on this subject. He referred to the question by one developing country as to whether increased emphasis could be placed on the development of food control infrastructure without reducing the work of developing Codex standards and indicated that this could be achieved to a large extent if, within the overall reduction in the number of Codex meetings, the number of regional meetings was protected. This, in fact, was the approach of the Director-General. The Assistant Director-General interpreted the discussion in the Commission as giving priority to meetings of the Codex General Subject Committees and also of the Codex Regional Coordinating Committees.

91. In summing up, the Chairman expressed the appreciation of the Commission to the Deputy Director-General and the Assistant Director-General for having attended the Commission's discussions on this important subject. He indicated that the remarks of the Deputy Director-General, the Assistant Director-General ES and the Chief of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme should be reflected in the report together with the

views which had been expressed by the various delegations. The Chairman indicated that the following significant conclusions had emerged from the discussions:

- a. Great value was attached to the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission both in the developing countries and in the industrialized countries.
- b. The costs falling on FAO and WHO in connection with the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission were small in relation to the costs borne by Host Governments who chaired Codex Committees and Member Governments in general in following the work of the Commission and in implementing its recommendations.
- c. The Commission in general had expressed concern that the budget for the Food Standards Programme for the current biennium had been reduced and at the lengthening of the period of time elapsing between Codex sessions.
- d. Special importance had been attached by Members of the Commission to the work of the Codex General Subject Committees on Pesticide Residues, Food Labelling, Food Additives and Food Hygiene.
- e. The Commission expressed concern at the slowing down effect of the reduced budget and reduced number of Codex meetings on the overall programme of work of the Commission.
- f. The Commission recommended that provision should be made for a full session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling in the present biennium. The session would be held in Canada and paid for by the Canadian Government. The only expenses falling on FAO would be the cost of secretariat travel to service the session and a modest amount of documentation in connection with the final report of the session. The Commission considered that the meeting of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling should not be at the expense of the meeting of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products.
- g. The Commission considered that there was a need for Members of the Commission to ensure that delegates attending the forthcoming meetings of the FAO Council and the World Health Assembly were fully briefed on the views of the Commission, so that these views could be considered at those meetings of these two bodies.

92. The Commission subsequently noted with satisfaction that the Director-General had agreed to add a full session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling to his proposals for Codex sessions in the current biennium, in addition to the 27 sessions already included.

PART VI

CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES

93. The Commission had before it the Report of the Fifth Session of the Codex Committee on General Principles (ALINORM 76/36), which was introduced by Mr. G. Weill (France), who had chaired the Committee's session. The Chairman of the Committee outlined the subject matters which had been considered at the session. As regards the question of whether criteria should be established for drawing a line of demarcation between meaningful acceptance and

non-acceptance in relation to “Acceptance with Specified Deviations”, the Chairman of the Committee reported that those delegations which considered that there was a need for such criteria agreed that the criteria would be solely for the purpose of offering guidance to governments in choosing between acceptance with specified deviations and non-acceptance. A very full discussion of the arguments for and against the establishment of demarcation criteria, for the guidance of governments, ensued. In conclusion, there was general agreement in the Committee that the question of whether there might be problems arising from specified deviations could best be considered if the Secretariat were to prepare a document for the next session of the Committee, reviewing all acceptances with specified deviations. The Committee had instructed the Secretariat to draw up the document in such a way as to facilitate the reaching of a conclusion on whether, in the light of the nature of the deviations specified, there was a need to establish demarcation criteria for the guidance of governments. In this connection, it would be open to the Secretariat to put forward suggestions or recommendations to the Committee on the basis of an analysis of acceptances. There was also general agreement that the main thing at this stage was to obtain more responses from governments.

94. On the question of establishing criteria for determining when it is appropriate to publish in the codex Alimentarius a recommended Codex standard, the Chairman of the committee reported that the Committee had agreed that, in view of the number and the extent of acceptances received so far, it would be premature at this stage to contemplate the establishment of such criteria. The Committee had stressed that what was really essential was to have the maximum amount of information from governments regarding their response to and action on step 9 standards sent to them for acceptance. The Committee had noted that it was the intention of the Secretariat to consider how best to present regularly to governments information concerning acceptances.

95. The Chairman of the committee also reported on the discussions in the Committee concerning Recommendation No.82 of the UN Conference on Human Environment (Stockholm, June 1972), which, amongst other things, had requested the Codex Alimentarius Commission to develop a code of ethics for the international trade in food. This subject had also arisen at the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Regional conference for Asia, Bangkok, December 1975. There had been agreement in the Committee that the only really satisfactory way of ensuring proper consumer protection would be for the developing countries to establish or up-date their food laws and regulations and to set up or strengthen their food control facilities. However, because of the time required to achieve this, the Committee considered that the proposal to establish a Code of Ethics should be looked upon as a suggested interim measure of protection, pending the establishment of food control systems in countries at present lacking them. Thus the overwhelming view in the Committee was that the code should be proceeded with, even if at this stage some difficulties were foreseen and there was no agreement on the content or form it should take.

96. The Secretariat had indicated at the session that it would arrange, with funds provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), for a consultant to prepare a first draft of a code. The draft would be sent to Member Governments for their comments. The draft

plus the comments would be considered by a working party, which the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany had suggested be established. The working Party would meet for the first two days of the next session of the Committee. The recommendation of the working party would be reviewed in plenary by the Committee. It had been recognized that it would be advantageous if arrangements could be made to have also the views of the Regional Codex Co-ordinating Committees on the draft code.

97. The Chairman of the Committee also reported on the Committee's consideration of proposals which had been submitted by the French delegation regarding format and possible types of Codex standards. The Committee had thought that the idea of greater flexibility in the format of codex standards, as had been suggested by the delegation of France, was one which Codex Commodity Committees should have regard to when embarking upon new subjects or encountering a complex problem as a result of adhering too rigidly to the format for Codex standards in the Procedural Manual. As regards the question of possible types of Codex standards, the committee had thought the proposals of France valuable in the evolution of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. However, the Committee had recalled that the Commission had given considerable thought to different concepts of codex standards and the commission had finally concluded that the present concept of codex standards had, in general, proved to be more acceptable to Members of the commission.

98. The Chairman of the Committee reported that the Secretariat had been requested to prepare for the Committee's next session a brief, concise paper on the foregoing matters which might be of assistance to Commodity Committees.

99. The Chairman of the Committee reported that the Committee had given consideration to a number of important issues which had been raised by the delegation of Denmark in connection with paragraph 4.A.1 of the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius concerning the expression "Name and description laid down in the standard". The Secretariat had been requested to review, in consultation with the legal officers of FAO and WHO, the matters which had been raised by the delegation of Denmark. The Secretariat paper would be submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration, and the Executive Committee could then, after review, decide to refer the matter either to the Codex Committee on General Principles or to the Commission directly.

100. The Commission endorsed the various proposed actions of the Committee, as had been reported on by the Chairman of the Committee. As regards flexibility in the format of Codex Standards the Commission took note of the comment of the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products that a certain flexibility which that Committee had found useful to introduce in the standards it was developing, might be of interest to other Commodity Committees. As regards the forms which had been devised by the Secretariat to facilitate governments in replying on acceptances, the Commission noted a suggestion that the experience of other international organizations in devising similar kinds of forms might be useful. The Commission also noted a statement from the Secretariat that steps would be taken to recruit a consultant to commence work on the draft code of ethics.

101. The Executive Committee, at its Twenty First Session, had considered that there was a need to introduce greater flexibility into the procedure for the amendment of step 9 standards, in order to deal more expeditiously with editorial amendments and amendments which, though substantive, were of a consequential nature. The Executive Committee had referred this matter to the Codex Committee on General Principles. On the basis of proposals of the Secretariat which had been drafted in consultation with the Legal Advisers of FAO and WHO, the Codex Committee on General Principles had recommended to the Commission, for adoption, the following amendments.

- a. Amendment proposed to paragraph 5 of the Introduction to the “Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Codes of Practice, Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues, Codex Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives” as set forth in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

(words underlined below added to existing text)

“It will be for the Commission itself to keep under review ... may be omitted. The Commission may also decide to omit any other step or steps of that Procedure where, in its opinion, an amendment proposed by a Codex Committee is either of an editorial nature or of a substantive nature but consequential to provisions in similar standards adopted by the Commission at Step 8”.

- b. Proposed Amendment to paragraph 2 of the “Guide to the Procedure for the Revision and Amendment of Recommended Codex Standards” as set forth in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

(words underlined below added to existing text)

“Taking into account such information ... by the sponsoring Codex Committee. In the case of an amendment proposed by a Codex Committee, it will also be open to the Commission to adopt the amendment at Step 5 or Step 8 as appropriate, where in its opinion the amendment is either of an editorial nature or of a substantive nature but consequential to provisions in similar standards adopted by it at Step 8”.

Procedure for the Amendment of Step 9 Standards

102. The delegation of the U.S.A. referred to the decision of the Commission to amend the above Procedure in such a way as to provide greater flexibility in dealing with editorial or consequential, although substantive, changes to Step 9 standards (see para 101). The delegation of the U.S.A. enquired as to whether the amendment referred to above also applied to the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards. The Secretariat stated that it was its understanding that the amendment in question applied across the board and therefore to the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

103. 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.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

104. The Commission had before it the reports of the Tenth Session (ALINORM 76/22) and the Eleventh Session (ALINORM 76/22A) of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling which were held in 1975 and 1976 respectively. The reports were introduced by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. H.W. Wagner (Canada) who pointed out that the Eleventh Session of the Committee had been limited to only two days.

105. The Commission was informed that the Food Labelling Committee at its Tenth Session had considered and endorsed the labelling provisions of 14 commodity standards which were at Step 8 of the Procedure. The Committee had further discussed several documents, including those dealing with claims, nutritional labelling of foods, labelling of bulk containers and location and use of class names for food additives. It had agreed to reconsider the first three subjects in the light of further government comments and had specifically requested information on them from governments for its next full session.

106. Recognizing the importance attached to the subject of date marking and the desirability of providing clear guidance on this matter to Codex Commodity Committees in the near future, the Draft Guidelines for Date Marking of Prepackaged Foods in the labelling provisions of Codex commodity standards had been considered at both sessions of the Committee.

107. The Canadian Secretariat, taking into account further government comments, had revised the text of the Guidelines as set out in Appendix III of ALINORM 76/22. The revised document was presented to the 11th Session of the Committee as LIM 1 to CX/FL 76/2.

108. The Commission discussed the decision of the majority of the Labelling Committee to request the Commission to authorize distribution of the Guidelines to Member Governments and Commodity Committees following finalization of the document in the light of further government comments at the Twelfth Session of the Labelling Committee (ALINORM 76/22A, para 92).

109. The reservations of some delegations to the Eleventh Session of the Committee with respect to this matter were also brought to the attention of the Commission. These delegations held the view that the request was tantamount to asking for preapproval by the Commission at this session of the Guidelines which are expected to be finalized at the Twelfth Session of the Labelling Committee (ALINORM 76/22A, para 93).

110. Some delegations attached great importance to the Guidelines being available to Commodity Committees as soon as possible, in order to promote the inclusion of harmonized date-marking provisions in the various standards presently under elaboration. However, other

delegations held the view that the net effect of the proposed accelerated procedure would not be sufficiently substantive to warrant a departure from established procedures of the Commission. Some concern was expressed that a precedent might be set for the future with regard to other documents containing guidelines drawn up by General Subject Committees for use by Commodity Committees. It was considered essential that the Commission should always review such guidelines prior to their distribution to Commodity Committees.

111. The Commission agreed with a ruling of the Chairman that the Guidelines should be presented to the Commission subsequent to finalization by the Food Labelling Committee at its next session.

112. The Commission agreed that Commodity Committees should, where appropriate, incorporate date marking provisions into standards.

113. The Commission noted that the Committee had discussed in detail the date marking provisions incorporated into the three standards at step 8 elaborated by the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses. After some amendments, these provisions were endorsed conditionally pending the decision of the Commission concerning the status of the document on date marking. It was agreed to discuss this matter further when considering the standards in detail (see paras 343–344 and 349). All other labelling provisions of these standards had been endorsed.

114. The Commission further noted that at the 11th Session of the Labelling Committee, in addition to the three standards noted above, the labelling provisions of seven other standards at step 8 of the Procedure had been discussed and, with some amendments, had been endorsed.

115. The Commission was informed that two Commodity Committees had proposed to include, in certain standards, in the sub-section on Styles a provision for “other presentations”. It was pointed out that, as a result, consequential changes might be required in the labelling provisions of certain standards, the labelling sections of which had been endorsed at the 10th Session of the Labelling Committee and which would be at Step 8 before this session of the Commission. This matter would be brought up during discussion on the various standards (see also paras 274 to 281, /323–325 of this Report).

Confirmation of Chairmanship

116. 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.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES

General Information

117. In introducing the report (ALINORM 76/12 and Corrigenda), the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives Dr. G.F. Wilmink (Netherlands) drew the attention of the Commission to the work in progress within the Committee. He expressed satisfaction that the conclusions of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives had been made available in good time to the 10th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives. In order to expedite work on the potential intake of food additives - information which was essential for the endorsement of food additive provisions - an informal Working Group had been set up with Belgium acting as rapporteur. The Committee had also found it necessary to constitute an ad hoc Working Group, with Netherlands acting as rapporteur, to consider the question of natural, nature-identical and artificial flavouring substances. This Working Group would consider such basic questions as whether some flavouring substances should be considered food ingredients or food additives.

118. Dr. Wilmink drew the attention of the Commission to some difficulties in connection with the exact meaning of some food additive provisions, especially where the additives interacted with food or otherwise underwent changes in the food. It was necessary in some cases for Codex Commodity Committees to be more specific when proposing such food additive provisions by indicating appropriate analytical parameters and methods of analysis on the basis of which the provisions could be checked for compliance. The Commission agreed that attention should be given to this question and requested the Secretariat to bring this matter to the attention of Commodity Committees. The Commission was also informed of the endorsement of a number of food additive provisions in Codex standards, notably in draft standards for foods for infants and children, and of an advisory list of additives in soft drinks under elaboration on the basis of a Canadian paper.

119. The Codex Committee on Food Additives also had under consideration a draft standard for the labelling of food additives when sold as such and an ad hoc Working Group, with the United Kingdom acting as rapporteur, had been set up to prepare a revised document in the light of government comments on the draft standard. The Committee had also drawn up a list of food additives pending evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (List B). When finalized on the basis of government comments and information from interested international organizations, this list would serve for the guidance of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives.

Specifications for Food Additives

120. The Commission had before it a number of specifications for the identity and purity of food additives (ALINORM 76/41) at Step 5 of the Procedure for the Establishment of Food Additive Specifications. It noted that the specifications were generally acceptable and that they were considered by the Codex Committee on Food Additives as suitable for adoption by the Commission as recommended Codex specifications. This was all the more so as they had been revised by the 18th meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and had further been improved by the Codex Committee on Food Additives through slight amendments on the basis of comments received from governments. These changes had no bearing on the validity of the toxicological assessment by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert

Committee on Food Additives. The Commission adopted the specifications at Step 5 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives and requested the Secretariat to publish them as a first series of International Recommended Specifications for Food Additives.

Principle relating to the Carry-Over of Additives into Foods

121. The Commission had before it the above Principle contained in Appendix IV, ALINORM 76/12, which had been reconsidered by the Codex Committee on Food Additives in the light of comments, on the recommendation of the 10th Session of the Commission. The Commission noted that the Carry-Over Principle did not deal with the question of the label declaration of additives carried over into foods from the use of ingredients and agreed that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling. On the recommendation of the Codex Committee on Food Additives, the Commission endorsed the Carry-Over Principle as a guide for Codex Commodity Committees when preparing Codex standards.

Changes to the Status of Endorsement of Food Additive Provisions in Step 9 Codex Standards

122. The Commission noted that, on the basis of the conclusions of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives, the endorsement of a number of provisions for food additives in Step 9 standards had been modified by the Codex Committee on Food Additives. This meant that while some temporary endorsements had been confirmed, others had been withdrawn, necessitating the deletions of certain food additives previously provided for in Step 9 standards. The Commission agreed that there was no need to follow the Amendment Procedure and requested the Secretariat to issue appropriate corrigenda to the Step 9 standards concerned. The Commission also noted that, in the case of additives which, on the basis of the findings of experts, constituted a hazard to health, governments would be informed without delay through the appropriate mechanism set up in WHO.

Provisions for Contaminants in Codex Standards

123. The Commission noted the concern of the Codex Committee on Food Additives that while some Codex standards contained provisions for contaminants, other Codex standards did not. This was mainly due to a lack of data on the basis of which maximum levels for contaminants could be proposed by Codex Commodity Committees. The Commission was informed that the Joint FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme might generate data on the basis of which it would be possible to judge what, if any, provisions should be included for contaminants in Codex standards. The representative of WHO informed the Commission that all necessary information arising from the above Joint Programme would be made available to the Commission. The view was expressed by the delegation of Poland that all standards, including Step 9 standards, should be reviewed with the aim of making recommendations for maximum levels of contaminants. In this respect the Commission noted that national monitoring programmes would also yield useful information.

The commission requested the Secretariat to bring this matter to the attention of Codex Commodity Committees.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

124. 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.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE

125. The Commission had before it the reports of the 11th (1974) and 12th (1975) sessions of the above committee (ALINORM 76/13 and ALINORM 76/13A) and government comments (ALINORM 76/42-Part V). The Rapporteur, Dr. R.W. Weik (USA), introduced the two reports.

Consideration of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/13, Appendix II)

126. The Rapporteur proposed three amendments to the text of the Draft Code. These were:

- Sub-section IV.A 3(b) "Water supply"

The sentence beginning "Where in-plant chlorination of water is used ...", should be preceded by the sentence: "The appropriate authority may permit in-plant chlorination of water if this is necessary for public health reasons".

- Sub-section IV.C 4 "Personnel Health"

Instead of text contained in the General Principles of Food Hygiene (IV.C 4), the relevant subsection from the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat (ALINORM 76/15, Appendix II "Hygiene Health of Personnel", para 36 a, b and c), should be inserted.

- Sub-section IV.D 3(b)(i) "General Cooling Requirements"

To the last sentence the following should be added: "in as far as this temperature is approved by the controlling authority which shall nevertheless ensure that necessary measures are taken to control microbiological growth".

127. The delegations of France and Italy emphasized the importance of including provisions for the initial and periodic control of the health of personnel. The Commission decided, however, not to include wording to this effect in the text.

Paragraph referencing

128. The Rapporteur proposed to substitute the present mixture of Roman/Arabic notation with an homogeneous system of decimal referencing.

129. The Commission agreed to the various amendments proposed by the Rapporteur and also to the proposal of the delegation of France for some minor rewording to clarify the French text.

Status of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing

130. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Code, the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing at Step 8 of the Procedure.

Consideration of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products at Step 8

131. The Rapporteur pointed out that there had been considerable discussion in the Committee on the substantive points raised in the written comments (ALINORM 76/42-Part V) received from governments and proposed that the editorial changes suggested could be worked out by the Secretariat in cooperation with the Chairman of the Committee. This would include harmonization of the referencing system with that of the previous Code. The Commission agreed to this.

Status of the Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products

132. The Commission adopted as a Recommended Code the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg Products at Step 8 of the Procedure.

Consideration of the Proposed Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Molluscan Shellfish at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/13A, Appendix VI)

133. The Rapporteur referred to the discussion in the Committee on the status of the Code and pointed out that several delegations had been of the opinion that the advanced state of the proposed draft code warranted a recommendation to the Commission to omit Steps 6 and 7 (ALINORM 76/18A, para 69). Several delegations held the view that the Code should await consideration by the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products and subsequent re-examination by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

Status of the Code

134. Since there had been some dissent from the proposal to omit Steps 6 and 7, the Commission decided to advance the proposed draft Code of Practice to Step 6 of the Procedure.

Matters arising from the reports of the 11th and 12th Sessions of the Committee. Terms of Reference of the Committee

135. The Commission noted that the Committee, following discussion at its 12th Session (ALINORM 76/13A, para 32) had sought the advice of the Executive Committee about its future role in certain matters. In particular it wished to know

- i. whether all hygiene provisions included in codes of practice being elaborated by Codex Commodity Committees should be referred to it for endorsement; and
- ii. whether, in view of its increasing activity in the area of microbiological specifications, it should be the body to advise on and ultimately to endorse microbiological specifications for food and associated methodology.

136. The Commission further noted that the Executive Committee (ALINORM 76/4, paras 21–25) had agreed that it was clear, both from a previous decision of the Commission and the action of Codex Commodity Committees themselves, that hygiene matters in codes of practice should be referred to the Food Hygiene Committee. Furthermore it was clear that it was the responsibility of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene to approve all provisions on food hygiene, whether in standards or codes of practice, including microbiological specifications and associated methodology.

137. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Executive Committee (ALINORM 76/4, para 25) that in order to remove any doubts concerning the role of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, the Terms of Reference of the Food Hygiene Committee be amended as follows (words underlined added):

- a. to draft basic provisions on food hygiene applicable to all foods;
- b. (i) to consider, amend if necessary, and endorse provisions on hygiene prepared by Codex Commodity Committees and contained in Codex Commodity Standards, and (ii) to consider, amend if necessary, and endorse provisions on hygiene prepared by Codex Commodity Committees and contained in Codex codes of practice unless, in specific cases, the Commission has decided otherwise, or (iii) to draft provisions on hygiene in respect of a particular food commodity within the terms of reference of a Codex commodity committee at the request of that Committee;
- c. to draft, where necessary, provisions on hygiene in respect of any food not assigned to any Codex Commodity Committee;
- d. to consider specific hygiene problems assigned to it by the Commission.

Note: The term “hygiene” includes, where necessary, microbiological specifications for food and associated methodology”.

138. The Rapporteur drew the attention of the Commission to the opinion of the Committee that, when examining the hygiene provisions of codes of practice, technological and hygienic requirements were often difficult to separate and required expert technical advice. The Commission agreed therefore that it was desirable to have representation from Commodity Committees when hygienic provisions of codes relevant to their work were being examined by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

139. The delegation of Sweden asked the representative of WHO if the revision, mentioned in para 99 of ALINORM 76/13 of the WHO publication “Guide to Hygiene in International Flight” had taken place and if this Guide, in a satisfactory way, covered the hygienic problems of food handling in connection with catering in long distance transport, especially air flights. The

representative of WHO replied that a revised version of the publication was expected this year and that the Guide also covered food hygiene aspects in connection with international flights.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

140. 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 U.S.A.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC CONSULTATION ON PESTICIDES IN AGRICULTURE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

141. The Commission had before it an extract from the report of the above Ad Hoc Consultation (AGP: 1975/M/3) and also an extract from the report of the 9th Session of the FAO Committee of Experts on Pesticides in Agriculture (AGP: 1975/M/4). As the business arising from these two meetings was covered under the item dealing with the report of the 8th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, the Commission agreed to consider matters of interest arising from the above two reports under the item dealing with the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (see para 160).

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

142. The Commission had before it the report of the 8th session of the above Committee (ALINORM 76/24 and corrigenda) together with some 180 proposed maximum limits for pesticide residues. In introducing the report, the Chairman of the Committee, Ir. A.J. Pieters, drew the Commission's attention to work in progress in the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues. Apart from the normal work of recommending maximum limits for pesticide residues in food, the Committee was elaborating a practical sampling procedure which defined the Codex maximum residue limits in relation to the lot.

143. The Committee had also examined the relationship between itself and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues, an expert body sponsored jointly by the Plant Production and Protection Division of FAO and the Food Additives Unit of WHO, and had concluded that no fundamental changes were necessary in the relationship of these bodies. However, the Committee had urged FAO and WHO to give every possible consideration to strengthening the resources available to the Joint Meeting and to the Codex Secretariat. The Committee had also recommended that the planned FAO Conference on Pesticides in Agriculture should consider the operations and needs of the Joint Meeting as a matter of special concern.

144. The Committee had also suggested that the publication of the reports and monographs of the Joint Meeting should be speeded up as they served as the basis on which the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues made its recommendations. The Chairman of the Committee then referred to the scheduling of sessions of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in the 1976/77 biennium and expressed the opinion that, in view of the importance of the work of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, it would be necessary to hold two

sessions in that biennium instead of only one provided for. (For further discussions on this point, see paras 86, 159–160).

Maximum Residue Limits at Step 8

145. The Commission had before it a number of maximum limits at Step 8 of the Procedure, as contained in ALINORM 76/24, Appendix II, and government comments thereon, as given in ALINORM 76/42-Part X.

146. The delegation of the Netherlands drew the Commission's attention to its written proposals to amend a number of maximum residue limits recommended by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (see ALINORM 76/42-Part X). As regards diphenylamine, the delegation of the Netherlands was of the opinion that this pesticide should be re-evaluated toxicologically by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues. The Commission agreed that this matter should be referred to the Joint Meeting for possible re-evaluation in the light of any new toxicological information.

147. As regards the proposed maximum limits for endosulfan residues in fruit and vegetables, the delegations of Italy and France were of the opinion that the limits were too high and should be reduced to 0.5 mg/kg. The delegations of Belgium, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland were in support of the above proposal. On the suggestion of the delegation of the Netherlands, the Commission agreed to include a footnote against the various limits at Step 8 under item 33 indicating that they were at or about the limit of determination.

148. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany was of the opinion that the limit for fentin in carrots (item 40.3) should be reduced to 0.1 mg/kg. The delegation of the Netherlands was of the opinion that the limit for hexachlorobenzene in the various carcase meats (items 44.1 to 44.5) should be reduced to 0.5 mg/kg (in the carcase fat), and that the limit for the same residue in cereals (item 44.9) should be reduced to 0.01 mg/kg. In the opinion of that delegation, the limit for cyhexatin in apples and pears (items 67.1 and 67.2) should be lowered to 1 mg/kg.

149. The Commission noted the following errors affecting Step 8 standards: item 57.3 should read 0.05 mg/kg, the maximum level being at or about the limit of determination; item 12.33 should read 0.05 mg/kg, on a fat basis; item 13.13 should be changed to “fat of cattle ...” and a new item should be added under item 61 - Phosphamidon, i.e. “Peaches 0.2 mg/kg”.

Status of the Maximum Residue Limits

150. The Commission noted that the 1975 Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues had changed the maximum residue limits for chlordimeform in pears from 5 mg/kg to 10 mg/kg and the maximum residue limits for chlorobenzilate in apples from 2 mg/kg to 5 mg/kg. The Commission decided that these limits be returned to Step 6 of the Procedure. As the proposals, either from the floor or on the basis of written comments, to change a number of

the maximum residue limits at Step 8 did not receive sufficient support, the Commission adopted them, with the exception of the maximum residue limits above, at Step 8 of the Procedure as Recommended International Maximum Residue Limits.

Amendments to Maximum Residue Limits at Step 9

151. The Commission had before it amendments at Step 5 proposed by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to a number of maximum residue limits at Step 9 of the Procedure. The Commission noted that the Committee had recommended that the remaining steps should be omitted as the proposed amendments were not controversial. The Commission adopted the proposed amendments at Step 5, also agreed that Steps 6 and 7 be omitted, and adopted them at Step 8 (see items 12.1–12.9, Appendix II, ALINORM 76/24).

Maximum Residue Limits at Step 5

152. The Commission had before it a number of maximum residue limits at Step 5 of the Procedure, as contained in document ALINORM 76/24, Appendix II, and noted that for items 49.34 and 49.35 (malathion 8 mg/kg in dried beans and 8 mg/kg in lentils) the Committee had recommended the omission of the remaining steps as the maximum limits were not controversial. The Commission adopted the proposed maximum residue limits at Step 5, also decided to omit Steps 6 and 7, and adopted them at Step 8. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany was not in agreement with the omission of the steps.

153. As regards the other maximum residue limits at Step 5 of the Procedure, the Commission did not discuss them in any detail. However, the following corrections were noted to the maximum residue limits at Step 5:

- a. footnote ⁴ to be deleted against items 49.33, 57.5, 57.6, 57.9, 57.10, 57.11 and 57.12.
- b. items 67.6 and 67.7 to read 0.05 mg/kg on a fat basis, together with the footnote indicating that the maximum level is at the level of determination.

The Commission advanced these maximum residue limits to Step 6.

154. The delegation of Canada questioned whether, in view of the heavy workload, the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should deal with maximum residue limits in animal feeds. In reply, it was pointed out that the Joint Meeting recommended maximum residue limits in those animal feeds which could lead to residues in animal products such as meat and milk and that it was up to the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to decide whether such recommendations should be taken up in the Codex Procedure. The Chairman of the Committee indicated that this question had been discussed by the Committee, which had found it useful to recommend maximum residue limits in animal feeds in some cases.

155. The delegations of the Netherlands, Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland were of the opinion that the maximum residue limits for carbaryl were too high and would cause difficulties as regards their acceptance. The delegation of France stated that the maximum

residue limits were, in general, too high, and that this was particularly so in the case of carbaryl.

156. The delegation of Japan informed the Commission that endrin was not permitted in that country. It further pointed out that daily intakes calculated for captan, chlordane, chlordimeform, endosulfan, fentin and paraquat using Japanese food intake data, exceeded the acceptable daily intake established by the Joint Meeting. The delegation of Japan was requested to make the information available to the Secretariat together with the method used to calculate maximum daily intakes.

Non-substantive changes to maximum residue limits at Step 9

157. The Commission considered the following non-substantive changes proposed by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to maximum residue limits at Step 9 of the Procedure:

Item 25 - delete "including, where present, dichloroacetaldehyde" as this metabolite was not considered to be significant;

Item 27.1 - delete "including citrus fruit" as such fruit was included in the class of tree fruits;

Items 1.7

22.5 – 22.7

28.2 – 28.5 Reexpress these items in the appropriate Step 9 publication as shown

34.3 in Appendix II, ALINORM 76/24

43.5

48.4 – 48.7

158. The Commission agreed that these changes need not follow the Codex amendment procedure and requested the Secretariat to issue appropriate corrigenda or to make the necessary corrections when re-issuing publications containing the recommended Codex maximum residue limits.

Scheduling of sessions of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

159. Following the statement made by the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues concerning the need to hold two sessions of the Committee during the biennium 1976/77 (see para 144), the delegation of the Netherlands read a draft resolution for consideration by the Commission, aimed at ensuring annual meetings of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues and at strengthening the Secretariats of these two bodies. The delegation of U.S.A., supported by the delegations of France, Australia, Senegal, U.K., Canada, New Zealand, the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway, Nigeria, Sudan, Ghana, Poland and Sweden, and the representative of IOCU, expressed its strong support of the objectives of the Netherlands draft resolution. The delegation of Gabon, while not questioning the importance of the

Commission's work on pesticide residues, noted that the ever increasing number of FAO meetings made effective participation by governments in all those meetings difficult. The Secretariat pointed out that it had proposed the scheduling of only one session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in the 1976/77 biennium prior to the Resolution of the FAO Conference concerning meetings in general. The Secretariat had made this proposal in order to permit adequate preparations to be made for the Ninth Session of the Committee and only after having ascertained that the momentum of the Committee's work would not be impaired.

160. The delegations speaking in support of the Netherlands' draft resolution stressed the importance of pesticides in the production of food and, hence, the need to agree internationally on maximum residue limits in food so as to protect the health of the consumer and, by harmonizing legislation concerning pesticide residues, facilitate international trade. In view of these considerations and of current interest in questions of environmental pollution affecting food, these delegations concluded that a reduction of the momentum of work of the Codex Committee and of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues would be very regrettable. The Commission agreed to express its views on this matter in the terms set forth in the statement set out hereunder and requested that the attention of the Directors-General be drawn specifically to this statement.

- a. " The Codex Alimentarius Commission stressed the world-wide importance of arriving at international agreement on maximum limits for residues of pesticides used to increase food and fibre production, as such international agreement would not only protect the health of the consumer throughout the world, but would, at the same time, facilitate international trade. In recommending internationally acceptable maximum limits for pesticide residues, the Commission underlined the important role the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues was playing in supplying the necessary scientific data to the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.
- b. The Commission noted the recommendations of the 8th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, Resolution X. of the ad hoc FAO Government Consultation on Pesticides in Agriculture and Public Health (AGP: 1975/M/3) and the recommendations of the 9th Session of the FAO Committee of Experts on Pesticides in Agriculture (AGP: 1975/M/4), all of which stressed the importance of strengthening the the resources available to the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues and to the Codex Secretariat. It also noted that the 18th Session of the FAO Conference had stressed the importance of the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme and had emphasized the need for FAO and WHO to give greater support to these activities (C 75/REP).
- c. Taking into account the above considerations and also the large amount of work to be performed in the field of maximum residue limits for pesticides and the continuing nature of this work, the Commission noted with regret the proposed scheduling of only one session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in the 1976/77 biennium and stressed that annual sessions be planned for 1978/79. The plans to hold only one Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues were not consistent with the statements made above and the Commission requested the Directors-General of FAO

and WHO to consider whether two sessions could be provided for in 1976/77 in the proposals to be submitted to the next World Health Assembly and FAO Council.

- d. The Commission, therefore, requested the Directors-General of FAO and WHO to take such steps as would ensure in future annual meetings of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues.”

Confirmation of Chairmanship

161. 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

162. The Commission had before it the Report of the 9th Session of the above Committee (ALINORM 76/23) which was introduced by Dr. J. Kanizsay as representative of the Hungarian National Codex Committee.

163. The Commission noted that two items of the agenda of the Committee's 9th Session “Endorsement of Methods of Analysis and Sampling proposed by the Commodity Committees”, and “Sampling for the Determination of Net Contents”, had been dealt with by working groups appointed by the Committee.

Methods of Analysis

164. With regard to methods of analysis, it was pointed out that the Committee was placing a great deal of importance on collaborative studies, preferably on an international scale, for a wide range of foods before accepting them as general referee methods.

165. As a good example of such methods, the Commission noted that a potentiometric end point titration for the determination of total chlorides in foods, which had been collaboratively studied by 12 laboratories, had been endorsed by the Committee for use in Infant Foods, Processed Vegetable Products and Table Olives and had now been advanced as a General Referee Method for the Determination of Chlorides (calculated as Sodium Chloride) in Foods, to Step 5 of the Procedure.

166. The Commission agreed to advance the method to Step 6.

167. The Commission also noted that the Committee had endorsed a general method for the determination of crude fat.

168. The delegation of Thailand pointed out that fat could become bound to soya protein during processing, and asked whether the method endorsed could determine total crude fat including that associated with protein in baby foods. The Secretariat took note of this question and undertook to seek further information on the point.

169. The Commission also noted the observations of the delegation of Thailand that in the Standards for Canned Baby Foods, Infant Formula and Processed Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Children, which had been adopted at Step 8, a method for the determination of linoleic acid was not yet available.

Sampling for the determination of net content

170. The Committee noted the report of the Working Group (ALINORM 76/23, Appendix III), which had discussed the definition of net contents in terms of the lot. The Working Group had attempted to reconcile two divergent points of view by proposing a "Moderate Acceptance Plan", the technical details of which were to be worked out for examination at the next session of the Committee. On completion of its work, it was expected that Commodity Committees would be asked to examine the "Moderate Acceptance Plan" in terms of the products for which they were developing standards.

171. The representative of ISO pointed out that Technical Committee 34 (TC 34) had tried for a number of years to resolve sampling problems. A joint meeting of representatives of AOAC/CODEX/ISO had taken place in Budapest in October which discussed areas where liaison between the three organizations could usefully be achieved. He advised the Commission that a meeting of Working Group TC/34 was planned for early May which all interested delegates could attend.

Role of Referee Methods

172. Several delegations drew attention to the role of reference methods as presently defined with regard to the needs of the Commodity Committees.

173. It was pointed out that in the setting up of specifications for Standards, methods of analysis were needed which were not necessarily suitable as referee methods and that, by contrast, referee methods were often sophisticated and not necessarily suitable for routine work. The question was also raised as to whether there was not a danger of duplication of work of this Committee with for example some aspects of the activities of the Joint FAO/WHO/UNEP Food Contamination Monitoring Programme under whose auspices an ad hoc Expert Consultation on Methods of Analysis and Sampling of Contaminants in Food had taken place early this year. It was pointed out by the Secretariat that this Consultation had dealt specifically with methods of analysis for contaminants (mercury, lead, cadmium, organochlorines including PCBs, and aflatoxin) and that in this respect their work was complementary to that of the committee.

174. The Commission requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper for consideration by the Executive Committee reviewing the types of Codex methods of sampling and analysis being elaborated and setting out any questions relating to the Procedure for their elaboration and the significance of their acceptance by Governments.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

175. 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 Hungary.

PART VII

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA

176. The Commission had before it the Report of the Second Session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa held in Accra in September 1975, as contained in ALINORM 76/28. The report was introduced by Dr. Robert Oteng, Coordinator for Africa, who highlighted the deliberations of the Committee on the various subjects before the meeting, particularly the endorsement by the Committee of the Model Food Law and the emphasis placed by the Committee on the need for developing better food control infrastructure in the Region.

177. The Coordinator pointed out that the role and task of the Coordinating Committee for Africa could not be compared with that of the Coordinating Committee for Europe, mainly because food legislation and food control in many of the countries of the region were still in the process of development. In this connection he stated that, in order to stimulate participation by African countries in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and to expedite development of food control infrastructure, the role of the Coordinator should be operational in character and that funding assistance from the Commission, OAU, ECA or directly from countries of the region would be sought.

178. The Commission noted, however, that the Executive Committee, at its Twenty First Session, had given careful consideration to the role of Codex Coordinators in developing regions. The Executive Committee had concluded that as the work of the Commission was recomandatory or advisory, but not operational in the sense in which this term is normally understood - it did not operate technical assistance programmes, for example - the work of the officers of the Commission was not operational either. The Executive Committee discussions on this subject, including the role of Coordinators as seen by the Executive Committee were to be found in document ALINORM 76/3, paras 38 to 46.

179. Although the Commission appreciated the special problems and circumstances of the Coordinating Committee for Africa, it did not depart from the conclusions of the Executive Committee concerning the role of Coordinators, and therefore, as had been indicated previously, there was no provision for the allocation of funds to the office of the Coordinator, to enable him to function on an operational basis. This was the position under the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, which all the Members of the Executive Committee had decided not to propose to change. The Coordinator for Africa would therefore, have to continue to operate, as before, on a voluntary basis.

180. The Commission agreed that if funds were to be made available from the sources mentioned in the deliberations of the last session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa,

held in Accra in September 1971, it would greatly assist the Coordinator in making more frequent contacts with member countries or in taking other action to further Codex work in the region.

181. The Commission reconsidered, as had been requested by the Coordinating Committee, its decision not to elaborate a standard for coffee and coffee products. Since the discussions by the Commission on this subject at the Tenth Session, no further information had been made available by Member Governments. The Secretariat indicated that trade statistics were already available. The work done by ISO and the EEC on coffee products was mentioned by several delegations. However, on the proposal of the Chairman of the Commission, it was agreed to request the Executive Committee to reconsider, in the light of the discussions over the years and the data available in documents presented earlier, whether or not Codex standards for coffee and coffee products should be developed.

182. The Commission noted that the Coordinating Committee had drawn up a list of products of significance in the trade of African countries which should be considered for possible standardization. Amongst these, tuber products had been given a high priority. In view of the interest in this commodity also in other regions, it was agreed to consider this proposal later during the session in conjunction with the discussions on the Secretariat paper on cereals, cereal products, tubers and starches.

183. With regard to the interest expressed by the Coordinating Committee in establishing limits for metallic contaminants in specific foods, the Commission was reminded of its decision to request Commodity Committees to propose limits, where appropriate.

184. The Commission noted that a provision had been made in the proposed budget of the Programme for 1976/77 for a consultant to assist in the preparation of the work of the Coordinating Committee. In this connection the Secretariat indicated that it would consult with the Coordinator regarding priorities in the subject matters to be dealt with.

Appointment of Coordinator for Africa

185. In accordance with Rule II.4(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission and on the unanimous proposal of the Coordinating Committee for Africa, the Commission reappointed, by general consent, Dr. Robert Oteng (Ghana) as Coordinator for Africa to serve for a second term from the end of the Eleventh Session to the end of the Twelfth Session of the Commission.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR LATIN AMERICA

186. The Chairman of the First Session of the Coordinating Committee for Latin America, Dr. E.R. Méndez, outlined the business discussed at the first session of the Committee (ALINORM 76/17). The main items of discussion by the Committee were as follows. The Coordinating committee had discussed work priorities and had suggested areas of priority which the Committee might pursue in the future. In view of the fact that a second session of

the Coordinating Committee had not been scheduled in 1976/77, the Coordinating Committee had agreed that the Regional Food Standards Conference for Latin America, which was scheduled for 1977, should consider these work priorities, among other questions: e.g. a review and development of food legislation and food control infrastructures in Latin America including the consideration of a draft model food law similar to that discussed by the Coordinating Committee for Africa. The Committee had drawn up a provisional agenda for the Conference and had agreed tentatively on the functions of the Coordinator for Latin America.

187. The Committee had also raised the question as to what criteria determined membership in a given geographic location of the Commission and whether a country could be a member of more than one geographic location and participate as full member in more than one Regional Coordinating Committee.

188. In this connection the Commission noted that for reasons of timing, paragraphs 24 to 31 of ALINORM 76/17 had not been adopted by the Coordinating Committee but that they had been cleared by the Chairman of the Committee. On the proposal of the delegation of Cuba, the Commission amended the first sentence of para 24 as follows: "A question was raised by the delegation of Cuba as to what were the criteria which determined a location". On the proposal of the same delegation paragraph 29 was also amended as follows: "Several delegations were also of the opinion that the problems outlined by the delegation of Brazil, which had wide implications, should be considered at a later stage and that no conclusions could be reached at the present session". On the proposal of the delegation of Brazil, paragraph 28 of ALINORM 76/17 was replaced by the following text: "The delegation of Brazil considered that the precedent set at the first session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa and the statement of the Legal Counsel did not satisfactorily explain the question concerning participation as Member of a country in more than one of the regional committees of the Codex Alimentarius Commission or the question of membership in more than one of the geographic locations of the Commission. It was further of the opinion that the region of Latin America was a well-defined one, which had interests particular to it. In its view, the question of participation as a full member should be decided primarily on the basis of the functions and objectives of the Committee, as a body for the definition of priorities and coordination of policies within the region. The efficiency of the Committee would be impaired if its membership were not restricted to countries with similar interests and which actually belonged to the region. This was not to say that participation as an observer by any interested Member Country in the work of Codex regional committees, in accordance with Rule VII.3 of the Commission, was not desirable". The Commission considered that paragraphs 24 to 31 of ALINORM 76/17, as amended above, could be regarded as having been adopted and the Secretariat undertook to re-issue ALINORM 76/17 as amended to Codex Contact Points.

Appointment of Coordinator for Latin America

189. In accordance with Rule II.4(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission and on the unanimous proposal of the Coordinating Committee for Latin America, the Commission appointed, by general consent, Dr. E.R. Méndez (Mexico) as Coordinator for Latin America to

serve from the end of the Eleventh Session to the end of the Twelfth Session of the Commission.

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS REGIONAL CONFERENCE FOR ASIA - Bangkok
8–15 December 1975

190. The Commission had before it document CX/ASIA 75/9, which was an advance copy of the body of the report of the above Conference, pending reproduction of the complete report, including list of participants, country statements and other information. The report was introduced by Professor A. Bhumiratana (Thailand) who reviewed the salient features of the Conference and thanked the Directors-General of FAO and WHO for making the Conference possible.

191. The Secretariat expressed the appreciation of FAO and WHO to the Government of Thailand for having hosted the Regional Conference and for having made all the necessary arrangements for its success. Appreciation was also expressed to the Government of Australia for their financial contribution towards the holding of the Conference. The Conference had proved to be extremely useful to the participating countries and to the Secretariat in highlighting the problems of Asia with regard to food legislation, food standards and food control infrastructure, including the need for strengthening of laboratories and training of analytical and food inspection personnel. Participation by some of the industrialized countries and the representatives of IOCU and ASMO as observers at the Conference greatly benefited the discussions and provided an opportunity to discuss the various problems regarding food standards, food control and consumer protection in a wide perspective. The Commission noted with pleasure the fact that the Conference had given general approval to the Model Food Law which had been prepared for its consideration.

192. The delegation of Iran regretted that, due to some last minute unavoidable circumstances, the country could not participate at the Conference. The delegation further informed the Commission that their country fully supported the Resolution contained in paragraph 112 of the report and endorsed the other recommendations made at the Conference.

193. Several delegations, including the representative of IOCU, who had participated in the Conference, referred to the very useful discussions held during the Conference which highlighted some of the special problems of food adulteration in the region and the need for improved food control and the development of food industry and trade. The Commission was requested by several delegations from the region of Asia to support strongly the implementation of the Resolution (paragraph 112 of the report of the Conference) adopted by the Conference which would call for assignment of additional resources. In this connection a delegation made reference to the work of the Asian Standards Advisory Committee (ASAC), set up under ESCAP, which had encountered some difficulties in the progress of its work because of the lack of adequate resources.

194. A point was made regarding the limited participation of the countries of the Asian region in the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies. It was suggested that FAO and WHO might explore means to emphasize the importance of the Commission's work to the member countries of the region and determine what could be done to increase their active participation.

195. The delegation of New Zealand inquired about the origin of the Model Food Law and referred to the provisions in it relating to warranty and the supervision of exports. It might be helpful to include with the code an explanation of the purpose of the provisions in it. The secretariat informed the Commission that the Model Food Law was originally drafted by the Secretariat on the basis of FAO's experience in assisting developing countries in food control. It drew considerably on the Canadian Food and Drugs Act. The draft law had been further reviewed by an Ad Hoc Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Experts and the latest version presented to the African and Asian countries was the one that took that Committee's comments into account. Referring to the warranty clause, attention was drawn to similar provision in other food legislations of certain developed and developing countries. In these countries where such a clause exists in their legislation it seemed to work fairly satisfactorily and did not cause any barrier to trade. The special needs of developing countries made it all the more necessary that careful consideration should be given to inclusion of such a clause in the national food legislation. As regards exports, the Model Food Law contained an enabling provision for the Government to make necessary regulations, if the circumstances so warranted. There was a strong need to look at the food control requirements of a country in an integrated manner. Many governments had separate export inspection legislation of one type or another. In an area such as food, it would be useful to consider the various possibilities before deciding on a particular course of action. The Commission gave a general acceptance to the Report of the Conference and noted the Resolution in paragraph 112 of the Report.

Appointment of Coordinator for Asia

196. In accordance with Rule II.4(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission and on the unanimous proposal of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Regional Conference for Asia, the Commission appointed, by general consent, Dr. K.O. Leong (Malaysia) as Coordinator for Asia, to serve from the end of the Eleventh Session to the end of the Twelfth Session of the Commission.

Establishment of a Coordinating Committee for Asia

197. As requested by the Commission at its last session, when it agreed in principle to the establishment of a Coordinating Committee for Asia, the Commission had before it at its present session document ALINORM 76/21, setting out the administrative and financial implications of establishing a Coordinating Committee for Asia. The Commission noted that provision had been made in the budgetary proposals for 1976/77 for one session of the Coordinating Committee to be held in the biennium. The Commission was informed by the Secretariat that the session could be held in the region of Asia if a Member Government in the region were found willing to host the session. The Secretariat indicated that it might be

possible to make some contribution towards defraying the costs of the session from the budget of the Programme. The Commission noted that there would be consultation between the Coordinator for Asia and the Secretariat on this matter and on the date of the First Session of the Coordinating Committee.

198. The Coordinator for Asia thought that a suitable time for holding the First Session of the Coordinating Committee would be towards the end of 1976. The Secretariat indicated that in fixing a date for the session it would be necessary to allow adequate time for the preparation and distribution in good time of all of the working documents for the session.

199. The Commission noted that arrangements had been made for an ad hoc meeting of delegates from the region of Asia on 8 April 1976, for the purpose of discussing arrangements for and the general programme of work of the Coordinating Committee's First Session.

200. The Commission agreed to establish a Coordinating Committee for Asia with the following membership and terms of reference:

"Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are Members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic location of Asia.

Functions:

The Committee exercises general coordination in the preparation of standards relating to the region of Asia and exercises such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Codex Alimentarius Commission."

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE AND CODEX COMMITTEE ON NATURAL MINERAL WATERS

201. The Coordinator for Europe, Dr. H. Woidich, recalled the decision made by the Tenth Session of the Commission that the Draft Regional Standard for Natural Mineral Waters should be tabled until the question in connection with claims concerning properties favourable to health had been resolved (see paragraphs 280-289, Report of the Tenth Session of the Commission). The Coordinator for Europe informed the Commission that, as a result of discussions with representatives of WHO, representatives of industry and the Codex Secretariat, a new revised draft standard for natural mineral waters had been worked out. This revised draft appeared to have overcome the difficulties encountered previously in connection with health claims and also included certain improvements over the previous text as included in Appendix II, ALINORM 72/19A.

202. The representative of WHO referred to a recent meeting between the Coordinator for Europe, representatives of the Swiss National Codex Committee and of WHO. He indicated that the meeting had discussed in detail the redraft of the European regional standard for mineral waters and had agreed upon the approach on how to proceed in this matter.

203. Considering (a) that the redraft of the standard for natural mineral waters would require a round of government comments; and (b) that no meeting of the Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters had been provided for in the 1976/77 biennium, the Commission decided that the Draft Standard for NATural Mineral Waters (Appendix II, ALINORM 72/19A), as redrafted on the basis of the various discussions which had been organized by the Coordinator for Europe, should be returned to Step 6 of the Procedure. The commission agreed that a combined one week session of the Codex Committee on Natural Mineral Waters and of the Coordinating Committee for Europe should consider the revised draft in the light of comments received.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

204. 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.

Boneless Meat

205. The delegation of Austria drew the Commission's attention to a questionnaire which had been issued to Governments and which had indicated the interest in the question of boneless meat of countries in the European Region. The Commission recalled its previous decision that no work needed to be done on this commodity, but agreed that the next session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe might rediscuss the question of boneless meat in order to see whether or not there was still interest in this question and, if so, what further action might be envisaged.

Codex Coordinating Committees

206. In reply to a question by the delegation of New Zealand, the Secretariat informed the Commission that all documents intended for Codex Coordinating Committees were, as a matter of normal practice, sent to all member countries of the Commission and that, furthermore, the Rules of the Commission provided for participation in an observer capacity of all Members of the Commission not members of the regions concerned. It would be a matter for Members of the Commission outside a given region to make known their interest in being represented, as invitations were not issued to them automatically.

PART VIII

CODEX COMMITTEE ON COCOA PRODUCTS AND CHOCOLATE

207. The Commission had before it the report of the Eleventh Session of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate (ALINORM 76/10) and government comments on the Draft Standards for Cocoa Butter and Chocolate at Step 8, contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part I and LIM 3.

208. The Commission agreed to reverse the order of agenda items 15(a) and (b) and consequently received the introduction of the report by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. E. Matthey (Switzerland) before consideration of the standards at Step 8.

Draft Standard for Cocoa (Cacao) Beans, Cocoa (Cacao) Nibs, Cocoa (Cacao) Mass, Cocoa Press Cake and Cocoa Dust (Cocoa Fines) for Use in the Manufacture of Cocoa and Chocolate Products at Step 7

209. The Commission, at its previous session (ALINORM 74/44, paras 83–91), discussed the above standard and had agreed to return it to Step 7 until such time as the FAO Study Group on Cocoa could meet and review the FAO Model Ordinance on which part of the standard was based. It was reported that the review had not yet taken place and the Commission had, therefore, no business under this item. Dr. Matthey then reviewed the status of work of the Committee as summarized at page 14 of ALINORM 76/10.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Cocoa Butter at Step 8

210. The Commission had before it the above draft standard as contained in ALINORM 76/10, Appendix II, for which the Chairman of the Committee acted as rapporteur.

211. The delegation of Argentina made a general statement indicating its readiness to accept the standard for incorporation into the food regulations of its country.

Section 2 - Description

212. The Commission noted, from the original description that 2.1.1 “Expeller Cocoa Butter” prepared from cocoa nib or cocoa mass only could be the same as press cocoa butter.

213. The Commission therefore agreed to the following amendment, proposed by the delegation of Japan, to 2.1.2 - Expeller Cocoa Butter: “Expeller Cocoa Butter is the fat prepared by the expeller process from cocoa beans singly or in combination with cocoa nib, cocoa mass, cocoa press cake and low fat cocoa press cake, as described respectively in sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 and complying with the Minimum Qualities laid down in section 3 of the Standard for Cocoa (Cacao) Beans, Cocoa (Cacao) Nib, Cocoa (Cacao) Mass, Cocoa Press Cake and Cocoa Dust (Cocoa Fines). It may only be treated ...”

Section 3 - Essential Composition and Quality Factors

214. With regard to saponification values, the delegation of Ghana pointed out that values exceeding 198 did not normally occur in the butter of cocoa beans traded internationally and that in the opinion of the producing countries the footnote (***) allowing for the limit to be surpassed exceptionally was unnecessary. The Commission decided, however, to retain the footnote.

Section 4 - Food Additives

215. The Commission noted that a Working Group on Food Additives in Cocoa Butter had met during the Eleventh Session of the Committee. The Working Group had recognized that the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils had removed all reference to processing aids in their standards since no residues of processing aids remained in the finished product. The Committee had accepted the recommendations of the Working Group to delete the present provision for processing aids in the standard for Cocoa Butter which covered clarifying and filtration aids, and neutralizing and bleaching agents.

216. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives expressed concern at the deletion of processing aids from standards. He pointed out that the “total” disappearance of substances added in processing was a function of the limits of detection of the methods of analysis employed and that the retention of processing aids in the food additives section of the standard and the specifications of identity and purity for these products were essential to consumer protection.

217. There was further discussion as to whether extraction solvents for which residue limits were stated were food additives or processing aids or, as suggested by some delegations, should be declared under contaminants. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives informed the Commission that the entire subject was to be discussed at the next session of his Committee. The delegation of Belgium stated that generally speaking an actual contaminant which appears in a commodity standard in the section on food additives shall be mentioned on the label of the product.

Section 7 - Labelling

218. The Commission noted that this section would not be endorsed by the Food Labelling Committee, since this product was used only as an ingredient in other food products (ALINORM 76/22, para 4) and agreed to include a statement to this effect instead of the present opening sentence of the section. It was pointed out that this would seem at first sight to be contrary to the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling which stated at 3(a) “To draft provisions on labelling applicable to all foods”. The Commission noted that so far only prepackaged foods had been considered by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling and that the principle applicable to the particular case of cocoa butter would be discussed when the Committee dealt with the labelling of bulk containers and shipping containers at its next session.

Status of the Standard

219. The Commission adopted as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Cocoa Butter, as amended, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Chocolate at Step 8

220. The Commission had before it the above standard which was contained in ALINORM 76/10, Appendix III and Corrigendum. The Rapporteur, in introducing the standard, drew the attention of the Commission specifically to the range of products covered by the standard - all designated chocolate with or without a further qualifying term.

221. The representative of the EEC pointed out that certain products which in some countries traditionally had been called "chocolate" but which contained limited quantities (equal to or less than 5%) of e.g. egg yolk or honey could, in accordance with the present text for the designation of the product and when complying with the acceptance procedure, no longer be called "Chocolate" nor "composite chocolate". This would exclude the word 'chocolate' without qualification from many products which had traditionally carried this description. The representative of the EEC suggested that to overcome this difficulty Section 7 - Labelling, should carry the following footnote: "The use of the description "chocolate" in the present section does not exclude the same term being employed in a future standard related to Composite Chocolate to describe a chocolate to which certain edible substances have been added in a form which is practically indiscernable in quantities not exceeding 5% m/m of the final product".

The delegation of Ireland pointed out that it had before the Commission (document LIM 3) an amendment on this specific point, but that it was willing to withdraw the amendment provided that the EEC footnote was adopted.

222. The representative of the IOCU pointed out that consumer expectation varied from country to country and he was of the opinion that the range of products presently covered by the standard, with the addition of the footnote proposed by the representative of the EEC, would allow the consumer to find the products he expected in his country. The delegation of Canada expressed concern that such a proviso would permit too free an interpretation of what constituted "chocolate".

223. The delegation of Ghana reminded the Commission of the decision taken at the meeting of the Committee in Neuchâtel in 1971 (ALINORM 72/10, para 49) to set the minimum total cocoa solids in milk chocolate at 25% and expressed strong objection at the deviation, from this decision of the composition of chocolate as described under sections 3.1.7, 3.1.13 and 3.1.14. A number of delegations associated themselves with this point of view.

224. Other delegations which agreed in principle with the advancement of the draft standard expressed some specific reservations. The delegation of Finland pointed to a possible contradiction, in that the use of lactose was permitted as a sugar for which a Codex standard had been elaborated (CAC/RS 11-1969) but was restricted when listed under the heading of milk solids as an optional ingredient. The delegation of Japan informed the Commission that in their country a type of chocolate containing more than 30% of total cocoa solids, but not being covered by the draft standard for chocolate, had been produced for the past several decades. They expressed their concern about this type of chocolate that could be no longer designated as 'chocolate' when the standard was advanced to step 9.

225. Some inconsistencies in the translation into French of the text at sub-sections 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 3.1.4 and 7.1.7 were brought to the attention of the Commission. These should be rectified by the Secretariat.

226. The Chairman of the Committee agreed to the footnote proposed by the delegation of the EEC. Concerning the decision at Neuchâtel referred to by the delegation of Ghana and several other delegations, he noted that the same kind of debate had taken place at the last meeting of the Committee in Zurich (ALINORM 76/10, paras 78–83), when the delegation of the United Kingdom had shown that this type of chocolate was a traditional product which was produced in large quantities and widely exported. He considered that a workable compromise was to accept as name for the product 'milk chocolate' provided that the milk solids and cocoa solids content were declared. The delegations of Belgium, France and the Federal Republic of Germany expressed reservations on this subject, feeling that two products of different composition should be named differently.

227. The delegation of Ghana repeated its opposition to the inclusion of milk chocolate with high milk content in the standard and considered that if the products listed under 3.1.7, 3.1.13 and 3.1.14 could be relocated, appropriately named, in other standards, then the present standard could be advanced without difficulty.

Status of the Standard

228. The Commission decided to include the footnote to the labelling section referred to above. It further agreed to retain milk chocolate with high milk content in the standard. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Chocolate, as amended, at step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

229. Reservations on the Commission's decision were expressed by the following delegations: Brazil, Congo, Cuba, Gabon, Ghana, Japan, Kenya, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Togo and Tunisia. The representatives of COPAL and the East African Community expressed their agreement with the reservations made by these countries. The delegation of Canada reserved its position with regard to the inclusion of the footnote.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

230. 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.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

231. The Commission had before it the Report of the Eleventh (1974) and Twelfth (1975) Sessions of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables, as contained in ALINORM 76/20 and ALINORM 76/20A respectively. The reports were introduced by Dr. R.W. Weik (USA) who acted as Rapporteur.

Reconsideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/20, Appendix II)

232. At its Ninth Session the Commission had decided that the Draft Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail should be returned to step 7 of the Procedure, as it had noted that there was a problem regarding the composition of fruit mixtures which should be permitted to be designated Canned Fruit Cocktail. It had agreed that the Secretariat should request information on what mixtures of fruits were canned and what designations the various mixtures were given. The information was also to have included data on trade in the various mixtures.

233. The Committee at its Eleventh Session had considered the replies to the request for information and had noted that a very large part of the products marketed under the name of Canned Fruit Cocktail conformed to the present draft standard and that this product had been in commerce for approximately 40 years. The Committee had, therefore, agreed not to permit under the designation of Canned Fruit Cocktail the use of fruits other than those listed in the Standard.

234. Some delegations from the region of Europe proposed that a further standard be elaborated for a fruit mixture which would include fruits grown in their countries. It was agreed to discuss this matter further when considering future work for the Coordinating Committee for Europe.

235. At its Tenth Session the Commission had noted that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling had endorsed the labelling section of the standard with one amendment. It was pointed out that there was no provision for lot identification in the standard, although this was provided for in all other standards for processed fruits and vegetables presently under consideration by the Committee. The Commission agreed to include this provision in the standard.

Status of the Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail

236. The Commission adopted as a Recommended standard, the Draft Standard for Canned Fruit Cocktail, with the above amendment, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft General Standard for Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/20A, Appendix II)

237. The Rapporteur informed the Commission that the present standard had been discussed at a number of sessions of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables. The Committee, at its Twelfth Session, had finalized work on the draft standard and had agreed that a single General Standard covering two groups of products with different fruit contents designated "Specifications A and B" would be the best solution. This distinction was modeled

on specifications agreed in the Recommended International Standard for Soft Sugars (CAC/RS 6-1969).

238. The Commission discussed the draft standard at considerable length. A considerable number of amendments were proposed. The Commission was informed, however, that the Committee, at various stages during its deliberations, had considered these proposals and that the present standard reflected the outcome thereof.

239. With regard to the additives listed in the standard, it was noted that not all had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives. It was agreed that the Food Additives section should be reviewed by the Committee on Food Additives at its next session, taking into account the comments made by a number of governments which were contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part III (rev.) + Addendum 1.

240. A number of delegations pointed out that the translation of the term “jam” would present difficulties. The delegation of Uruguay, supported by the delegations of Spain and Venezuela, proposed - and it was agreed - that in Spanish the term “mermeladas” would be used in the title and in the text of the standard. The delegation of Portugal, supported by the delegation of Brazil, stated that in Portuguese-speaking countries the term “marmalade” is only used for quince (*Cydonia oblonga* L.) jam which in Portuguese is called “marmelo”. The Commission noted that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling had endorsed the labelling section of the standard with three amendments (ALINORM 76/22A, paras 8-19).

Status of the General Standard for Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies

241. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft General Standard for Jams (Fruit Preserves) and Jellies, with the amendments mentioned above, for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards, with the proviso that the additives section would be reviewed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives at its next session, it being understood that, in accordance with established practice, any additive provisions not endorsed or temporarily endorsed would be deleted from the standard.

242. The delegation of Japan reserved its position with regard to the coverage by the standard of products with different fruit content. It further held the view that the term “jam” should be restricted to products complying with Specification A and should not be used for products covered by Specification B. The delegations of Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland and Sweden reserved their positions with regard to the use of certain food additives. The delegation of Austria proposed to include a provision for contaminants. The Commission decided not to take action on this proposal, since the matter would need to be considered, in the first instance, by the Committee.

Consideration of the Draft General Standard for Citrus Marmalade at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/20A, Appendix III)

243. The Commission noted that the Draft General Standard for Citrus Marmalade was closely related to the Draft General Standard for Jams and Jellies and that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling had endorsed the labelling section of the standard with three amendments (ALINORM 76/22A, paras 21–25).

244. Several delegations pointed out that the translation of the term “jellymarmalade” would also present difficulties. It was noted that the French translation of this term would be “marmelade-gelée”. The delegations of Spain, Uruguay and Venezuela drew attention to the need to correct the Spanish translation of the term “jelly-marmalade” to read “jalea de agrios”. Several Spanish-speaking delegations pointed out that the Spanish translation of the title of the standard could also give rise to misunderstandings and it was agreed that the title of the standard should be translated as “Proyecto de Norma General para Marmelada y Jalea de Agrios”.

Status of the General Standard for Citrus Marmalade

245. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft General Standard for Citrus Marmalade, with the amendments mentioned above, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards, with the proviso that the additives section would be reviewed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives at its next session, it being understood that, in accordance with established practice, any additive provisions not endorsed or temporarily endorsed would be deleted from the standard.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Mature Processed Peas at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/20A, Appendix IV)

246. A number of delegations and the observer of the IOCU supported the opinion of the delegation of France that an obligatory declaration of “net drained weight” should be made and that this provision should be included in all standards for processed fruits and vegetables products. It was pointed out that “net drained weight” was not uniformly defined, and that this subject would be considered at the next session of the Committee on Food Labelling. The delegation of Norway questioned the inclusion in a Codex standard of a method of analysis which was not a referee method. The Commission noted that the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables had established a minimum limit for the total dry solids content of the product and agreed to await the recommendations of the Food Labelling Committee.

247. Several delegations expressed their concern at the extent of the additive list and urged that consideration be given to the question of whether it could not be reduced. In this connection, the Commission agreed that the same procedure should be followed as with the two other draft standards considered by it. It was noted that the Food Labelling Committee had endorsed the Food Labelling section with minor amendments (ALINORM 76/22A, paras 26–30).

Status of the Draft Standard for Canned Mature Processed Peas

248. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Canned Mature Processed Peas with the amendments mentioned above, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards, with the proviso that the additives section would be reviewed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives at its next session in the way mentioned above.

Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Canned Tropical Fruit Salad at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/20, Appendix III)

249. The Commission considered at Step 5 of the Procedure the above-mentioned proposed draft standard and decided to advance it to Step 6.

Proposed Amendments to the Recommended International Standard for Canned Peaches (CAC/RS 14-1969, Rev. 1)

250. The Rapporteur introduced a proposal of the U.S.A. for an amendment to the above standard to bring it in line with other canned fruit standards with respect to the packing media. The Commission agreed to refer the amendment for consideration at Step 4 to the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables at its next session in the light of government comments to be obtained at Step 3.

Inclusion of Contaminants Provision in Standards

251. In connection with the proposal recorded above for the revision of a Step 9 standard the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives pointed out that different Commodity Committees dealt differently with the question of contaminants in the standards they were elaborating. He further drew attention to the fact that in the standards elaborated in the first years of activity of the Codex Alimentarius Commission contaminants were not dealt with.

252. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Food Additives urged that all Commodity Committees give serious consideration to the desirability of including a contaminants section, in particular covering certain heavy metals, in every standard before them and that also Step 9 standards coming up for revision be included in these considerations.

253. The Commission agreed with the proposal and instructed Commodity Committees to request governments to provide information regarding contaminants for all products for which standards were being elaborated. This would allow for provisions for maximum levels of contaminants to be proposed which would subsequently be considered by the Codex Committee on Food Additives.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

254. 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 U.S.A.

JOINT ECE/CODEX ALIMENTARIUS GROUP OF EXPERTS ON STANDARDIZATION OF FRUIT JUICES

255. The Commission had before it the report of the Group of Experts (ALINORM 76/14) and government comments on the Draft Standards at Step 8 contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part IV and Add. 1, as well as comments by the United Kingdom on the changes to Step 9 standards proposed by the Group of Experts. The Chairman of the Joint Group of Experts, Prof. W. Pilnik, introduced the report.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Grape Juice at Step 8

256. The Commission had before it the above draft standard as contained in ALINORM 76/14, Appendix II, and noted that the delegation of Sweden, in its written comments, had expressed the opinion that the requirement for a minimum soluble solids content of 15° Brix (a) did not take into account acceptable products the natural soluble solids content of which was below this value and (b) would make the addition of water to juices with higher soluble solids than 15% possible. For these reasons, the delegation of Sweden had proposed that Section 2.1 should be redrafted without the inclusion of a minimum soluble solids requirement. The Commission thought that this matter should be considered by the Joint Group, but decided not to alter Section 2.1 at this time.

Status of the Standard

257. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Grape Juice, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standards for Concentrated Grape Juice and Sweetened Concentrated Labrusca Type Grape Juice at Step 8

258. The Commission had before it the above two draft standards as contained in ALINORM 76/14, Appendices III and IV, respectively. The Commission noted that the delegation of Denmark had proposed, in their written comments, that a declaration of the amount of added sugars should be provided for in the standard. The Commission noted that this matter had been discussed by the Group of Experts and that a quantitative declaration of sugar content had not been thought necessary. The Commission decided, therefore, not to make any changes in this respect in the standard. However, the Commission agreed with the editorial amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom to change “sugar” to “sugars” in Section 8.8 of the Draft Standard for Sweetened Concentrated Labrusca Type Grape Juice. Furthermore, for the sake of consistency, the phrase concerning tartaric acid in Section 1.1 of the latter draft standard was changed by the commission as follows: “but is substantially free of crystals of salts of tartaric acid”.

259. The delegation of Poland reiterated its opposition to the provision in the section on contaminants and informed the Commission that recent work carried out in Poland showed that the levels of contaminants found in single strength and concentrated juices were

comparable and that, therefore, it did not appear proper to provide for the same maximum levels for contaminants in the reconstituted juice as in the unreconstituted single strength juice. The Commission noted that the Group of Experts did not have adequate data on levels of contaminants in concentrated juices, on the basis of which maximum levels for contaminants in the concentrated juice itself could be established, and also noted that the question of contaminants remained under review.

Status of Standards

260. The Commission adopted, as Recommended Standards, the Draft Standard for Concentrated Grape Juice and the Draft Standard for Sweetened Concentrated Labrusca Type Grape Juice at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Pineapple Juice at Step 8

261. The Commission had before it the above standard as contained in ALINORM 76/14, Appendix V. The Commission noted the written comments of the delegation of Sweden concerning Section 2.1 dealing with the soluble solids content of pineapple juice, but, as in the case of grape juice, decided not to make any changes to that Section (see para 256).

262. Considerable discussion took place on Section 4.1 concerning the provisional maximum level for tin of 150 mg/kg. This maximum level (reduced from the 250 mg/kg provided for in the standard) had been referred back to the Group of Experts by the Codex Committee on Food Additives (ALINORM 76/12) for consideration. However, the Group of Experts had not met between the session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Eleventh Session of the Commission and, therefore, new comments by the Group of Experts on the level of 150 mg/kg were not available. During the discussions it was pointed out that, in the absence of adequate toxicological evidence, there was no agreed view as to whether or not either 250 mg/kg or 150 mg/kg represented a hazard to health.

263. The maximum level of 150 mg/kg for tin proposed by the Group of Experts met with strong opposition by a large number of delegations representing mainly producing countries, as, in their view, existing evidence supported a maximum level of 250 mg/kg. In their opinion, a maximum level of 150 mg/kg would result in a significant proportion of canned pineapple juice moving in trade not meeting the requirements of the standard in respect of tin content. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the presence of tin from a technological point of view had certain advantages. These delegations, therefore, proposed that the original maximum level of 250 mg/kg be reinstated into the standard.

264. The delegations of Belgium, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland were of the opinion that the question of tin should be referred back to the Group of Experts for reconsideration, especially, as neither of the proposed maximum levels (250 mg/kg or 150 mg/kg) had been endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives. It was pointed out

that natural pineapple juice did not contain tin and that the question, therefore, related to the suitability of tinned containers for packing pineapple juice.

265. On the basis of the above discussion, the Commission decided to reinstate the original maximum level of 250 mg/kg into the Draft Standard for Pineapple Juice and referred it to the Codex Committee on Food Additives for endorsement. The delegations of Belgium and Poland were opposed to this procedure. The delegation of France recommended that the question of tin and tinned containers should be dealt with as a general problem.

Status of the Standard

266. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Pineapple Juice at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Proposed Draft Standard for Non-Pulpy Blackcurrant Nectar at Step 5

267. The Commission had before it the above standard as contained in ALINORM 76/14, Appendix VI, and noted that the pulpy nectars had been included in the general standard. For this reason, the Group of Experts had considered it necessary to develop an individual standard for the non-pulpy product. The Commission also noted that, for technological reasons, non-pulpy blackcurrant nectar could not be packed in simple tinned containers and that the matter of tin content was being given particular attention by the Group of Experts.

Status of the Standard

268. The Commission decided that the Draft Standard for Non-pulpy Blackcurrant Nectar should be advanced to Step 6 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Amendments to Step 9 Standards

269. The Commission had before it Appendix VIII to ALINORM 76/14 containing amendments proposed by the Group of Experts to standards at Step 9 of the Procedure and comments of the delegation of the United Kingdom on these proposed amendments, as well as additional amendments proposed by the United Kingdom (ALINORM 76/39-Add. 1). In introducing this subject, the Chairman of the Group of Experts informed the Commission that some of the proposed amendments were consequential to changes which had been made to standards at earlier steps in the Codex Procedure, while others were the result of oversight or were editorial improvements. In addition, some additional changes had been proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom as contained in Part B of ALINORM 76/39-Add. 1, some of which were consequential or editorial in nature, while others required consideration by the Group of Experts.

270. The Commission adopted all the changes proposed by the Group of Experts contained in Appendix VIII of ALINORM 76/14 in conformity with the new accelerated procedure for the amendment of Step 9 standards (see para 101) and requested the Secretariat to issue appropriate corrigenda for the standards indicated in Part A of document ALINORM 76/39-Add.1.

271. The delegation of Norway was of the opinion that the processing aids provided for in the standard for apple juice and concentrated apple juice should be listed separately from the additives. The Secretariat undertook to make the necessary editorial changes in this respect.

272. As regards the amendments proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom, the Chairman of the Group of Experts pointed out that the amendments concerning carbon dioxide (para B.4 of ALINORM 76/39-Add.1) and sulphur dioxide (para B.5 of ALINORM 76/39-Add.1) were not editorial and should be examined by the Group of Experts. With the agreement of the delegation of the United Kingdom, the Commission referred these points to the Group of Experts but adopted the other editorial amendments (paras B.1, B.2, B.3, B.6, B.7 and B.8 of ALINORM 76/39-Add.1) in conformity with the new accelerated procedure (see para 101). The Secretariat was requested to include the above changes in the corrigendum to be issued.

JOINT ECE/CODEX ALIMENTARIUS GROUP OF EXPERTS ON STANDARDIZATION OF QUICK FROZEN FOODS

273. The Commission had before it the reports of the Ninth and Tenth Sessions of the Joint Group of Experts (ALINORM 76/25 and ALINORM 76/25A) and government comments on the draft standards at Step 8, contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part II and Addenda 1 and 2. The Chairman of the Joint Group of Experts, Mr. T. Van Hiele (Netherlands) introduced the reports and outlined work done by the Group on standards and codes of practice for quick frozen foods.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Peaches at Step 8

274. The Commission had before it the above standard which was contained in Appendix III of ALINORM 76/25. The Chairman of the Joint Group of Experts reviewed the government comments at Step 8 on the Draft Standard. He drew the Commission's attention to a discussion at the Tenth Session of the Group of Experts concerning the question of styles, on the basis of the report of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (see paras 23–25, ALINORM 76/25A). As a consequence, the Group of Experts had agreed to add a general provision to the styles section of some draft standards at early steps in the Codex Procedure, in order to permit the marketing of new styles of products in conformity with all other requirements of the standard. It had also agreed to make a consequential amendment to the labelling section, to ensure that these new styles, not specifically identified in the standard, would be subject to analogous labelling requirements as regards the name of the product. The Group of Experts had requested governments to comment on the need to

include such a general provision on other styles in Step 9 standards and in the standards for quick frozen peaches and bilberries.

275. The Commission agreed that this question represented a general issue which probably affected all Codex Commodity Standards containing a provision on styles. However, it considered that the provision on other styles was not for general and automatic application to all Codex standards but should be considered by Codex Committees on a commodity by commodity basis. The general provision on other styles would be applicable in those cases where the format concerning styles adopted by the Tenth Session of the Commission, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, was too restrictive and where the introduction of a certain flexibility into the styles section was justified. The format adopted by the Tenth Session of the Commission is as follows (see paras 185– 191, ALINORM 74/44):

“The product shall be prescribed in one of the following styles:

- a., or
- b., or
- c.”

276. The Commission, in agreeing to the use of the general provision on other styles, confirmed that its action was not a reversal of the decision made at its Tenth Session, but rather should be viewed as a derogation to meet special circumstances associated with the standards to which the new provision was being applied.

277. As regards the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Peaches, the Commission agreed to the inclusion of the general provision for other styles and that section 2.4.3 be amended accordingly. The Commission also agreed that section 6.1 dealing with the name of the food should be amended, as a consequence of having amended section 2.4.3. The text to be used was that given in the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Spinach. The Commission also agreed to delete the words “following the longitudinal axis” from the definition of “halves”, (section 2.4.3(b), thus including products cut along the equatorial line under the style designation “halves”. The delegation of the U.S.A. indicated that it was opposed to such an amendment being adopted in the Commission itself.

Status of the Standard

278. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Peaches, with the above amendments, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Bilberries at Step 8

279. The Commission had before it the above Draft Standard as contained in Appendix IV, ALINORM 76/25. In the light of the conclusions in paras 275–276 above, the Commission agreed that the general provision for other styles was not applicable to this product.

Status of the Standard

280. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Bilberries at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Spinach at Step 8

281. The Commission had before it the above Draft Standard as contained in Appendix I, ALINORM 76/25A. It noted that the Group of Experts had included the general provision for other styles and the consequential labelling provision concerning the name of the product. The delegation of the U.K. reserved its position concerning the minimum requirement for 5.5% m/m salt-free dry matter included in sub-section 3.2.2 (h).

Status of the Standard

282. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Spinach at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Code of Practice for the Processing and Handling of Quick Frozen Foods at Step 8

283. The Commission had before it the above Draft Code of Practice as contained in Appendix VII, ALINORM 76/25 and changes thereto adopted at the Tenth Session of the Group of Experts and given in para 46 of ALINORM 76/25A. In introducing the Draft Code, the Chairman of the Group of Experts drew the Commission's attention to a collaborative study which had been organized by the Group of Experts and which involved a number of representative quick frozen foods, in an attempt to get a better insight into product quality in relation to time/temperature conditions and other relevant details. He pointed out that the Draft Code represented the best that could be achieved, given existing conditions and information available. It was expected that the Code would be reviewed in the light of further experience and information.

Section 4.2

284. In the opinion of the delegation of the U.S.A., the recommendation for a maximum variation of air temperature of 2°C would be difficult to achieve and was furthermore not appropriate, as this variation was originally intended for product temperature variation. The Commission noted that the recommendation was worded as an ideal to be aimed at.

Section 5.6 and 6.3 as amended (see ALINORM 76/25A)

285. The delegation of Sweden was of the opinion that the maximum product temperature of -18°C was to be regarded as an ideal to be aimed at, and considered that the proviso that the

product temperature should, in any case, not rise above -12° in the warmest pack should be included in a footnote, in order to indicate that such a rise be regarded as an exceptional situation which may be tolerated. The delegations of France, Japan and Iran held a similar view and considered that sections 5.6 and 6.3 should aim at -18°C, without further reference to -12°C in the warmest pack. The delegations of Belgium and Italy considered that the temperature in the warmest pack should not rise above -15°C. The delegation of Norway agreed with the proposals of Sweden.

Section 5.1

286. In the opinion of the delegations of Iran, Japan and Senegal, the pre-cooling temperature of +10°C was too high.

Status of the Code of Practice

287. The Commission noted that the product quality depended not only on product temperature, including temperature fluctuation, but also on length of storage and that these questions were under study by the Group of Experts. It recognized that the Code of Practice represented the best that could be achieved given the existing circumstances, but agreed that the Code should be reviewed in five years time in the light of further information. The Secretariat was requested to so indicate in an introduction to the Code. As regards recommendations concerning product temperature in sections 5.6 and 6.3, the Commission agreed to insert a footnote indicating that these were subject to reconsideration prior to its 13th Session. With the above indications, the Commission adopted, as a Recommended Code of Practice, the Draft Code of Practice for Processing and Handling of Quick Frozen Foods at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards and Codes of Practice.

Proposed Draft Standards for Quick Frozen Foods at Step 5

288. The Commission advanced the proposed draft standards for quick frozen blueberries, cauliflower, broccoli and leeks (Appendix V, ALINORM 76/25 and Appendices II, III and IV, ALINORM 76/25A) to Step 6 of the Codex Procedure. The delegation of France considered that, generally speaking, the paragraphs of these standards relating to defects included specifications that were too detailed.

Method for Checking Temperature of Quick Frozen Foods at Step 5

289. The Commission advanced the above method as contained in ALINORM 76/25A, Appendix VI, to Step 6 of the Codex Procedure. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew the Commission's attention to work in progress on methods for the measurement of the temperature of quick frozen foods.

Amendments to Standards at Step 9 of the Procedure

290. The Commission adopted the amendments proposed by the Group of Experts as given in ALINORM 76/36 (Conference Room Document) and also agreed that the sections dealing with styles in the Step 9 standards should be brought into line with the Step 8 standards adopted as Recommended Standards at the present session.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT HYGIENE

291. The Commission had before it the Report of the Third Session (1974) of the Committee on Meat Hygiene (ALINORM 76/15) and government comments on the draft codes at Step 8 contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part VI + Add.1 (CRD) and Addendum. The reports were introduced by Mr. B.R. Mason (New Zealand) who acted as Rapporteur.

Consideration of Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/15, Appendix II)

292. The Rapporteur, in his introduction, pointed out that in the course of the three sessions of the Committee agreement had been reached on most issues. From the written comments received it appeared, however, that some differences still existed with regard to a few items. Representatives of the countries concerned had met earlier during this session of the Commission and had succeeded in finding an appropriate form of wording acceptable to the parties concerned. He thanked the representatives for their work.

293. In discussing the Code, reference was made to the written comments. Amendments agreed to by the Commission and the principal points made were as follows:

Para 9 : "Edible offal" - the definition was revised to read as in the Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products (PMP). Substitute "as have been" for "as may be" (PMP, para 8).

Para 15 : "Meat". The delegation of Argentina indicated that it was opposed to the wording of the present definition of meat, which was restricted to meat from mammals slaughtered in an abattoir and which, in its opinion, would be an obstacle to the substantial and still increasing export of game which Argentina and other countries had established.

In order also to cover game, the delegation of Argentina held the view that the definition of "Meat" should be amended, so that it did not refer only to mammals slaughtered in an abattoir. It proposed that the definition should read "Meat means the skeletal muscles and connective tissues of a mammal fit for human consumption".

The Commission did not amend the definition. It further noted that, for the next session of the Committee on Processed Meat Products, Argentina, in collaboration with the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, would draft a working document dealing with the hygienic aspects of game meat as an Appendix to the Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products. At the time when such an Appendix would be elaborated, the

Commission would have to consider its possible attraction into the Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat.

Sub-section V.A heading: The inclusion of “Registration” in the heading similar to the PMP Code was discussed and, in conjunction therewith, the reinstatement of a provision requiring approval and registration of abattoirs and establishments by the controlling authority (PMP, para 25). It was pointed out that the definitions of “abattoir” and “establishment” referred to approval and registration by the controlling authority. The Commission decided not to make any amendment.

Paras 23 (e) and (f) : It was noted that the present wording of the two provisions and the related footnote were the result of extensive discussions in the Committee on Meat Hygiene. Some divergent opinions with regard to these items were, however, expressed in the written comments received. The Commission noted with satisfaction that the representatives of the different groups had discussed the matter and had agreed to an addition to the present footnote to read: “However, the controlling authority may approve other systems in the light of technological developments which will ensure that contamination is prevented to an equivalent extent.” Following some discussion, the Commission accepted the proposal.

It was pointed out that the agreement reached on the provisions in question was an illustration of the spirit of cooperation prevailing in the work of Codex Committees. Special research has been undertaken to substantiate claims made by certain delegations and this had significantly contributed to convincing the experts in other delegations that technology adapted to conditions prevailing in some countries should be considered on its own merits. The Commission agreed to substitute “cleansing” for “rinsing” in para 23(e).

Para 23 (g) : In order to avoid any misinterpretation, the provision was expanded to read: “If necessary separate facilities for the preparation of edible fats and if they are not removed daily from the premises facilities for their storage”.

The delegation of Uruguay expressed its reservations with regard to the amendment.

Para 23 (j) : There was no discussion on this provision. However, the delegation of the U.S.A., supported by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, at the end of the deliberations of the Commission, made a statement concerning 23(j) (see para 295).

Para 24 (c) : A rewording of the provision to differentiate between the operation of packing of meat in primary wrappers and packing in outer cartons was accepted by the Commission.

“Room, temperature controlled, for boning and cutting, physically separated from other rooms. Boning, cutting and primary wrapping should be separated from packaging operations.

However, meat may be packed in the room where it is boned, cut up and wrapped, provided precautions acceptable to the controlling authority are taken to prevent contamination of the product.”

The delegation of France proposed to add to the first sentence “(in cartons or cases)” to make clear, beyond doubt, what was meant by “packaging”. No amendment was made.

Para 25: A change was made consequential to the text contained in paragraphs 39(e) and (f) and in line with PMP, para 27, by inserting after “chilling room” the terms “freezing room, freezer store”.

Para 26 : Substitute 26(m) for 27(m).

Para 32 : A proposal for a revised text clarifying the intent of the provision was agreed to:

“No containers, wooden crates, wooden boxes or cartons should be assembled in the parts of an abattoir or establishment where animals are slaughtered, or dressed, or where meat is cut up or boned, prepared, handled, packed or stored. No containers, equipment or utensils should be stored in any part of an abattoir or establishment where animals are slaughtered, or dressed, or where meat is cut up or boned, prepared, handled, packed or stored unless required for immediate use in that place.”

Para 36 (b) : The delegation of Italy stated that, in its view, in the provision for Hygiene and Health of Personnel, a statement should be included to the effect that the examination of personnel should take place at least annually.

Para 37 (d) : The Commission took note of the observations of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals on this provision.

The Commission agreed that the provisions in the Appendix to the Code under the heading “Mobile Slaughterhouses” should be incorporated in the Code as part F, the paragraphs to be renumbered 46 and 47 respectively.

Status of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat

294. The Commission adopted, with the amendments listed above, the Draft Code of Practice for Fresh Meat at Step 8 of the Procedure as a Recommended Code. The delegation of France stated it was not opposed to the adoption of the Code but it considered that parts of the text could be expressed in more precise terms.

295. The United States delegation indicated that it had received assurance that it was not the intention of paragraph 23 (j) to prevent slaughter on the main slaughter floor of animals which, under the procedures set down in paragraphs 21 and 23 of the Code of Ante-mortem and Post-mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals, were, in the opinion of the supervisory

veterinary, fit for slaughter on that floor. With assurances of the correctness of that interpretation, the US did not oppose the adoption of this Code at Step 8.

Consideration of Draft Code of Ante-mortem and Post-mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals at step 8 (ALINORM 76/15, Appendix III)

296. The Commission noted that only two written observations had been received, the substance of which had already been discussed by the Committee.

Status of the Draft Code of Ante-mortem and Post-mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals

297. The Commission adopted the Draft Code of Ante-mortem and Post-mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals as a Recommended Code at Step 8 of the Procedure.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

298. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of New Zealand.

Adjournment of the Committee

299. The Commission noted that the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene had now completed its current work and, therefore, agreed that the Committee should adjourn sine die.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED MEAT PRODUCTS

300. The Commission had before it the Report of the Eighth Session (1975) of the Committee on Processed Meat Products (ALINORM 76/16) and government comments on the draft standards and code at Step 8 contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part VII and Add. 1 and 2 (CRD). The report was introduced by Dr. Viggo Enggaard (Denmark), chairman of the Committee, who acted as Rapporteur.

Consideration of Draft Standard for Canned Corned Beef at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/16, Appendix II)

301. The Rapporteur, in his introduction, reminded the Commission that the present standard had been brought to its attention at Step 8 on two previous occasions.

302. The Commission agreed to a proposal of the delegations of Argentina and Uruguay to delete the word “tipo” from the title in the Spanish version of the standard. With regard to the other written observations received, the Rapporteur stated that the various matters raised had been discussed fully at the meetings of the Committee. He further pointed out that the sections on additives, hygiene and labelling in the standard had all been endorsed or temporarily endorsed by the respective Codex General Subject Committees.

303. The Commission noted a statement of the delegation of Austria that it held the view that all standards for processed meat products should contain provisions for the minimum content of myosin and for a maximum percentage of collagen expressed as connective tissue protein related to the total meat protein.

304. The Commission was informed that at the next session of the Committee the question of collagen-free protein in meat would be considered.

305. The delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that, among the additives listed in the standard, there was no provision for nitrate but only for nitrite. As in recent years it had become apparent that small quantities of nitrite might be converted to nitrate, the delegation proposed to list nitrate in the additives section. The Rapporteur stated that in addition to the nitrate originating from nitrite, there could also be traces of nitrate present from e.g. water used in the manufacture of the product.

306. It was noted that, in a footnote against the proposed maximum level for nitrite calculated on the total net content of the final product, it was stated that in the light of further information based on current research the level might be reviewed.

307. The Commission briefly considered a proposal to relate the footnote also to any nitrate present in the food, but decided that this question was of a general nature, as in the section only intentionally added substances were listed and no exception should be made in this particular standard.

308. The Chairman of the Food Additives Committee referred to a related discussion earlier during the session of the Commission during which it was stressed that Commodity Committees should pay due attention to the conversion of additives during processing and storage. He further emphasized the importance that should be attached to the selection of methods of analysis for the additive and its derivatives as the value of the standards depended to a considerable degree on the presence of these methods. Close collaboration with international bodies, e.g. ISO and AOAC, was stressed. He pointed out that for the substances listed in the additives section the maximum levels set indicated acceptable levels in the final product.

Status of the Standard for Canned Corned Beef

309. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Canned Corned Beef, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of Standard for Luncheon Meat at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/16, Appendix V)

310. The Rapporteur informed the Commission that all the written amendments received related to issues discussed by the Committee during its sessions.

311. A number of delegations stated that in their countries the use in meat products of certain additives, in particular erythrosine, was not allowed. It was pointed out that erythrosine was permitted to be used only in the product with binder. The observer from ASMO proposed the inclusion of a provision for date-marking as especially high summer temperatures (up to 50°C) influenced the acceptability of the product. The delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that their remarks concerning nitrates and nitrites (para 305 above) also applied to this product. The Commission did not make any amendments to the standard.

Status of the Standard for Luncheon Meat

312. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Luncheon Meat at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/16, Appendix VII)

313. In discussing the code reference was made to the written comments. Amendments agreed to by the Commission and the principal points made were as follows:

Note: A note similar to the one introducing the Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat (FM) was introduced: "In the preparation of this Code recognition has been given to the need to avoid precluding the adoption of new technical developments provided these are consistent with the hygienic production of wholesome meat and meat products."

Para 10 "Hermetically sealed": It was proposed to delete in the definition the qualification that a hermetically sealed container should be impermeable "to gas". No change was made.

Paras 12 and 14: The delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that the definition of "Inspector" (12) read in conjunction with the definition of "Meat" (14) implied that all foods containing meat, irrespective of the quantity of meat in the food would be subject to supervision by a veterinarian. It held the view that this was, in practice, not feasible, nor indeed necessary when products contained only limited amounts of meat and reserved its position with regard to these definitions. The Commission noted the view of the Netherlands delegation but decided not to alter the text in this respect. It was pointed out that the essential requirement should be that the ingoing meat had been subjected to and passed by an inspector.

sub-section IVA - Heading: During the deliberations of the Commission on the equivalent heading in the Fresh Meat Code, it had been noted that the Meat Hygiene Committee had deleted the reference to "Registration" and consequently also the provision requiring approval and registration of establishments by the controlling authority (see also para 293 of this Report). The Commission discussed whether in the present Code similar deletions should be made, but agreed not to make any change.

Para 28 (c): The Commission agreed to delete the reference to a specific maximum temperature and to revise the provision to read as follows: “The temperature in rooms for boning out and trimming should be controlled and held suitably low unless cleaning practices are carried out as provided in sub-section IV.C.34(d).”

Para 28 (i): It was agreed to expand the third sentence to read: “In rooms in which meat and meat products are prepared, processed, handled or packed windows should be fitted ...”

Para 37 - “Hygiene and Health of Personnel”: It was agreed to delete the reference to “abattoirs” in sub-paragraphs 37(b), (c), (d), (e), (i) and (k).

para 45 - Transportation: A provision regarding possible breakdown of the cold chain during storage and transport was included (cf. FM 41(g)):

“Every effort should be made to prevent changes in temperature of frozen meat and meat products at any time during storage and transport but where accidental thawing takes place, the meat or meat products should be examined and evaluated by the inspector before any further step is taken.”

Section E - Sanitation Control Programme - It was pointed out that the identical section in the Fresh Meat Code was headed “Programme for Veterinary Supervision and Hygiene Control”. After some discussion it was decided not to make a change.

Annex A (e) : The word “visibly” was inserted before the word “effective”.

Status of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products

314. The Commission adopted the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat Products at Step 8 of the Procedure, with the amendments mentioned above, as a Recommended Code. The Commission expressed particular satisfaction at the results achieved by the Codex Committee on Processed Meat Products.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

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

CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT

Confirmation of Chairmanship

316. The Commission confirmed that the Codex Committee on Meat should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS

317. The Commission had before it the reports of the Ninth (1974) and Tenth (1975) sessions of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, as contained in ALINORM 76/18 and ALINORM 76/18A respectively, two codes of practice as contained in ALINORM 76/13A and Corrigendum (English version only), and government comments on the various documents (ALINORM 76/42-Part VIII and Addendum 1). The reports were introduced by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. O. Braekkan (Norway), who acted as Rapporteur.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Fillets of Flat Fish at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/18, Appendix II)

318. The Rapporteur proposed the following amendments, which were either of an editorial or consequential nature, to the draft standard as adopted by the Committee at its Tenth Session and as amended by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling at its 11th Session:

Sub-section 2.2 - Substitute “under such conditions” for “at a low temperature” (see ALINORM 76/18A, para 24)

Sub-section 3.2.1 (c) - Substitute “container” for “pack”.

Section 5 - Amend title and provision as in the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Hake (see ALINORM 76/18A, Appendix II).

Sub-section 6.6 - Amend to read: “... to identify the producing factory and the lot”, the rest of the sentence to be deleted. (See ALINORM 76/22A, para 44). The Commission agreed to the above amendments.

319. It was suggested that a requirement be included in the process definition that the temperature of the product after freezing should not exceed -18°C. The Commission decided not to change the text. The delegation of France proposed certain changes of an editorial nature in the French text of sub-sections 2.1 (b) and 2.2 as in the written comments of France. The Secretariat took note of and undertook to make the necessary editorial corrections. The French delegation reiterated, as a statement applying to all standards, its position with regard to the declaration of the country of origin, which was that such declaration should be mandatory.

320. The question was raised whether defect tables, if included in standards for fishery products, should be regarded as optional or mandatory. The Rapporteur pointed out that the Committee considered this question on a case by case basis and that the need for defect tables, as well as the matter of whether they should be optional or mandatory, depended on the nature of the product.

321. The Commission was informed that with regard to date-marking the Committee would await the finalization of the guidelines for date marking by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling before discussing this matter further.

Status of the Standard for Quick Frozen Fillets of Flat Fish

322. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Fillets of Flat Fish, with the above-listed amendments, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Crab Meat at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/18, Appendix IV)

323. The Rapporteur proposed a number of changes to which the Commission agreed:

- Sub-section 2.3 - Insertion of a new provision for “other presentation” (see ALINORM 76/18A, para 65).
- Sub-section 5.1 - Add a reference to the Code of Practice for Canned Fish (CAC/RCP 1976/10).
- Sub-section 7.2.7 - Insert new labelling provision covering other presentations consequential to addition of 2.3 above (see ALINORM 76/22A, paras 33 & 38).
- Sub-section 7.7 - Amend to read: “... to identify the producing factory and the lot”. (See ALINORM 76/22A, paras 40 and 44).

Status of the Draft Standard for Canned Crab Meat

324. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Canned Crab Meat with the amendments listed above, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns at Step 8 (ALINORM 76/18A, Appendix III)

325. The Rapporteur referred to the written comments of Bangladesh and stated that the species and families of shrimps and prawns proposed for inclusion in the standard were already covered, with one exception, Macrobrachium, which was a freshwater shrimp. It was decided not to extend the list of species. The following changes were agreed to by the Commission:

- Sub-section 2.3.1.5 - Substitute “(> 70 per lb)” and “(≤ 70 per lb)” for “(> 70 lbs)” and “ (≤ 70 lbs)”.
- Sub-section 6.1.2 - Add a labelling provision covering “other presentations” (see ALINORM 76/22A, para 41)
- Sub-section 6.3 - Revise to read “When the shrimps or prawns are glazed and the cooking and/or glazing water contains additives these shall be declared”.
- Sub-section 6.6.2 - Revise to read: “When the product undergoes further processing...” (see ALINORM 76/22A, para 43)
- Sub-section 6.7 - Amend to read: “... to identify the producing factory and the lot”. (see ALINORM 76/22A, para 44)
- Annex C - Amend as proposed by the U.S.A. in written comments.

326. It was pointed out that in the body of the standard for Jams and Jellies, there was a clause excluding from the standard certain products the designation of which included the word “jam” but which did not conform to the provisions of the standard. A similar kind of provision affecting Dublin bay prawns was contained in the present standard in the form of an appendix to the standard. The Commission requested that the general question of the use of appendices to standards to cover questions of this kind be covered in the paper on somewhat analogous matters which the Secretariat had been requested to prepare for the next session of the Codex Committee on General Principles.

327. The delegation of France indicated that it was opposed to the inclusion of certain of the additives listed in the food additives section. The Commission noted that the Codex Committee on Food Additives would review this section. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew attention to a certain inconsistency in the way the provision on declaration of country of origin (6.2) appeared in different standards. It held the view that the declaration of country of origin should be optional, depending on whether or not the omission of such declaration would mislead or deceive the consumer. The Commission decided to leave the text of the standard on this matter unaltered.

Status of the Standard for Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns

328. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Quick Frozen Shrimps or Prawns with the amendments mentioned above, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standards for Quick Frozen Lobsters, Rock Lobsters, Spiny Lobsters and Slipper Lobsters and Canned Sardines and Sardine-Type Products at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/18, Appendix III and ALINORM 76/18A, Appendix V)

329. The Commission considered at Step 5 of the Procedure the above-mentioned proposed draft standards and decided to advance them to Step 6.

330. The Rapporteur expressed appreciation to the French authorities which had hosted a working group in Nantes on this subject, which had in turn greatly facilitated the subsequent deliberations of the Committee. The working group had resolved the controversies existing with regard to the defect table for sardines and sardine-type products.

Consideration of Draft Codes of Practice for Fresh Fish and for Canned Fish at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/13A, Appendices II and III)

331. The Commission was informed that these Codes, which had been developed by the FAO Fisheries Department, had been thoroughly studied by the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, in collaboration with the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The Commission noted that the combined efforts had been fruitful and it further noted with satisfaction that the FAO Fisheries Department had further codes in preparation. The Commission expressed appreciation for this continued work.

Status of the Draft Codes of Practice for Fresh Fish and for Canned Fish

332. The Commission adopted the Draft Codes of Practice for Fresh Fish and for Canned Fish at Step 5. The Commission concurred with the recommendation of the two Committees to omit Steps 6 and 7 and adopted the two codes at Step 8 of the Procedure as Recommended Codes.

Consideration of Proposed Draft Code of Practice for Frozen Fish at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/18A, Appendix VI)

333. The Commission was informed that this code, after having been developed by an Expert Consultation convened by the FAO Fisheries Department, had been revised by the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, which had advanced it to Step 5. The Commission noted that this code of practice would still have to be reviewed by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. It was agreed to advance the Code to Step 6 of the Procedure for consideration by the Food Hygiene Committee, after which it would be submitted to a future session of the Commission.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

334. 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 FOODS FOR SPECIAL DIETARY USES

335. The Commission had before it the reports of the Eighth and Ninth Sessions of the above Committee (ALINORM 76/26 and ALINORM 76/26A), containing three standards for foods for infants and children at Step 8 of the Procedure and government comments thereon, as contained in ALINORM 76/42-Part IX and Addenda 1 and 2. The reports were introduced by the Chairman of the Committee, Prof. R. Franck, who outlined briefly the work of the Committee. He informed the Commission that the Draft Standards for Infant Formula, Canned Baby Foods, and Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Children had been finalized by the Committee and were, in his opinion, in the light of current knowledge available, the best that could be achieved. The section on methods of analysis had also been finalized and endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Infant Formula at Step 8

336. The Commission had before it the above standard as contained in ALINORM 76/26A, Appendix III. It was noted that there was an error in Section 5.1 and that it should read, as shown in the report of the Codex Committee on Food Additives. The Secretariat undertook to correct Section 5.1 accordingly.

337. The delegation of the United Kingdom stated that it was not entirely satisfied with a number of the provisions contained in the standard for infant formula. As human milk was, without doubt, the best food for infant feeding, the compositional aspects of infant formulae should be based on values found following analysis of breast milk; but human milk would not meet the requirements of the standard on at least eight points. The standard for infant formula should, moreover, include a statement encouraging breast feeding. Furthermore, as children above the age of six months required other food in addition to substitutes for human milk, the standard should include a warning concerning supplementary feeding of infants over six months of age. The delegation of the United Kingdom also reserved its position concerning some compositional aspects of the standard for Infant Formula. In view of the rapid progress of research in infant feeding and in the compositional and other aspects of human milk, the delegation of the United Kingdom was of the opinion that the Standard for Infant Formula should be kept under review. While not opposing the Draft Standard being adopted at Step 8, it informed the Commission that the United Kingdom would not be in a position to take action on a Recommended Standard for Infant Formula.

338. The delegation of France supported the statements made by the delegation of the United Kingdom and questioned whether chemically modified starches should be given to infants of less than three months of age. The delegations of France and the Netherlands also questioned the suitability of casein as a reference protein.

339. The delegation of Switzerland was of the opinion that the minimum requirement of 60 µg copper was too high. It was further of the opinion that a preamble to the standard should draw attention to the nutritional points outlined by the delegation of the United Kingdom. The delegation of Senegal supported the statement made by the delegation of the United Kingdom and was of the opinion that the draft standard should be returned to the Committee for further consideration.

340. The delegation of Italy was of the opinion that the standard should take more into account infant and child nutrition from birth to the age of 12 months and also had reservations concerning the levels of Vitamin D provided for. Furthermore, it was of the opinion that the standard should provide for carbohydrate content and that the starches modified by phosphates should be deleted as they were technologically not indispensable.

341. The delegation of Poland was of the opinion that maximum levels for the various nutritive components as well as microbiological provisions should be provided for. The delegation of Gabon was of the opinion that the standard should be more discriminating as regards the age of the infant and that the list of additives was too long. Furthermore, it was of the opinion that the name of the product was not sufficiently specific and that the declarations provided for in Sections 10.1.3 and 10.1.4 should be mandatory. The delegation of Gabon also expressed preference for a mandatory declaration of expiry date.

342. The delegation of Thailand made reference to a meeting in Singapore sponsored by UNICEF which had dealt with problems of infant feeding and was of the opinion that the conclusions of that meeting should be taken into account. The Commission was informed that

the Draft Standard for Infant Formula was not acceptable to that country. The FAO Secretariat pointed out that the draft standard attempted to define a product which could be regarded as a substitute for human milk and that broader questions of infant nutrition appeared to be a matter for those concerned with the problem of nutrition and child care. Section 10.9.2 of the standard served as a warning in this respect.

343. The Commission agreed that the Draft Standard for Infant Formula represented an acceptable international opinion given present knowledge. It also agreed, on the recommendation of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, that Section 10.8.1 should be amended to require the declaration of minimum durability until such time as the question of date marking as a general issue had been finalized.

344. The Commission also agreed that, when issuing the standard for acceptance by governments, a preamble should be included by the Secretariat indicating that the standard would be reviewed in the light of further knowledge and also indicating the policy of FAO/WHO concerning infant nutrition, including a statement that, where possible, breast feeding should be preferred.

Status of the Standard

345. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Infant Formula, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods at Step 8

346. The Commission had before it the above standard as contained in ALINORM 76/26A, Appendix III. It was noted that in Section 3.1.3 the maximum level for sodium should read 200 mg/kg and that in Section 9.3.2 reference should be made to Section 3.1.2 and not to 3.3. It was agreed to amend Section 9.8.1 to require the declaration of date of minimum durability, as in the case of Infant Formula.

347. The delegations of France and Italy were of the opinion that the standard was lacking in nutritional aspects and that the section dealing with particle size should be more detailed. They were furthermore of the opinion that the maximum level for sodium was excessive and that the use of some of the additives was not justified.

Status of the Standard

348. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods, at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Consideration of the Draft Standard for Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Children at Step 8

349. The Commission had before it the above standard as contained in ALINORM 76/26A, Appendix IV. The Commission agreed, on the basis of the advice of the Chairman of the

Committee, that the flavours in Section 5.4 should be expressed on an “as consumed basis”. On the recommendation of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, the Commission agreed to change Section 9.2.2 to read “The specific name shall be declared for ingredients and food additives. In addition, appropriate class names for these ingredients and additives may be included on the label”. It was further agreed to amend Section 9.8.1 to require the declaration of date of minimum durability, as in the case of Infant Formula. The Commission also agreed with the Codex Committee on Food Labelling to substitute for Section 9.3.2 the corresponding provision in the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods. The delegation of Thailand informed the Commission that the Standard for Cereal-based Foods for Infants was not acceptable to that country and that a standard covering infants from three months onwards had been established in that country, with specifications for such nutritional factors as protein and essential fatty acids. The delegations of France and Italy were of the opinion that the standard should be more discriminating as regards age and should also provide for minimum protein content. The dextrinization of starch products intended for infants under four months was also essential. There were other compositional aspects which needed looking into. The delegations of France and Italy were of the opinion that the standard should be further revised by the Committee.

Status of the Standard

350. The Commission adopted, as a Recommended Standard, the Draft Standard for Cereal-based Foods for Infants and Children at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards.

Methods of Analysis for Foods for Infants and Children

351. The Chairman of the Committee informed the Commission that the section on methods of analysis for foods for infants and children had been finalized by the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses and endorsed by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. The actual text of the section on methods of analysis had been drawn up by the Secretariat and had been verified by the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses and of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. The Commission requested the Secretariat to ensure that this section was included in the standards to be sent to governments for acceptance.

Modified Starches to be included in the Draft Standard for Canned Baby Foods

352. The Commission was informed that two of the modified starches in the standard for Canned Baby Foods, i.e. distarch glycerol and acetylated distarch glycerol, had been included in the above standard by the Ninth Session of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses. Because of the scheduling of Codex sessions, the Codex Committee on Food Additives had not been able to consider these substances. The representative of WHO informed the Commission that the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives would reconsider the question of modified starches and other additives in relation to infants. The Commission agreed that, when endorsed by the Codex Committee on Food Additives,

the above two modified starches should be included in the Recommended Standard for Canned Baby Foods.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

353. 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.

JOINT FAO/WHO COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENT EXPERTS ON THE CODE OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

354. The Commission had before it the Report of the 17th Session of the above Committee (CX 5/70, 17th Session, April 1975) and ALINORM 76/43. Mr. F.S. Anderson (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Committee, acted as Rapporteur.

Procedure for Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards

355. The Commission was informed that the Committee at its 18th Session (Rome, September 1976) would consider the implications, in relation to its work on the Code of Principles, of the inclusion of a new step and a revision of the final step in the Procedure for the Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards, as had been adopted by the Tenth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Progress at Seventeenth Session

356. One standard - for yogurt and sweetened yogurt - had reached Step 7 of the Procedure for Elaboration of Milk and Milk Product Standards. Further progress was made on draft standards for Flavoured Yogurt, for Cream, for Edible Acid Casein, for Edible Caseinates and for Extra Hard Grating Cheese. These were at Step 5 and were expected to reach the stage of recommended standards at the Eighteenth Session. The revised General Standard for Cheese (Step 5) should also make further progress at the Eighteenth Session.

Hygienic Requirements for Milk and Milk Products

357. Having developed standards for the most important milk products, the Committee had turned its attention to hygienic requirements for milk products and would be discussing a draft code of practice for dried milk which the delegation of Australia had offered to prepare. In this field, the Committee had agreed to proceed on the basis of need and demonstrated health hazards and would take into account available expert recommendations on microbiological standards and methodology. The Committee would look for advice as necessary from the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

Imitation Milk Products

358. At the next session the Committee would be considering products covered by Article 4 of the Code of Principles. For this, the Committee was indebted to Dr. F. Winkelmann of the Technical Secretariat for his work on Imitation Milk and Imitation Milk Products (AGA/MISC/76/2).

Labelling Provisions for Standard for Yogurt and Sweetened Yogurt (A-11(a))

359. The Commission noted that the labelling provisions of the yogurt standard (A-11(a)) had not been endorsed by the Committee on Food Labelling at its 9th Session (June 1974), due to the absence of a complete list of ingredients (ALINORM 74/22A, para 12). The Committee of Government Experts had considered this matter at its 17th Session (April 1975) and had revised the provision in accordance with the relevant provision in the Recommended International General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.

360. After some discussion, the Commission unanimously endorsed the labelling section of the standard specifying, however, that this decision was taken exceptionally for a specific case and should not be regarded as a precedent. The delegations of Austria and France stated their reservations with regard to several other provisions in the standard.

Acceptance Forms

361. The Commission noted a proposal from the delegation of the Netherlands for the use of special forms for assisting governments in notifying acceptances, similar to those in use for Recommended Codex Standards. In this connection, it was pointed out that a growing number of acceptances of milk and milk product standards were on the basis of the Acceptance Procedure laid down in the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius. The Commission further noted that the Committee would discuss the matter at its next session.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON EDIBLE ICES

362. The Commission had before it the report of the second session of the above Committee (ALINORM 76/11). Dr. G. Björkman (Sweden), Chairman of the Committee, acted as Rapporteur.

Consideration of Proposed Draft Standard for Edible Ices and Ice Mixes at Step 5 (ALINORM 76/11, Appendix II)

363. The Commission noted that the Committee had found it necessary to classify the edible ices with regard to the different possibilities of composition in altogether fifteen groups and subgroups. To avoid complications with the use in the English language of the word "icecream" as a general name for edible ices and also some traditional names in certain other languages, it was agreed by the Committee that any name customarily used in a country where the product was sold might be used, provided that the name was followed by a reference indicating the appropriate group and subgroup in the standard.

364. The Commission further noted that some proposed requirements on microbiological standards in the Hygiene section together with government comments on these would be considered by the Food Hygiene Committee at its next session in May this year. Some delegations referred to the rather extensive list of food additives provided for in the standard. The Rapporteur pointed out that the Committee would discuss the Food Additives section in detail at its next session. The suggestion was made that in the list of food additives a differentiation should be made on the basis of the compositional groups or even the subgroups of edible ices. The Commission thought that this was a good proposal and the Rapporteur undertook to study the feasibility of the proposal for further discussion at the next session of the Committee.

Status of the Draft Standard for Edible Ices and Ice Mixes

365. The Commission adopted the Draft Standard for Edible Ices and Ice Mixes at Step 5. The delegations of Belgium and France stated that they considered the advancement of the standard to Step 6 to be premature taking into account the number and the nature of still unresolved questions. The delegation of Poland held the view that the use of additives in the products covered by the standard was technologically not required.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

366. The Commission confirmed, under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Edible Ices should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Sweden.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FATS AND OILS

Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Low Fat Spreads at Step 5

367. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils informed the Commission that the Committee had decided to proceed with the elaboration of a standard for low fat spreads. The existing draft standard had been redrafted in accordance with the margarine standard and special points of interest were related, inter alia, to the designation of the product and the fat content. The delegation of Japan, supported on some points by the delegation of France, stated that in the view of its government, the product was not a simple fat, but a dietary food product with a low calorie content and a lot of food additives. In view of the special nature of the product, the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils should not continue its work on the standard. The Commission should consider in the first instance a justification for the development of standards for such products, and then decide whether the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils or the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses was the appropriate body to elaborate the standard. The Commission discussed this matter and decided not to refer the standard to the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses but to refer consideration of this to the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils which could seek the advice of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, if appropriate. The delegation of Portugal stated that it could not agree to some of the additives proposed.

Status of the Standard

368. The Commission agreed to advance the Draft Standard to Step 6.

Consideration of the Proposed Draft Standard for Low Erucic Acid Rapeseed Oil at Step 5

369. The Commission noted that the Committee was continuing its work on a draft standard for low erucic acid rapeseed oil and drew special attention to the importance of provisions for sterols (brassica sterol) and erucic acid content. The Secretariat pointed out that, for budgetary reasons, the proposed Expert Consultation on the health implications of erucic acid proposed to be held in the biennium 1976/77 had been cancelled, but expressed the hope that it would be possible for WHO to hold an ad hoc Group Meeting on the subject. The delegation of France, supported by the delegation of Japan, pointed out that any standard for edible rapeseed oil should be based on a low erucic acid content, because many countries had already established, or would in the near future, make legislative provisions prohibiting the use of high erucic acid rapeseed oil for human consumption and would, therefore, oppose the advancement of the standard under its present name to Step 6. It was noted that the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils had already elaborated a standard for edible rapeseed oil which had been issued to governments for acceptance.

Status of the Standard

370. The Commission decided to advance the Draft Standard to Step 6.

Matters arising from the Report of the Eighth Session of the Committee

371. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils, Mr. A. Hubbard (U.K.) introduced the report of the Eighth Session of the Committee (ALINORM 76/19). He drew the attention of the Commission to those matters on which the Committee sought the advice of the Commission:

- a. The Committee had agreed that the General Standard for Fats and Oils not covered by individual standards at Step 9 (CAC/RS 19-1969) should cover both fats and oils for direct consumption and for use as ingredients in other foodstuffs. This decision had required a significant revision of the standard, and the revised version was set forth in Appendix IV to ALINORM 76/19. The Committee requested the Commission to approve the circulation of this revised version to governments for comments at Step 3 of the Amendment Procedure for Step 9 standards. The Commission approved the request.
- b. The Committee was of the opinion that it was necessary to clarify to which types of products the individual standards for edible vegetable oils at Step 9 applied and proposed to introduce as an editorial amendment, a new scope section into these standards. Consequential upon the decisions taken on an accelerated amendment procedure earlier at this session, the Commission agreed to adopt the proposed amendment of individual standards for edible vegetable oils at Step 8.

- c. The Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling, at its Sixth Session, had recommended to the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils to modify the procedure for the determination of moisture content in margarine. The Committee complied with the request and finalized the method to be included in the standard for margarine at Step 9, subject to endorsement by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. The Commission agreed that this procedure be followed.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

372. 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.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON SUGARS

373. The Commission was informed by Mr. R.S. Attwell on behalf of Mr. H.M. Goodall, Chairman of the Codex Committee on Sugars, that the Committee had not met in the period between the Tenth and the present session of the Commission. However, a progress report on a draft standard for fructose had been prepared by the United Kingdom Secretariat for consideration by the Twenty-First Session of the Executive Committee (ALINORM 76/27). The Executive Committee had decided that the draft standard for fructose together with progress report, should be considered by the Eleventh Session of the Commission at Steps 4 and 5 in accordance with the procedure followed with regard to the standard for powdered dextrose.

374. The Commission was further informed that the work of the U.K. Secretariat was geared towards the outcome of the revision of the methods of analysis for sugars being carried out by ICUMSA and also of the methods of analysis for starch hydrolysis products being carried out by ISO. It was unlikely that the outcome of these studies would be available for consideration by the Committee during the current biennium.

Draft Standard for Fructose at Steps 4 and 5

375. The Commission had before it the above-mentioned progress report, ALINORM 76/27, which contained government comments on the standard in Appendix I and a revised draft of the standard for fructose in Appendix II. Addendum I to ALINORM 76/27 contained the Danish comments and the United Kingdom delegate introduced verbally the Egyptian comments which had arrived too late to be printed and distributed. It was pointed out that the substance of the comments in Appendix I had already been incorporated into the revised draft standard as set out in Appendix II. The Danish comments had advocated a wider range for the values of Specific Rotation, from -89° to -93.5° , supported by information received from the Institute of Sugar Technology, Braunschweig. He recommended that this amendment be accepted. The Egyptian comment suggested that the pH range should be restricted; acceptance of this suggestion was not recommended, as the range 4.5 to 7.0 was necessary. Taking into account the uncontroversial nature of the standard, the U.K. Secretariat requested the

Commission to advance the standard to Step 6 and, if it were considered to be appropriate, to omit Steps 6 and 7 and adopt the draft standard for fructose at Step 8.

376. It was pointed out that some delegations had opposed the elaboration of a standard for fructose at the present time because of new technological developments currently taking place. The delegations of France and Italy shared this view and drew the attention of the Commission to the fact that the product was also used for dietetic reasons. Both delegations, supported by the delegations of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Brazil, requested that the standard be only advanced to Step 6. The delegation of Canada, supported by several other delegations expressed concern about the high maximum limits for lead in the standard for fructose and for sugars in general, and stated that the present levels of consumption of sugar and sugar related products in Canada, if such products contained 2 ppm lead as a contaminant, would contribute two-thirds of the provisional maximum tolerable weekly intake of lead as suggested by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. The Commission strongly recommended that the lead levels in sugars be kept under review and that the attention of the Codex Committee on Food Additives should be drawn to this matter.

Status of the Standard

377. Noting the reservations of several delegations and noting that the omission of steps could only be authorized without dissent, the Commission decided to advance the draft standard for fructose to Step 6 of the Procedure. The U.K. Secretariat was requested to seek another round of government comments, to revise the standard in the light of these comments and present the standard for consideration by the next session of the Commission at Step 8.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

378. 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 SOUPS AND BROTHS

Matters arising from the Report of the Committee

379. The Chairman of the Codex Committee on Soups and Broths, Dr. E. Matthey of Switzerland, introduced the Report of the First Session of the Committee (ALINORM 76/9). He pointed out that the Committee had discussed several general matters concerning the products to be standardized. The Committee had then proceeded to consider both a proposed draft standard for soups and broths elaborated by Switzerland and the International Association of Soup Manufacturers (AIIBP) and a more detailed proposal submitted by the Codex Secretariat. In the course of the discussion it was recognized that such matters as nutritional value, compositional requirements (paragraphs 10 and 11 of ALINORM 76/9) and the quantity of characterizing ingredients would present some difficulties in setting up a standard to cover all soups and broths. It was noted that concrete figures for compositional

requirements were already available for bouillons. The Committee had decided therefore to modify the standard for soups and broths in such a way as to cover only bouillons.

380. On the revised draft, as set out in Appendix II to ALINORM 76/9, government comments had been invited at Step 3 of the Procedure.

381. AIIBP had been requested to assist in the preparation of working documents for the next session of the Committee (including a review of the proposed list of additives for bouillons).

382. As regards continuation of work on soups and broths, the Committee had requested the AIIBP to prepare a basic document to establish the feasibility of elaborating provisions for the composition of the products and for prescribing quantitative requirements for the major ingredients.

383. The Commission recommended that both the National and the FAO Secretariats together with the International Association of Soup Manufacturers should participate in drafting the basic document on soups and broths.

Confirmation of Chairmanship

384. The Commission confirmed under Rule IX.10 that the Codex Committee on Soups and Broths should continue to be under the chairmanship of the Government of Switzerland.

PART IX

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR FOOD CONTAMINANTS - SCOPE AND MAGNITUDE OF WORK

385. The Commission had before it document ALINORM 76/29 on the above subject, which had been prepared by Mr. L.M. Beacham (U.S.A.) in his capacity as consultant of FAO/WHO/UNEP. The Commission also had before it document ALINORM 76/29-Corrigendum, which had been prepared by the delegation of Japan.

386. Mr. Beacham stated, in introducing the document, that the UN Conference on Human Environment held in Stockholm in June 1972, in its Recommendation No. 82, had called for increased support to be given to the Codex Alimentarius Commission to develop international standards for pollutants in food. The document reviewed the current usage of different kinds of pesticides, occurrence of industrial chemicals, heavy metals, mycotoxins and other microbiological contaminants in the environment, and avenues and incidence of contamination of food with them. The attention of the Commission was especially drawn to the recommendations made in paragraph 9 of the document, for its consideration.

387. Several delegations complimented Mr. Beacham on the excellent review of the problems of contaminants in food within the framework of the Codex programme. A suggestion was

made that the document might be issued with appropriate modifications, as an information booklet for wider circulation. Several delegations informed the Commission about the work being done in their countries on the complex problems of environmental contaminants and supported the need for priority to be given by the Commission to food contaminants. At the same time, it was pointed out that the differences in analytical methods, the questions of reliability of data and the need for increased food production and prevention of waste to feed the world population would call for a careful assessment and a cautious approach.

388. A reference was made to the WHO Environment Health Criteria Programme and a point was made about the inclusion of nitrates, nitrites, which were used as food additives and were also environmental contaminants, and N-nitroso compounds, in the list of priority contaminants to be studied. The WHO representative pointed out that the aim of the Programme was to compile relevant environmental, toxicological and epidemiological data and to establish, where possible, dose-effect and dose-response relationships. Some criteria documents, such as on mercury, cadmium, lead, PCB's, mycotoxins, and nitrates, nitrites and N-nitroso compounds were important from the point of view of food contamination. The first four criteria documents had been reviewed by task groups and were ready for publication. The last had been finalized by a task group in February and was being edited. The criteria document on mycotoxins would be reviewed by a task group later this year. He pointed out that these criteria documents constituted valuable data base for review by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives for establishing "tolerable intakes" for man. The precise mechanism to be used was subject to review and possible attention in the future. The WHO representative further informed the Commission that nitrites, as additives, were on the agenda of the next meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives in April 1976, and would be reviewed in the light of new information on the N-nitroso compounds which could be formed under various in vitro and in vivo conditions.

389. As regards the recommendation, contained in the document before the Commission, to consider the possibilities of setting up a new Codex Committee to deal with industrial chemicals and heavy metals in food, it was the general opinion in the Commission that the existing Committees, even though they had heavy workloads, should deal with the contaminants and that no new Committee was necessary. The Commission agreed that at this point in time the best way to proceed would be for the data on levels of contaminants in food to be submitted to the appropriate Codex Commodity Committees, which should make proposals on the limits of the contaminants in various foods for further consideration and endorsement by the General Subject Committees, i.e. the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues for residues of pesticides, including similar environmental contaminants such as PCB's, dioxins, etc., the Codex Committee on Food Additives for heavy metals and other elemental contaminants, and the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene for mycotoxins and other microbiological contaminants. It was further decided that appropriate changes in the terms of reference of the three General Subject Committees should be prepared, if necessary, and be submitted to the next session of the Executive Committee for consideration.

390. The Commission was informed of the fact that only one Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues was provided for during the 1976/77 biennium (see also paras 51, 132, 159 and 160

of this Report) and agreed to request FAO and WHO to examine ways to strengthen and accelerate the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues - that is the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues - which provides important inputs to the Commission.

391. The attention of the Commission was drawn to the work of the Council of Europe referred to in the document ALINORM 76/34-Part II, which also dealt with contaminants in food. The representative of the Council of Europe briefly informed the Commission about the recent activities of the Sub-Committee on the Health Control of Foodstuffs and the Working Group on Microbiology, and indicated the Council's willingness to share its data and the results of its studies with the Commission. The Commission welcomed this offer and agreed that close liaison continue to be maintained with the Council of Europe.

Vinegar

392. The Commission had before it a paper entitled "Views of Governments on Standards for Vinegar" (ALINORM 76/30, Part I) prepared by the Secretariat.

393. At its Tenth Session, the Commission had discussed a basic document on vinegar and had decided to request the Secretariat to obtain more information from governments on production, trade, types of vinegar, vinegar, used as ingredients in other foodstuffs and other technical matters. A questionnaire CL 1974/39 had been sent to governments inviting also their comments on whether vinegar should be standardized and if so in which form, i.e. one standard or a number of standards. The Codex Secretariat had collated the information received from 24 countries.

394. The discussion on the paper reflected the opinions expressed in writing by the Member Governments. The majority of delegations stated that standards for one or more types of vinegar could be elaborated, but they would not favour standardization at present and would place a low priority on the subject. It was pointed out that careful consideration should be given to any decision to embark on new work, taking into account the budgetary constraints of the Programme.

395. The delegation of Nigeria further pointed out that the products appeared to be of greater importance in certain regions than in others. The delegation of Italy stressed that within the region of Europe there already existed great divergence in national legislation on vinegar, which does impede trade in vinegar and those products for which vinegar is used as a packaging media.

396. A considerable number of delegations from European countries expressed themselves in favour of commencing work on the standardization of vinegars on a European basis and the Coordinator for Europe suggested that the subject of vinegar might be considered at the next meeting of the Coordinating Committee for Europe. Several other delegations stated that if there were to be standards for vinegar they should be elaborated on a world-wide basis.

397. It was noted that many of the various types of vinegar were produced in Europe and exported to other regions. The Coordinating Committee for Europe therefore could cover nearly all types of raw materials and technological processes involved in the manufacture of vinegars.

398. In conclusion the Commission decided not to establish a Committee to elaborate standards for vinegar, in view of the low priority which governments in general attached to the subject, and in the light of budgetary constraints of the Programme. It was agreed that the Coordinating Committee for Europe should discuss at its next session the questions related to vinegar and consider whether it would be feasible to standardize the various types of vinegar. The Coordinating Committee should then report on the results of its deliberations to the Twelfth Session of the Commission.

Salt

399. The Commission had before it ALINORM 76/30, Part II which was prepared and introduced by the Secretariat.

400. The Commission at its Ninth Session had considered the proposal of the Coordinating Committee for Europe that regional standards be developed for salt (para 25, ALINORM 72/19A), in view of the significant European trade in salt, although the possibility of world-wide standards should not be excluded.

401. The Codex Committee on Food Additives had, at its Eighth Session, agreed that a specification of identity and purity should be elaborated for food grade salt and had adopted a draft specification (ALINORM 72/12, Appendix VI) which had been prepared by the delegation of the Netherlands. Even if it was decided not to proceed with the elaboration of a Codex standard or standards for salt, the Codex Committee on Food Additives was of the opinion that it would be desirable to continue the elaboration of a specification for food grade salt and had asked for approval of further work on the specification.

402. It had been pointed out that several commodities in international trade would require the establishment of a standard, such as table salt intended for direct consumption and food grade salt, used mainly by the food industry. Other products such as curing salts might also have to be considered. Opinion had differed on the issue of whether a standard or standards be elaborated on a European regional or world-wide basis. The opinion had been expressed that it would be appropriate to develop a European regional standard for table salt, but that food grade salt appeared to be more suitable as the subject of a world-wide standard.

403. It had been decided that a working paper should be prepared concerning the need or otherwise for regional or world-wide standards after taking into account the views of the Comité européen d'Etude du Sel (European Committee on Salt). As a result, a questionnaire had been distributed to governments covering production and trade in salt, the kind of products consumed or used in food preparation, existing legislation, methods of analysis and

the opinions of governments on the need for standardization. The replies of 23 governments had been received and formed the basis of the paper.

404. Several delegations at the present session of the Commission considered that the elaboration of standards for salt had low priority but were not opposed to standardization of food grade salt.

405. Other delegations pointed out the great importance of salt in developing countries and thought that world-wide rather than regional standards should be elaborated.

406. The delegation of the Netherlands was of the opinion that the standardization was especially important with regard to food additives and contaminants and suggested that further work on salt might be undertaken by the Codex Committee on Food Additives.

407. The Commission noted that there was some measure of support for the development of a standard or standards for food grade salt and, bearing in mind that 15 of the 23 countries replying to the questionnaire were in favour of either regional or world-wide Codex standards, agreed that the Codex Committee on Food Additives should develop a standard for food grade salt based on the work it had already done and taking into account, in particular, the remarks made in the previous paragraph. The delegation of France was in favour only of determining limits for additives and contaminants and not of the standardization of salt grades.

Tea

408. For the consideration of Tea, the Codex Secretariat prepared a document entitled "Government Comments on ISO Standards for Black and Instant Tea and on International Trade in Tea Products" (ALINORM 76/31, Addenda I and II and Conference Room Document No. 2 containing comments received from Sweden).

409. The Tenth Session of the Commission had discussed a background paper on tea and had concluded, as set out in paragraph 355 of ALINORM 74/44, that the ISO Draft Standard for Black Tea and the ISO working document on a specification for Instant Tea should be adapted to the Codex format and sent to governments for comments. Furthermore, information had been requested by the Secretariat on production and trade in instant tea and tea products to enable the Commission to decide whether standards for these products were needed.

410. Appendix I to CL 1975/29 contained an adapted version of the ISO Draft Standard for Black Tea, supplemented by notes from the Secretariat which drew attention to those sections which differed substantially from the usual Codex format. Appendix II to CL 1975/29 contained an adapted version of the ISO working paper on instant tea. The Secretariat, recognizing the early stage this ISO working paper was at, did not add to Appendix II any suggestions for provisions normally included in Codex standards.

411. Comments had been received on sections concerning scope, description, essential composition and quality criteria, food additives and labelling provisions.

412. The view was expressed that sections on sensoric evaluation should be included in the standards and that the section on essential composition should contain provisions for moisture content, caffeine content and crude fibre content.

413. The delegation of Norway pointed out that ISO and Codex standards normally differed considerably, especially as far as labelling provisions were concerned.

414. The representative of ISO, emphasizing the wish for cooperation, informed the Commission that the working group for tea had been converted into a sub-committee of Technical Committee 34. He elaborated further on the work currently undertaken by the sub-committee and invited interested governments to comment on the relevant ISO documents. It was noted that the sub-committee would meet in September 1976 and would then deal with all comments received on the ISO Draft Standard for Black Tea and on the ISO Specification for Instant Tea.

415. The Commission, taking into account the budgetary constraints, decided not to embark on standardization work for tea and tea products at the present time. It was agreed that the Secretariat should follow closely the work undertaken by ISO on the subject and submit the adapted versions of the two tea standards (Appendices I and II of CL 1975/29) and the comments as set out in the above-mentioned documents to the sub-committee on tea, to be considered at the September meeting of that Committee.

416. The Commission further agreed that the Commission should postpone further discussions on tea and tea products until the ISO sub-committee on tea had finalized its standardization work on black tea and instant tea.

Coffee and Coffee Products

417. The delegation of Brazil stated that its position had not altered from that expressed at the Ninth and Tenth Sessions of the Commission that Codex standards for coffee and coffee products should be elaborated (see para 333 of the Report of the Tenth Session of the Commission).

Cereals

418. The Commission had before it a background document on "Cereals, Cereal Products, Tubers and Starches" (ALINORM 76/32).

419. At previous sessions, the Commission had stressed the importance it attached to cereals and cereal products, tubers and starches. At its Tenth Session the Commission had considered an information document on cereals (ALINORM 74/33). The Commission had concluded that, in order to come to a final decision as to whether standardization of these

products was feasible, more data were required on production, trade and local consumption of the products, with special emphasis on those products which were consumed and traded on a regional basis, including data on hygienic and legislative aspects. The Secretariat had prepared a questionnaire, as contained in CL 1974/52, requesting also data for products of regional importance based on the food composition tables of the different regions of the world.

420. Appendix I of the paper contained a tabulation of the data received on export, import and local consumption according to main groups such as basic grains, starchy roots and tubers, processed cereals, cereal-based products and starches. The Appendix also contained a summary on fraudulent and objectionable practices as well as details of national legislation on the products.

421. The Secretariat paper gave an overall picture of basic grains, grains, starchy roots and tubers of regional importance, processed cereals and cereal-based products, covering main products, their characteristics and special problems related to them.

422. During the discussion the representative of the International Association of Cereal Chemistry supplied additional information on the analytical work carried out by ICC in cooperation with ISO and corrected some information given in paragraphs 8 and 13 of the paper concerning soft wheats and hard wheats especially in the French version of the paper. He pointed out that the grading systems under paragraphs 14–17 applied only to Triticum aestivum. The representative of ISO gave information on the work done by Technical Committee 34 of ISO and indicated that Sub-Committee 4, “Cereals and Pulses” of TC 34 would be ready to examine the measures to be taken regarding specifications, etc., after the Commission had come to a decision regarding its future intentions concerning Codex work on cereals and cereal products.

423. The delegation of Senegal reiterated its opinion, as expressed at previous sessions of the Commission, that cereals and cereal products should be Standardized. Several delegations, while recognizing the importance of the products, were however, of the opinion that their standardization would be too complex to be undertaken at the present time.

424. The delegations of Thailand and Japan stated that for important products for their countries, such as rice, in the case of Thailand and rice, wheat and other products in the case of Japan, legislation already covered those provisions which were designed to protect the consumer.

425. The Coordinator for Africa recalled that the 2nd Session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa had emphasized the important role of tubers and tuber products in the diet of that region. In his opinion, standardization work on starchy roots and tubers should commence as soon as possible. However, noting that very few countries had submitted data for tubers either to the Codex Secretariat or to the Coordinating Committee for Africa, he suggested that the regional Coordinating Committees should collect data on tuber products of importance to their regions and survey the intraregional trade, thus commencing work on a regional level. His view was supported by the delegations of the United States of America and the United

Kingdom. The delegation of France drew the attention of the Commission to the fact that the UNECE had already elaborated a standard for ware potatoes.

426. The Commission concluded that standardization of cereals and cereal products was too complex a subject to be undertaken at the present time. However, noting the views which had been expressed by the Coordinating Committee for Africa, the Commission recommended that regional Coordinating Committees interested in certain products, such as tubers in Africa, should gather background information, determine priorities and submit their proposals for standards together with full documentation on the products to the Commission for consideration.

PART X

Provisional Timetable of Codex Sessions in 1976/77

427. The Commission had before it ALINORM 76/38, containing a provisional timetable of Codex sessions for 1976/77. As had been indicated earlier during the Commission's deliberations, a full session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling was to be added to the list of 27 sessions.

428. At the outset of the discussion on this item, the delegation of the U.S.A. expressed its concern at the increasing period of time elapsing between sessions of various Codex Committees and more especially, elapsing between sessions of the Commission. It recalled that, at an earlier session, it had reluctantly agreed to a period of 18 months elapsing between sessions of the Commission, as a temporary measure. It was, therefore, concerned that the period would now be 2 years. This concern was shared by other delegations.

429. As regards 1976, it was noted that the 18th Session of the Milk and Milk Products Committee would be held in Rome from 13 to 18 September. The 12th Session of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate would be held in Biel (Fr. Bienne) from 1 to 5 November.

430. As regards 1977, it was noted that the 3rd Session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa would be hosted by the Government of Ghana in Accra from 17 to 21 January 1977.

431. The delegation of Mexico indicated, with regard to the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Regional Conference for Latin America which had been scheduled to be held in Mexico, with the tentative date 17–24 January, that it was not possible for him, at this stage, to give firm and precise information concerning the arrangements for the Conference.

432. The delegation of the Netherlands indicated that the Ninth Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues would probably be an 8 day session (Monday to Monday). The dates 14 to 21 February were still subject to confirmation and should be left in square brackets.

433. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that the Tenth Session of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses would be held from 28 February to 5 March.

434. The delegation of the Netherlands indicated that the Eleventh Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives would probably be held from 31 May to 6 June, but this date was subject to confirmation by the Netherlands authorities.

435. It was noted that the 9th Session of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils would be held from 28 November to 2 December.

436. As regards the 1st Session of the Coordinating Committee for Asia, the Coordinator for Asia indicated that the place and date of this session would be discussed by the ad hoc working group of delegates from the region on 8 April 1976.

437. The delegation of Hungary proposed that the Tenth Session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling, which had been listed provisionally by the Codex Secretariat for 17–21 October 1977, should be brought forward to the end of May or early June 1977 and if possible linked with the Tenth Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe, which had been scheduled for June 1977. It was agreed that, for operational reasons affecting the Codex Secretariat, it would be necessary to leave a period of at least two weeks between the session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and a session of either of the two Committees mentioned above. The delegation of Austria agreed that the Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe could be held later in June and the delegation of Hungary agreed to leave the session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling in October, where it had been tentatively scheduled.

438. As regards the scheduling of the three Codex Committees which normally meet in North America, it was noted that, for operational reasons, it would be difficult for these three Committees (Processed Fruits and Vegetables, Food Hygiene and Food Labelling) to be held consecutively. It would be possible to have two of these meetings consecutively in North America, but not three. The delegation of Norway considered that sessions of the Committee on Food Hygiene and Food Labelling should be held consecutively. Other delegations considered that the Codex Committees on Processed Fruits and Vegetables and Food Labelling should be held consecutively. It was pointed out that the delegates who attended the Food Labelling Committee were usually those who attend the Processed Fruits and Vegetables Committee and not, in the main, those who attended the Food Hygiene Committee. In the circumstances, there was a strong case for linking the sessions of the Processed Fruits and Vegetables Committee and the Food Labelling Committee. Because of overloading of Codex sessions in May/June 1977, it was proposed that the sessions of the Food Labelling Committee and the Processed Fruits and Vegetables Committee be postponed to September 1977. The delegations of Canada and the USA undertook to examine this request sympathetically and also to consult among themselves on the matter and with the Codex Secretariat.

439. The delegation of Switzerland indicated that if it would be of help concerning the schedule of meetings in 1977, the 2nd session of the Codex Committee on Soups and Broths could be held in September 1977 instead of April 1977.

440. It was agreed that the Secretariat should proceed to schedule the sessions for 1976/77, taking into account the remarks above.

Provisional List of Codex Sessions in the 1978/79 Biennium

441. The Commission took note of the provisional list of Codex sessions in the 1978/79 biennium, set out below, which had been drawn up by the Secretariat, in response to the wishes of the Executive Committee at its 22nd session (see ALINORM 76/4, para 4). The list took into account the views which had been expressed by the Executive Committee concerning the need for no loss of momentum, more especially in the work of the Codex Committees on Pesticide Residues, Food Additives, Food Labelling and Food Hygiene (see ALINORM 76/4, para 9).

1978/79

1. Codex Alimentarius Commission (12th s.)
2. Codex Alimentarius Commission (13th s.)
3. Executive Committee (24th s.)
4. Executive Committee (25th s.)
5. Executive Committee (26th s.)
6. Coordinating Committee for Africa (4th s.)
7. Coordinating Committee for Asia (2nd s.)
8. Coordinating Committee for Latin America (2nd s.)
9. Coordinating Committee for Europe (11th s.)
10. Milk and Milk Products (19th s.)
11. Fruit Juices (13th s.)
12. Quick Frozen Foods (12th s.)
13. Food Additives (12th s.)
14. Food Additives (13th s.)
15. Pesticide Residues (10th s.)
16. Pesticide Residues (11th s.)
17. Food Hygiene (15th s.)
18. Food Hygiene (16th s.)
19. Food Labelling (13th s.)
20. Food Labelling (14th s.)
21. Methods of Analysis and Sampling (11th s.)
22. Processed Fruits and Vegetables (14th s.)
23. Fats and Oils (10th s.)
24. Sugars (7th s.)
25. Foods for Special Dietary Uses (11th s.)
26. Fish and Fishery Products (13th s.)

- 27. Soups and Broths (3rd s.)
- 28. General Principles (6th s.)
- 29. Processed Meat Products (10th s.)
- 30. Cocoa Products and Chocolate (13th s.) ¹
- 31. Edible Ices (4th s.) ¹

Date and Place of the Twelfth Session of the Commission

442. The delegation of the Netherlands stated that, as a matter of principle, the Commission should hold at least some of its sessions in Geneva, in view of the fact that the work of the Commission was sponsored jointly by WHO and FAO, even though it was noted that certain additional expenses would be involved for WHO. The representative of WHO indicated that he would report back on this matter to WHO.

443. The delegation of Senegal indicated that, at its request, during the Second Session of the Coordinating Committee for Africa, its Government had given its agreement to host the Twelfth Session of the Commission in Dakar and that it had conveyed its interest in this matter to the Codex Secretariat. It was noted that this had taken the form of an exchange of correspondence between Dr. Ndoye (Senegal) and the Codex Secretariat, and that the Secretariat had conveyed information concerning the requirements for a session of the Commission and the additional costs to the Programme, more especially travel costs, involved. The Commission noted the statement of Dr. Ndoye who, nevertheless expressed thanks to the Commission, on behalf of the Government of Senegal. The Commission wished to place on record its appreciation of the interest and importance which the Government of Senegal attached to the work of the Commission.

444. The delegation of Austria informed the Commission that the Government of Austria wished to extend an official invitation to the Commission to hold its Twelfth Session at the Kongresshaus, Innsbruck. The delegation of Austria indicated that the Conference Hall and local facilities would be available free of charge to the Commission.

PART XI

OTHER BUSINESS

Vegetable Proteins

445. The delegation of the U.S.A. indicated its interest in the Commission giving consideration to developing standards for vegetable proteins. The Secretariat was asked to follow up, as necessary, in order to bring the matter before the Commission at its Twelfth Session for consideration.

Possible Relocation of the Joint Office of the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme

446. One delegation, in drawing attention to the fact that communication between the Secretariat of the Programme and Members of the Commission had encountered frequent and protracted difficulties, especially concerning the receipt of government comments and working documents for Codex sessions, enquired whether FAO and WHO had given any thought to the possible relocation of the Joint Office of the Programme to another UN centre. In response to the question of this delegation, the delegation of Austria informed the Commission that a large UN Office complex with full meeting facilities would be completed by 1978 in Vienna. This information was known at the UN Headquarters and consideration was being given in the UN System as to how best to utilize the facilities.

447. The Government of Austria, in view of its long association with the work of the Codex Alimentarius and its forerunner, the Codex Alimentarius Europaeus, would be willing to host, if this should be the wish of the bodies of FAO and WHO which, according to the Statutes of FAO and WHO, have to take this decision, and would be in a position to provide excellent facilities to the Codex Secretariat to ensure the smooth running of the Programme from Vienna. The Commission noted this offer and agreed that the Codex Secretariat should examine this possibility and approach the Austrian authorities concerning what would be its needs.

¹ To be held only if work programme not completed in 1976/77 biennium

448. The Secretariat indicated that it would be necessary to place this matter before the Directors-General of FAO and WHO as it would obviously involve administrative and financial considerations. The Commission requested that the Executive Committee should be kept fully informed of any developments concerning this matter.

Valediction

449. Mr. E. Kimbrell (U.S.A.) expressed, on behalf of the Codex Alimentarius the appreciation of the Commission and of its Members to the retiring Chairman, Dr. D.G. Chapman (Canada), for his leadership and guidance as Chairman and his long and active support of the Commission as a delegate over the years. The Commission gave Dr. Chapman a standing ovation.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

* 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.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

MEMBERS DE LA COMMISSION

MIEMBROS DE LA COMISION

ALGERIA

ALGERIE

ARGELIA

H. Aïrèche

Pharmacien-chargé d'études

Ministère de l'Industrie et de l'Energie

Direction Industries Alimentaires

Rue Ahmed Bey

Alger

O. Oumenkhache

Fonctionnaire

Ministère de l'Industrie et de l'Energie

Rue Ahmed Bey

Alger

ARGENTINA

ARGENTINE

L.M. Laurelli

Primer Secretario

Embajada de la República Argentina

Piazza dell 'Esquilino 2

00185-Rome (Italy)

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE

W.C.K. Hammer
Assistant Secretary
Department of Primary Industry
Trade Group Offices
Barton, Canberra A.C.T.

D.R. Barnes
Principal Executive Officer
Department of Primary Industry
Trade Group Offices
Barton, Canberra A.C.T. 2600

W.A. Langsford
First Assistant Director-General
Department of Health
P.O. Box 100
Woden A.C.T. 2606

Mrs. W.I. Williams
Representative
Australian Federation of Consumer Organizations
38 Taurus Street
North Balwyn

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE

Dr. H. Woidich
Coordinator for Europe
Lebensmittelversuchsanstalt
Blaasstrasse 29
A-1190 Wien

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

Dr. J. Ettl
Ministerialrat
Ministry of Health and Environment Protection

Stubenring 1
A-1010 Wien

Dr. H. Hauffe
Ministerialrat
Ministry of Trade, Commerce and Industry
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna

Dr. A. Psota
Senatsrat
Ministry of Health and Environment Protection
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Wien

H. Redl
Chairman, Austrian FAO Committee
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna

Dr. R. Wildner
Regierungsgebäude
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

T.D. Biebaut
Secrétaire d'Administration auprès du Ministère des affaires économiques
Square de Meeûs 23
1040 Bruxelles

H. Baeyens
Représentant permanent de la Belgique auprès de la FAO
Via A. Gramsci 8
00197-Rome (Italy)

C. Cremer
Inspecteur des denrées alimentaires
Ministère de la santé publique
Cité administrative de l'état
1010 Bruxelles

M. Fondu
Fédération industries alimentaires belges
122 Rerum Novarumlaan
2060 Merksem

R. Huybens
Président du Comité belge du Codex Alimentarius
Ministère des affaires étrangères
Rue Quatre Bras 2
1000 Bruxelles

P. Lenelle
Inspecteur en chef - Directeur
Ministère de la santé publique
Bruxelles

M.J.F. van de Steene
Ingénieur agronome
Ministère de l'agriculture
Administration des services économiques
Rue de Stassart 35
1050 Bruxelles

BOLIVIA
BOLIVIE

M. Vargas Jordán
Ministro Consejero
Embajada de Bolivia
Via Archimede 143
00197-Rome (Italy)

BRAZIL
BRESIL
BRASIL

L.T. de Macedo
General Director
Animal Products Inspection Department
?DIPOA - Edifício Gilberto Salomão
13º Andar - S.C.S.
Brasilia D.F.

B. de Azevedo Brito
Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO

Brazilian Embassy
Via della Farnesina 193
00194-Rome (Italy)

J. Fleischman
Rua Alice 150 - 2C-01
Rio de Janeiro

R. Resende
Confederação nacional da indústria
Avenida Nilo Pecanha 50 - Sala 2501
20000 Rio de Janeiro

CANADA

H.W. Wagner
Director, Standards Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage
Ottawa/Hull K1A 0C9

D.G. Chapman
Advisor, Legislative Policy (Food)
Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa

K.H. Dean
Chief Processed Fruit and Vegetables
Sir John Carling Bldg. - Room 419
Ottawa, Ontario

J.A. Drum
Chairman, Technical Executive
Grocery Products Manufacturers of Canada
42 Overlea Blvd
Toronto, Ontario M4H 1B8

C.J. Ross
Research Manager
Canadian Cannery Ltd.
1101 Walkers Line
Burlington, Ontario

B.L. Smith
Head, Office of International Standards
Health Protection Branch
Carlingwood Plaza
Ottawa K1A0L2

D.W. Ware
Associate Director
International Liaison Service
Canada Department of Agriculture
Ottawa, Ontario

CHILE
CHILI

O.L. Echeverría
Embajador
Embajada de Chile
Via Panisperna 207
00184-Rome (Italy)

CONGO

J. Mombo Bruno
Chargé de liaison avec le Codex
Direction générale du commerce
BP 2098
Brazzaville

CUBA

A. Castro Domínguez
Jefe Departamento de Higiene de los Alimentos
Ministerio de Salud Pública
Calle 23 y N
Havana

M. Blanco
Director, Quality Control
Instituto Nacional de la Pesca
Havana

J. González Rojas
Representante Permanente Alterno
Primer Secretario

Misión Permanente de Cuba ante la FAO
Via A. Gramsci 14
00197-Rome (Italy)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Ing. V. Husák
Director of Food Industry Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Těšnov 65
Praha 1

Dr. S. Stampach
Permanent Representative to FAO
First Counsellor
Embassy of Czechoslovakia
Via dei Colli della Farnesina 144
00196-Rome (Italy)

A. Burger
Senior Executive Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Těšnov 65
Praha 1

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

J.G. Madelung
Ministry of Agriculture
10 Slotsholmsgade
Copenhagen

N. Borre
Director, National Food Institute
Mørkhøj Bygade 19
DK-2860 Søborg

Mrs. A. Brincker
Food Technologist
Danish Meat Products Laboratory

Howitzvej 13
DK-2000 Copenhagen F

V. Enggaard
Assistant Director
Danish Meat Products Laboratory
Howitzvej 13
DK-2000 Copenhagen F

H. Feilberg
Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture
Slotsholmsgade 12
DK-1216 Copenhagen V

K. Haaning
Veterinary Inspector
Veterinardirektoratets Laboratorium
Bulowsvej 13
DK-1870 Copenhagen

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

M. Kondrup
Food Technologist
Chief of Secretariat ISALESTA
Vesterbrogade 1
DK-1620 Copenhagen V

P. Lindberg
Mørkhøj Bygade 19
DK-2860 Søborg

L.J. Okholm
Head of F.D.B.'s Central Laboratory
Roskildevej 65
DK-2620 Albertslund

J. Reeckmann
Legal Adviser

H.C. Andersens Bld. 18
DK-1596 Copenhagen

EGYPT
EGIPTE
EGIPTO

I. Kheiralla
Chairman Elnasr Bottling Co.
1 Magar Street
Dokki

M. Abo Samra
Chairman of Starch and Glucose Co.
26 Tallat Harb Street
Cairo

EL SALVADOR

J.M.D. García
Representante Alterno de El Salvador ante la FAO
Embajada de El Salvador
Piazzale delle Belle Arti 1
00196-Rome (Italy)

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

Y.K. Salminen
Head of Food Bureau
National Board of Trade and Consumer Interests
Box 9
00531 Helsinki

Mrs. A.L. Koskinen
Chief Inspector
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Aleksanterink 10
00170 Helsinki 17

E.H. Petäjä
Director of Customs Laboratory
Board of Customs

Box 812
00101 Helsinki 10

FRANCE
FRANCIA

G. Weill
Secrétaire général du Comité Interministériel de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Ministère de l'Agriculture
78, rue de Varenne
Paris 7ème

M. Bressou
Contrôleur général des services vétérinaires
Direction des services vétérinaires
5, rue Ernest Renan
Issy-les-Moulineaux 92130

Mrs. M.A. Caillet
Médecin inspecteur de la santé
Ministère de la santé
8, avenue de Ségur
75700 Paris

J.L. Gianardi
Inspecteur principal de la répression des fraudes et du contrôle de la qualité
42 bis, rue de Bourgogne
75700 Paris

C. Gross
Inspecteur général de la Répression des fraudes
Ministère de l'Agriculture
42 bis, rue de Bourgogne
Paris 7e

G. Jumel
Vice-Président du Comité national français du Codex
3, rue de Logelbach
75847 Paris

GABON

L. Lapeby
Inspecteur général de l'Agriculture Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage

et du Développement Rural
Libreville

H.H. Animbo
Représentant permanent du Gabon auprès de la FAO
Ambassade du Gabon
Via XX Settembre 40
00187-Rome (Italy)

J.N. Gassita
Inspecteur général des Pharmacies
Inspection générale des Pharmacies
B.P. 295
Libreville

GERMANY, FED. REP. of
ALLEMAGNE, REP. FED. d'
ALEMANIA, REP. FED. de

Dr. D. Eckert
Ministerialdirigent
Bundesministerium für Jugend, Familie
und Gesundheit
Bonn - Bad Godesberg

Dr. R. Franck
Bundesgesundheitsamt
1000 Berlin 33 - Postfach

Mrs. E. Hufnagel
Regierungsdirektorin
Bundesministerium für Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit
Bonn - Bad Godesberg
Deutschherrenstr. 87

C.H. Kriege
Ministerialrat
Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten
53 Bonn - Bonnerstr.

Dr. F. Schulte
Ministerialrat
Bundesministerium für Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit
Deutschherrenstr. 87
D53 Bonn - Bad Godesberg

Dr. W. Schultheiss
Geschäftsführer
Schlosstrasse 5
6146 Alsbach

H.B. Tolkmitt
Rechtsanwalt
Schwanenwik 33
2000 Hamburg 76

GHANA

R. Oteng
Director, Ghana Standards Board
P.O. Box M. 245
Accra

G.Y. Ahlijah
Senior Scientific Officer
Chana Standards Board
P.O. Box M. 245
Accra

A.A. Laryea
Permanent Representative of Ghana to FAO
Ghana Embassy
Via Ostriana 4
00199-Rome (Italy)

H.A. Mould
Deputy Chief Executive
Ghana Cocoa Marketing Board
P.O. Box 933
Accra

HUNGARY HONGRIE HUNGRIA

Dr. K. Sütö
Vice-Président de l'Office de Normalisation Hongrois
Budapest IX
Ullői u. 25

Dr. J. Kanizsay
Vice-président du Comité hongrois du FAO/Codex
Office hongrois de Normalisation
Ullői út. 25
1091 Budapest

D. Karácsony
Directeur de Trust de l'Industrie de conserve, Hongrie
Budapest IX
Gubasci ut. 19

Dr. J. Szilágyi
Directeur de S.A. de contrôle de qualité "MERT"
Budapest 1065, Münnich F. 22

IRAN

A.N. Shafi
Director General
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Bozorgmehr Street No. 14
Tehran

H. Tamizkar
Chief Cold Store Specialist
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Bozorgmehr St. No. 14
Tehran

IRAQ

IRAK

A.H. Awni
Secretary General of Iraqi Organization for Standards
Iraqi Organisation for Standards Planning Board
Saadoon Street
Baghdad

Mrs. B. Al-Saad
Senior Chemist
D.G. of Industrial Research and Control
Shaik Omar St.
Baghdad

R.M. Al-Shawi
Director of National Institute of Nutrition
National Nutrition Institute
Baghdad

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

J.C. Doherty
Assistant Principal
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Dublin 2

Miss C.E. Day
Information Officer
Confederation of Irish Industry
Confederation House
Kildare Street
Dublin 2

E.D.H. Dexter
Superintending Veterinary Inspector
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Agriculture House
Kildare St.
Dublin 2

A.T. Hunter
Head of Food Technology
Institute for Industrial Research and Standards
Ballymun Rd.
Dublin 9

R.H. Murray
Food Drink and Tobacco Federation of Ireland
c/c Ward C McDonnell Ltd.
Drogheda, Co. Louth

T.M. O'Toole
Food Scientist
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Kildare Street
Dublin 2

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

U. Pellegrino
Dirigente Superiore
Ministero della Sanità
Piazzale Marconi
Rome (EUR)

Prof. R. Andreotti
Capo Reparto
Stazione Sperimentale Conserve Alimentari
Viale Tanara 33
Parma

C. Callipo
Direttore
Federazione Italiana Acque Minerali (FEDERTERME)
Via Sicilia 186
Rome

C. Calvani
Comitato Nazionale Italiano del Codex Alimentarius
Via Sallustiana 10
Rome

C. Carola
Stazione Sperimentale Olii e Grassi
Via Giuseppe Colombo 79
Milano

Dr. N. Carugno
Servizio Ricerche
Amministrazione Monopoli di Stato
Via della Luce 34a bis
Rome

Prof. G. Crivelli
Ricercatore
Via Celoria 2
20133 Milano

R. Cubadda
Ricercatore

Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Città Universitaria
Rome

G. De Giovanni
Ispettore Superiore
Ministero Industria
Via V. Veneto 33
Rome

Dr. G. Fabriani
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

Mrs. A. Fratoni
Direttore di Laboratorio
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

E. Galeota
Funzionario
Ministero della Sanità
Rome

T. Garlanda
Chimico
Via Appiani 12
Milano

P. Giannessi
Ministero Agricoltura
Via XX Settembre
Rome

G. Gianni
Associazione Italiana Industria Prodotti Alimentari
Via P. Verri 8
Milano

G. Giordano
Veterinario di Stato
Ministero della Sanità
Direzione Generale Igiene Alimenti e Nutrizione

Palazzo Italia
00144-Rome

A. Hribal
Associazione Italiana Lattiero Casearia - Italia
Via Boncompagni 16
Rome

Dr. G. Lembo
Coltivatori Diretti
Viale XXIV Maggio
Rome

Mrs. C. Lintas
Ricercatore
Istituto Nazionale Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

Dr. M. Lombardi
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

G. Luft
A.I.I.P.A.
Via Nino Bonnet 10
Milano

Mrs. G. Maggioni
Ministero Sanità
Direzione Generale Igiene Alimenti e Nutrizione
Palazzo Italia
00144-Rome

A. Maltese
Associazione Nazionale dell'Industria Chimica
Via Fatebenefratelli 10
20121 Milano

Mrs. O. Mancini
Direttore di Sezione
Ministero della Sanità
Direzione Generale Igiene Alimenti e

Nutrizione
Rome

C. Masutti
Associazione Italiana Lattiero Casearia - Italia
Via Boncompagni 16
Rome

Dr. C. Miuccio
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

Prof. R. Monacelli
Capo Divisione Grassi e Olii
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
00161-Rome

A. Montechiaro
Segretario
A.I.D.I.
Via Veneto 54/6
Rome

A. Pederzini
Chimico
Laboratorio Galat
Via Guido Reni 33
Rome

Mrs. A. Bocca Piccioli
Ricercatore
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
Rome

G. Porcelli
Chimico Superiore
Ministero Sanità
Piazza G. Marconi 25
Rome

G. Quaglia
Ricercatore

Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

Mrs. E. Quattrucci
Ricercatore
Istituto Nazionale della Nutrizione
Via Lancisi 29
Rome

C. Ranzani
c/o UNIL-IT. S.p.A.
Via N. Bonnet 10
Milano

Dr. G. Rizza
Industrie Buitoni Perugina
San Sisto
Perugia

Mrs. A. Salvadori Chiavarelli
Laboratorio Centrale Chimico delle Dogane
Via della Luce 35
Rome

Dr. T. Severi
Ministero dell'Agricoltura e Foreste
Direzione Generale Tutela
Via XX Settembre
Rome

A. Signoretti
Assistente Clinica Pediatrica
Università di Roma

A. Svaldi
Ispettore Capo
Ministero dell'Agricoltura
Via XX Settembre 20
Rome

E. Tiscornia
Istituto Chimica Farmaceutica
Università

Viale Benedetto XV/3
Genova

I. Zaffino
Ministero Sanità
Direzione Generale Igiene Alimenti e Nutrizione
Palazzo Italia
00144-Rome

IVORY COAST
COTE D'IVOIRE
COSTA DE MARFIL

J. Ambé
Attaché Cultural
Ambassade de Côte d'Ivoire
Via Lazzaro Spallanzani 4-6
Rome (Italy)

JAPAN
JAPON

A. Suda, Deputy Head
Technical Official in the Prime Minister's Office
Resources Division Planning Bureau
Science and Technology Agency
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo

Y. Furusawa
Technical Adviser, Japan Soft Drink Industrial Association
Koishikawa, Bun Kyo-ku
Tokyo

M. Nakagawa
Deputy Director, Division for Guidance on Premiums and Representation
Fair Trade Commission of Japan
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo

S. Osawa
Deputy Director, Food Sanitation Division, Environmental Health Bureau
Ministry of Health and Welfare
Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo

T. Saito
Alternate Permanent Representative of Japan to FAO
Embassy of Japan
Via V. Orsini, 18
00192-Rome (Italy)

H. Sasaki
Technical Adviser
Japanese Union of Food Additives Association
c/o Ajinomoto Co., Inc.
1-6 Kyoboshi, Chuoku
Tokyo

M. Yamamoto
Food Standard Specialist
Consumer Protection Division
Food and Marketing Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo

KENYA
KENIA

J.M. Ng'ang'a
Assistant Director Veterinary Services
Veterinary Research Laboratories
P.O. Kabete

F.B. Maiko
Director
Kenya Bureau of Standards
P.O. Box 10610
Nairobi

J.C. Obel
Chief Public Health Officer for the Republic of Kenya
Ministry of Health
P.O. Box 30016
Nairobi

KUWAIT
KOWEIT

A. Al-Shalfan
Controller
Standards and Metrology Control
Ministry of Commerce and Industry
P.O. Box 2499
Kuwait

S. Ali-Ahmad Alfaras
Assistant Chief of Food Control
Kuwait Municipality
Kuwait

LUXEMBOURG
LUXEMBURGO

F. Arendt
Ingénieur chef de service
Institut d'Hygiène et de Santé Publique
1A rue Aug. Lumière
Luxembourg

MADAGASCAR

R. Ralibera
Représentant Permanent Adjoint auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de la République Malagasy
Via R. Zandonai 84/A
00194-Rome (Italy)

MALTA

I. Moskovits
Permanent Representative to FAO
Embassy of Malta
Lungotevere Marzio 12
00186-Rome (Italy)

MALAYSIA
MALAISIE
MALASIA

Dr. K.O. Leong
Standards Director
Standards and Industrial Research Institute

P.O. Box 35
Shah Alam, Selangor

R.D. Pereira
Research Officer (Standards)
Sirim P.O. Box 35
Shah Alam, Selangor

M.M. Yusoff
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment
Kuala Lumpur

MEXICO
MEXIQUE

E.R. Méndez
Codex Alimentarius Vice-Chairman
Dirección General de Normas
Apartado Postal No. 24-322
Mexico 7, D.F.

M.C. Olivera
Director General
Secretaría de Salubridad y Asistencia
México D.F.

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAS

Dr. P.H. Berben
Chief Health Inspector
Ministry of Public Health
Dr. Reyersstraat 10
Leidschendam

Dr. J.J.L. Mees
V.A.I. (Dutch Food Industry Federation)
Unilever N.V.
Burgem. s'Jacobplein 1
Rotterdam

Dr. C. Nieman
Joh. Verhulststraat 172
Amsterdam

M.J.J. Osse
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73
The Hague

J. Pasma
Produktschap Margarine, Vetten en Olie
Stadhoudersplantsoen 12
The Hague

Dr. A.J. Pieters
Public Health Inspector
Ministry of Public Health and Environment
Leidschendam

Dr. W. Pilnik
Department of Food Science
12 De Dreyen
Wageningen

H. Prins
Commission for the Food and Agriculture Industries
Director of Quality Control
P.O. Box 1
Zoetermeer

T. van Hiele
Director, Sprenger Institute
Haagsteeg 6
Wageningen

Dr. G.F. Wilmink
Cabinet Adviser
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73
The Hague

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

B.R. Nason
Senior Agricultural Economist
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

P.O. Box 2298
Wellington 1

P.A. Oliver
Second Secretary (Commercial)
Embassy of New Zealand
Via Zara, 28
00198-Rome (Italy)

NIGERIA

D.A. Akoh
Federal Government Chemist
Federal Ministry of Health
Chemistry Division
P.O. Box 12525
Lagos

Dr. I.A. Akinrele
Director of Research
Federal Institute of Industrial Research
P.M.B. 1023, Ikeja
Lagos

J.O. Alabi
Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO
Embassy of Nigeria
Viale Gorizia 4
00198-Rome (Italy)

P.M. Atuanya
Administrative Officer
Federal Ministry of Trade
Foreign Trade Division
Lagos

N.O. Awani
Technical Manager
Midfoods Nigeria Company
72 Bode Thomas Street
Surulere, Lagos

A. Banjo
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Research Officer

Federal Department of Fisheries
P.M.B. 12529
Lagos

A.N. Njoku-Obi
Professor
Department of Microbiology
Nsukka

I.O. Ogunkua
Manager, Sales Promotion and Market Research
Nigerian Produce Marketing Co. Ltd.
72 Campbell Street
Lagos

A.O. Oyejola
Acting Principal Quality Inspector
Nigerian Standards Organization
Federal Ministry of Industries
Lagos

Dr. G. Stumpff-Lendner
Chief Veterinary Officer
Fed. Vet. Public and Animal Health Division
PMB 2005
Kaduna

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

O.R. Braekkan
Professor
Government Vitamin Institute
Directorate of Fisheries
P.O. Box 187
Bergen

O. Christiansen
Assisting Director
Division of Hygiene and Epidemiology
The Health Services of Norway
Oslo

P. Haram
Counsellor
Ministry of Fisheries
Drammensveien 20
Oslo

P. Lodden
Counsellor
Administrasjonsdept.
Oslo

D. Mork Ulnes
Permanent Representative
Norwegian Embassy
Via delle Terme Deciane 10
00153-Rome (Italy)

J. Race
P.O. Box 8139
Oslo Dep.
Oslo 1

S. Skilbrei
Chief Inspector
Directorate of Fisheries
Mallendalsveien 4
5000 Bergen

O. Tvete
Director, Food Inspection Service
Ministry of Agriculture
Gladengvn. 6B
Oslo 6

OMAN, Sultanate of
OMAN, Sultanat d'
OMAN, Sultanato de

A.S. Taufiq
Head of Section - Dept. of Projects
Ministry of Commerce and Industry
P.O. Box 550
Muscat

I. Chaheen
Consultant
General Directorate of Industry
Ministry of Commerce and Industry
P.O. Box 550
Muscat

PARAGUAY

L. Martínez Miltos
Representante Permanente - Embajador
Embajada de Paraguay
Via Emilio de' Cavalieri 12
00198-Rome (Italy)

PHILIPPINES FILIPINAS

H. Carandang
Agricultural Attaché
Philippine Embassy
Via S. Valentino 12
00197-Rome (Italy)

Mrs. J.R. Ferrer
Attaché
Philippine Embassy
Via S. Valentino 12
00197-Rome (Italy)

POLAND POLOGNE POLONIA

Mrs. A. Czerni
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Quality Inspection Office
Stepinska 9
Warsaw

W. Orlowski
Chief, Fruits and Vegetables Section
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Quality Inspection Office

Stepinska 9
Warsaw

Dr. H. Sadowska
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
15 Miodowa
Warsaw

S. Tomaszewski
Expert in Food Technology
Master of Agricultural Science
Ministry of Foreign Trade
Quality Inspection Office
Stepinska 9
Warsaw

PORTUGAL

L.C. Netto
Ingénieur Agronome
Directeur du Laboratoire Central de Normalisation et de la Répression des Fraudes
Rua Cais de Santarem 15
Lisbon

F.A. de Alcantara Carreira
Président du Comité portugais du Codex
Ministerio Extrangeiros
Lisbon

E.M.C.C. Amaral
Instituto Nacional de Saude
Av. Padre Cruz
Lisbon 5

G.P. Martins
Ingénieur Agronome
Rua Cais de Santarem 15
Lisbon

SENEGAL

Dr. T. Ndoye
Médecin chef du service national de nutrition
Ministère de la santé publique
Dakar

I.A. Diaw
Directeur adjoint du contrôle économique
Direction du contrôle économique
Ministère des finances et des affaires économiques
B.P. 2050
Dakar

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

I. Díaz Yubero
Jefe Normalización Productos Agrarios
Ministerio de Agricultura
Paseo Infanta Isabel No. 1
Madrid

C. Barros
Subdirector
Centro Nacional de Alimentación y Nutrición
Km 2 Carretera de Majadahonda a Pozuelo
Majadahonda - Madrid

J.M. Roncero Solís
Normalización IMOPA
Ministerio de Agricultura
Paseo Infanta Isabel No. 1
Madrid

SUDAN
SOUDAN

A.H. Ibrahim
Government Analyst and
Secretary National Codex Committee
National Health Laboratory
Ministry of Health
P.O. Box 287
Khartoum

A.A. Khalil
Permanent Representative of Sudan to FAO
Embassy of Sudan
Via dei Caudini 2
00185-Rome (Italy)

A.M. Mizo
Head of Meat Hygiene and Food Control
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 293
Khartoum

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

B. Lundblad
Head of Department
Statens Livsmedelsverk
Box 622
S-75126 Uppsala

O. Ågren
Deputy Head of Food Standards Division
Swedish Codex Contact Point
National Food Administration
Box 622
S-75126 Uppsala

B. Augustinsson
Head of Law Division
Swedish National Food Administration
Box 622
S-75126 Uppsala

G. Björkman
Director General
Bodalsvagen 22
S-18136 Lidingö

K.G.A. Edhborg
Findus AB
S-26700 Bjuv

C.J. Regnell
Assistant
Statens Livsmedelsverk
Box 622
S-75126 Uppsala

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

E. Matthey
Chef du contrôle des denrées alimentaires
Service fédéral de l'hygiène publique
Haslerstrasse 16
Berne

Dr. W. Hausheer
F. Hoffmann - La Roche
124 Grenzacherstrasse
CH-4002 Basel

G. Huschke
Dipl. Ing./Chemist
Mischelistr. 39
CH-4153 Reinach

H.U. Pfister
Head of Codex Section
Federal Health Service
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3008 Berne

G.F. Schubiger
Case Postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour de Peilz

THAILAND
THAILANDE
TAILANDIA

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

Mrs. B. Teovayanonda
Secretary, National Codex Alimentarius Committee and Director, Biological Science Division
Department of Science
Ministry of Industry

Rama VI Street
Bangkok 4

C. Angpiroj
Commercial Attaché and Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
Royal Thai Embassy
135, Via del Serafico
Rome/EUR (Italy)

C. Intrachatorn
Third Secretary (Commercial)
Office of the Commercial Attaché
Royal Thai Embassy
Via del Serafico 135
Rome/EUR (Italy)

P. Laowhaphan
Agricultural Attaché/Permanent Representative to FAO
Via Zara 9
00198-Rome (Italy)

TOGO

K. Kokuvi
Directeur des affaires administratives
O.P.A.T.
B.P. 1334
Lomé

TUNISIA
TUNISIE
TUNEZ

Dr. A. Amraoui
Chef de la Division de Technologie Alimentaire
Institut de Nutrition
11, rue Aristide Briand, Babsaadoun
Tunis

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

R.J. Attwell
Principal, Food Standards Division

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

R.J.L. Allen
Food Manufacturers Association
Castle Lane
London SW1

F.S. Anderson
Principal Food Standards Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

L.C.J. Brett
Unilever House
Blackfriars
London E.C.4

Ms. S.E. Brown
Assistant Secretary (Agriculture)
U.K. Permanent Representative to the EEC
6, Rond Point Schumann
B-1040 Brussels (Belgium)

Mrs. S.J. Darke
Principal Medical Officer
Dept. of Health and Social Security
Alexander Fleming House
Elephant and Castle
London SE6 6BY

P.O. Dennis
Food Technologist
Brooke Bond Oxo
Trojan Way, Purley Way
Croydon CR9 9EH

Miss A.M. Evans
Principal, Food Standards Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House

Horseferry Road
London S.W. 1P 2AE

A.W. Hubbard
Head Food Science Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London S.W1

F.J. Lawton
Food Manufacturers Federation
1/2 Castle Lane
Buckingham Gate
London S.W.1

R. Sawyer
Superintendent, Food and Nutrition
Laboratory of the Government Chemist
Cornwall House
Stamford Street
London S.E.1

D. Stoker
Food Standards Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

S. Thorpe Tracey
Principal DHSS
Alexander Fleming House
Elephant and Castle
London

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

Eddie F. Kimbrell
Assistant to Administrator
Agricultural Marketing Service
US Department of Agriculture
Washington D.C. 20250

Dr. Robert W. Weik
Assistant to Director
Bureau of Foods
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street S.W.
Washington D.C. 20204

Donald E. Wilkinson
Administrator
Agricultural Marketing Service
US Department of Agriculture
Washington D.C. 20250

Dr. H.R. Roberts
Director
Bureau of Foods
Food and Drug Administration
200 C St. S.W.
Washington D.C. 20204

J.R. Brooker
Fishery Products Inspection and Safety
Division, N.O.A.A.
Department of Commerce
3300 Whitehaven Street
Washington D.C. 20235

D. Anderson
Technical Director, Quality Control
General Mills Inc.
9200 Wayzata Blvd.
Minneapolis, Minn 55426

Lowrie M. Beacham
Special Advisor to the President
National Cannery Association
1133 20th St. N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036

J.J. Birdsall
Director, Scientific Activities
American Meat Institute
P.O. Box 3556
Washington D.C. 20007

C. Feldberg
Director, Product Safety
CPC International Inc.
International Plaza
Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632

F. Jermann
Director, Quality Control
Bumble Bee Sea Foods
P.O. Box 60
Astoria, Oregon 97103

R.W. Harkins
Institute of Food Technologists
1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20005

Morgan M. Hoover
Assistant Technical Director
Manufacturing Chemists Association
1825 Connecticut Avenue
Washington D.C. 20009

Thomas B. House
President, American Frozen Food Institute
919 18th Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006

Donald D. McCollister
Manager, Government Registration
Health and Environmental Research
The Dow Chemical Company
P.O. Box 1706
Midland, Michigan 48640

E. Bruce McEvoy
Executive Vice-President
Sunkist (Europe) S.A.
24 Old Burlington Street
London W.1 (U.K.)

Raymond I. Mori
Director of Quality Assurance
Castle and Cooke Foods

50 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94556

Albert H. Nagel
Manager, Safety and Compliance
General Foods Technical Center
250 North Street, White Plains
White Plains N.Y. 10625

Daniel F. O'Keefe
President
US Food and Drug Law Institute
1200 17th Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036

J.B. Stine
Vice-President, Kraft Foods
500 Peshtigo Court
Chicago, Illinois 60690

R.J. Tarleton
Executive Vice-President
American Association of Cereal Chemists
3340 Pilot Knob Road
St. Paul Mn 55121

A. Thomas
Vice-President, M & M/Mars
Hackettstown, N.J. 07840

D.R. Thompson
European Representative
California-Arizona Citrus Industry and Industry Committee on Citrus Additives and Pesticides
Rue du Progrès 52
B-1000 Brussels (Belgium)

U.S.S.R.
U.R.S.S.

Dr. A. Zaitsev
Head of Laboratory
Hygienic Research of Food Additives
Institute of Nutrition AMS
Moscow G-240
Ustinsky projezd. 2-14

URUGUAY

A.M. Dovat
Jefe del Departamento Técnico
Laboratorio Tecnológico del Uruguay
Galicia 1133
Montevideo

C. Brugnini
Delegado Alterno del Uruguay ante la FAO
Embajada de la República del Uruguay
Via Ticino 7
00198-Rome (Italy)

VENEZUELA

V. González Marval
Venezuela S.A.
Ministerio de Sanidad y Asistencia Social
Centro Simón Bolívar
Edificio Sur, Piso 8, of. 813
Dirección de Salud Pública
Caracas 101

R.J. Rivas Febres
Licenciado en Biología
Comisión Venezolana de Normas Industriales COVENIN
Av. Poyaca, Ed. Fundación La Salle, Piso 5
Caracas

M. Cols-Paez
Jefe División de Higiene de los Alimentos
Centro Simón Bolívar
Ministerio de Sanidad y Asistencia Social
Caracas

Mrs. G. Villalba de Anderson
Jefe de Sección Productos Lácteos
Instituto Nacional de Higiene
Ciudad Universitaria
Caracas

YUGOSLAVIA YUGOSLAVIE

Z. Bartl
Dipl. Chim.,
43 300 Koprivnica
Podravka

ZAMBIA
ZAMBIE

B.E. Phiri
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
Zambian Embassy
Via E.Q. Visconti 8
00193-Rome (Italy)

OBSERVER COUNTRIES
PAYS OBSERVATEURS
PAISES OBSERVADORES

GUINEA
GUINEE

Ch. M. Fofana
Chargé des organismes internationaux
Embassade de Guinée
Via L. Luciani 41
00197-Rome (Italy)

J. Syrdgianis Camara
Représentant permanent adjoint auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de Guinée
Via L. Luciani 41
00197-Rome (Italy)

Mrs. S. Kaba
Pharmacienne
Ministère de la Santé
Conakry

SOMALIA
SOMALIE

Dr. M.Y. Scirua
Ambasciata di Somalia
Via dei Gracchi 303
Rome (Italy)

SOUTH AFRICA
AFRIQUE DU SUD
SUDAFRICA

P. de B. Retief
Consul Agricultural Produce
South African Embassy
London W.C. 2 (U.K.)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE CHIMIE CEREALIERE

Dr. G. Fabriani
Membre du Comité exécutif
Schmidgasse 3-7
2320 Schwechat (Austria)

ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL ANALYTICAL CHEMISTS (AOAC)

Dr. R.W. Weik
Referee, Dairy Products
P.O. Box 540 Benjamin Franklin
Washington D.C. 20404 (U.S.A.)

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES INDUSTRIES DE BOUILLONS ET POTAGES
(AIIBP)

Dr. G.F. Schubiger
Case Postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour de Peilz

ARAB ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION AND METROLOGY (ASMO)

M.S.B. Serag el Dine
25 Rue Iraq
Mohendesine
P.O. Box 690
Cairo (Egypt)

A.M. Faolalla
ASMO

P.O. Box 690
Cairo (Egypt)

ASSOCIATION MONDIALE DES INDUSTRIES DE
TRAITEMENT DES ALGUES MARINES (MARINALG)

P. Deville
Secrétaire général, MARINALG International
CECA Building
11, Avenue Morane-Saulnier
78140 Vélizy-Villacoublay (France)

COCOA PRODUCERS' ALLIANCE (COPAL)

S.D. Kamga
Secrétaire général adjoint
P.O. Box 1718
Lagos (Nigeria)

COMITE INTERNATIONAL PERMANENT DE LA CONSERVE

G.L. Jumel
Vice-président
3, rue de Logelbach
75847 Paris (France)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE (CE)

Mrs. G. Podestá
Administrateur Principal
Partial Agreement in the Social and Public Health Field
67006 Strasbourg (France)

COUNCIL FOR MUTUAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (CMEA)

V. Litchev
Professor
C.M.E.A.
Prospekt Kalinina 56
Moscow (U.S.S.R.)

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

M. Barthelemy
Directeur des Législations agricoles
Commission des Communautés européennes

200 rue de la Loi
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

G.G. Castille
Administrateur principal
Direction générale de l'agriculture
Organisations internationales concernant l'agriculture
200, rue de la Loi
1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

E. Gaerner
Administrateur principal
Commission des Communautés européennes
200, rue de la Loi
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

M. Graf
Administrateur principal
Secrétariat général du Conseil de la CEE
170, rue de la Loi
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

R. Haigh
Principal Administrator
Commission of the European Communities
200, rue de la Loi
1049 Bruxelles (Belgium)

B. Hogben
Principal Administrator
Commission of the EEC
200, rue de la Loi
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

A.A. Kinch
Head of Division
Commission of the European Communities
200, rue de la Loi
1049 Bruxelles (Belgium)

L. Rampini
Principal Administrator
200, rue de la Loi
1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

EUROPEAN FOOD LAW ASSOCIATION (EFLA)

Dr. A. Gérard
Secrétaire général
3, Boulevard de la Cambre
B-1050 Bruxelles (Belgium)

Dr. H. Schulze
Council Member
Rosenkavalierpl. 2
D-8000 München 81 (F.R. of Germany)

J.H. Byrne
Scientific Affairs Manager
20 Lonsdale Avenue
Margate, Kent (U.K.)

Dr. S. Valvassori
Via S. Secondo 67
Torino (Italy)

EUROPEAN FOOD EMULSIFIER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION (EFEMA)

C. Vrang
Director
A/S Grindstedvaerket
DK-8200 Brabrand (Denmark)

J.J. Jenkins
Food Industries Limited
Bromborough Port
Merseyside L62 4SU (U.K.)

EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY (EAIRO)

Dr. R.O. Arunga
Senior Research Officer
P.O. Box 30650
Nairobi (Kenya)

FEDERATION EUROPEENNE DES FABRICANTS D'ADJUVANTS POUR LA NUTRITION ANIMALE (FEFANA)

Dr. P. Mainguy
FEFANA

141 bis, Boulevard La Tour Maubourg
Paris (France)

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES INDUSTRIES ET DU COMMERCE EN GROS DES
VINS, SPIRITUEUX, EAUX-DE-VIE ET LIQUEURS (FICGVS)

Dr. S. Valvassori
F.I.C.G.V.S.
Via S. Secondo 67
10128 Torino (Italy)

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)

P. Shanahan
Economic Affairs Officer
Villa La Fenêtre
1211 Geneva 10 (Switzerland)

GROUPEMENT EUROPEEN DES SOURCES D'EAUX MINERALES NATURELLES
(GESEM)

C. Callipo
Secrétaire général du GESEM
186, Via Sicilia
00187-Rome (Italy)

P.A. Grippo
Secrétariat général du GESEM
Via Sicilia 186
00187-Rome (Italy)

INSTITUT EUROPEEN DE LA GOMME DE CAROUBE (INEC)

Dr. E. Nittner
c/o Meyhall Chemical A.G.
CH-8280 Kreuzlingen (Switzerland)

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SEED CRUSHERS (IASC)

L.C.J. Brett
1 Watergate
London E.C. 4 (U.K.)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF GLUCOSE INDUSTRIES (IFG)

Dr. R. Bauer
Secretary General, IFG
134 Avenue de Cortenbergh
B-1040 Brussels (Belgium)

E.G. Rapp
Attorney
4, Av. Ernest Claes
B-1980 Tervuren, Bruxelles (Belgium)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF MARGARINE ASSOCIATIONS (IFMA)

P. Pirnay
Secrétaire général
Rue de la Loi 83 (b. 7)
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

M. Fondu
Rue de la Loi 83
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

A. Peeters
Secrétaire
Rue de la Loi 83
B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgium)

INTERNATIONAL FROZEN FOOD ASSOCIATION

T.B. House
Director-General
919 18th Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006 (U.S.A.)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF THE FLAVOUR INDUSTRY (IOFI)

F. Grundschober
Scientific Adviser
8, rue Charles Humbert
Genève (Switzerland)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF CONSUMERS' UNIONS (IOCU)

Miss D.H. Grose
Representation Officer

14, Buckingham Street
London W.C. 2 (U.K.)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION (ISO)

Dr. J. Kanizsay
Directeur technique adjoint
ISO/TC 34
Office hongrois de normalisation
Ullői út. 25
1091 Budapest (Hungary)

INTERNATIONAL PECTIN PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION (IPPA)

Dr. W. Pilnik
Department of Food Science
The University
12 De Dreyen
Wageningen (Netherlands)

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT FOR THE INDUSTRIES OF DIETETIC FOOD PRODUCTS (ISDI)

Dr. W. Schultheiss
Geschäftsführer
Bad Homburg v.d.H.
Kelkheimerstrasse 10 (F.R. of Germany)

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF FOOD AND ALLIED WORKERS ASSOCIATIONS (IUF)

U. Lamagni
Permanent Representative
Via Po 24
Rome (Italy)

UNION DES ASSOCIATIONS DE BOISSONS GAZEUSES DES PAYS MEMBRES DE LA CEE (UNESDA)

R. Delville
26, rue du Lombard
Bruxelles (Belgium)

JOINT SECRETARIES
CO-SECRETAIRES
COSECRETARIOS

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

H.J. McNally
Liaison Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, 00100-Rome (Italy)

Dr. F.C. Lu
Chief, Food Additives
WHO, Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 (Switzerland)

Dr. L. Reinius
Veterinary Public Health Division
WHO, Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27 (Switzerland)

FAO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE LA FAO
PERSONAL DE LA FAO

Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO, 00100-Rome (Italy):

W.L. de Haas
Mrs. B. Dix
J. Hutchinson
Dr. L.G. Ladomery

Food Control and Consumer Protection Group (ESN)
FAO, 00100-Rome (Italy):

R.K. Malik
J.R. Lupien

APPENDIX II

OPENING ADDRESS BY MR. ROY I. JACKSON

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL, FAO

To the Eleventh Session of the
JOINT FAO/WHO CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you to Rome on behalf of the Director-General of WHO and the Director-General of FAO. I am pleased to be able to say that since your last session nine more countries have become Members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, bringing the current membership to 114 countries. This is indeed a very reassuring development, which, I believe you will agree, confirms the growing interest of the Member Nations of FAO and WHO in the work of the Commission. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome especially the representatives of the new Members as well as the representatives of observer countries participating for the first time in one of your sessions.

A further encouraging development since your last session has been the growing interest by Member governments in the Recommended Codex International Food Standards and the Recommended Codex International Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Food which have been sent to countries for acceptance. You will see from the documents before you that some 45 countries, including some developed countries, have now communicated their acceptance of a number of International Standards - in several cases a considerable number of them - including International Pesticide Residue Limits, with a view to giving effect to these through their food legislation and regulations. The Code of Principles for Milk and Milk Products has been accepted by 71 countries and there is an increasing number of acceptances of the many standards developed under the Code.

Further progress, however, still needs to be made in this field, and we hope that delegates will be able to provide during the session information on developments in their countries regarding acceptance of the standards, and the International Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues. Several other standards and additional International Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues have been developed since your last session for submission to the present session of the Commission. We have every hope that most of these will be adopted for issuance to governments for acceptance and implementation.

While the current work of the Commission has been proceeding satisfactorily, I would like to take this opportunity to indicate some of the thoughts of FAO and WHO on certain aspects of our priorities. In both Organizations, at the request of our governing bodies, increasing emphasis is being placed on what might be described as country-focus activities. This shift in emphasis does not detract from the importance of the work of the Commission. Indeed, it is intended to help in implementing the recommendations of the Commission, particularly in applying its standards to national practices. To this end, higher priority is given by FAO and WHO to collaborating with Member countries in strengthening their capabilities to ensure better food control, quality and safety. Protection of consumers against health hazards and commercial fraud, the ensurance of fair practices in the food trade, the promotion of the food industry and of international trade by removing obstacles to trade in foods and stimulating opportunities to increase earnings from exports, are all matters of great interest to our

Member countries which call for the support of our two Organizations. Obviously, the meetings of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies provide worldwide and regional fora for discussion of these matters.

Its international standards are important elements in providing a means of assisting governments to agree upon measures aimed at the improvement of food control, safety and consumer protection, the promotion of trade in food and the development of food industries.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention quite briefly two of the major activities of WHO and FAO which complement and forward the work of the Commission. These are the WHO Food Safety Programme and the FAO Programme on Food Control and Consumer Protection.

The WHO Programme is intended to develop and disseminate information as a preventive health measure, to protect the health of the consumer against food hazards, and to assist Member states in the planning and implementation of food safety measures. It aims at reducing human illness caused by microbial contamination and the chemical or physical adulteration of food. Under this Programme WHO will encourage the establishment and development of national food safety policies, programmes and services, so as to make food compatible with international standards and to prevent national and international spread of food-borne diseases.

On the other hand, the objectives of the FAO Programme are to protect consumers against hazards from adulterated, unsafe or contaminated food and to generally assist in the socio-economic development of member countries through national, regional and international programmes in food control, including monitoring and control of contaminants in food. The main thrust of the programme is directed towards the development or strengthening of national food control infrastructures to increase consumer protection against health hazards and commercial fraud, prevention and control of food contamination, development of the food industry, and the promotion of trade in order to earn or save foreign exchange. Advice and technical assistance are given to national authorities on food law and regulations, the setting up of laboratories and the training of food inspectors and analytical staff. In addition, FAO carries out, jointly with WHO, periodic evaluations of food additives and contaminants, and is developing a Joint International Programme for monitoring of contaminants in food.

During this session, you will be hearing more about these and other important activities of the two Organizations which have relevance for the work of the Commission. Here, I think I should mention that WHO has proposed, and FAO has agreed, that an inter-secretariat review would be appropriate at this time of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme in the context of the related activities in FAO and WHO. The reports you will receive on these activities will enable you to determine the extent to which they are meeting the ultimate objectives to which I referred earlier.

It is gratifying to note that in recent years the Commission has been turning its attention more and more to the needs of developing countries. Since the last session, a Joint FAO/WHO

Food Standards Regional Conference for Asia was held in Bangkok in December 1975 generously hosted by the government of Thailand. An important step taken by the Asian countries at this Conference, similar to that taken earlier by the African countries, was to approve a draft model food law. This was the second Regional Conference of its type, the first having been held in Nairobi in October 1973. A Regional Conference for Latin America is scheduled to be held in 1977.

Codex Coordinating Committees for Africa and Latin America have already commenced work and I assume that you will be taking a decision to establish a similar committee for Asia, which was agreed to in principle during your last session. All these new developments are meant to provide inter-governmental fora within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for greater and more active participation by developing countries in the work of the Commission directed principally to food legislation, food control and food safety needs of Africa, Latin America and Asia.

In view of the current financial situation, which has placed restrictions on the work of most UN bodies, FAO and WHO - the two co-sponsoring Organizations of the Codex Alimentarius Commission - have been re-appraising their programmes and priorities within the limits of their budgetary resources. Accordingly, it may become necessary to reduce the number of meetings and the volume of documentation under the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. It is important, therefore, for the Commission to re-examine its work priorities not only for the current biennium but also for 1978/79.

Turning now to personal matters, I would like to thank the retiring Members of the Executive Committee for the time and effort they have given so generously to promote the aims of the Commission. Their advice has been most valuable. As you may know, Dr. Chapman will be retiring from the Chairmanship at the end of this session. I am sure I speak for all of you in saying how greatly we have benefitted from his service in this office. His long experience in matters relating to food standards, food control and food safety at the national level, and his knowledge of the objectives and the working procedures of FAO and WHO as well as of the Codex Programme, have given a very practical orientation to the deliberations of the Commission. His decision not to stand for re-election you have, of course, respected, but I am sure with deep regret.

I would also like to express the appreciation of WHO and FAO to those governments who have undertaken the task of chairing and hosting meetings of the Commission's subsidiary bodies since the last session of the Commission.

It only remains for me to wish you all who are in attendance at this meeting a pleasant stay in Rome and a successful meeting.

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY OF ACCEPTANCES OF RECOMMENDED

STANDARDS

AS AT 9 APRIL 1976

Recommended Standard	Method of Acceptance			1) Acceptance given, or where there is a footnote to this column, presumed to be given, but not stated specifically to be Full Acceptance 2) Other Remarks
	Full Acceptance	Target Acceptance	Acceptance with Specified Deviations	
General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (Ref. No. CAC/RS 1-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Ghana, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina, Canada, Singapore, U.S.A.	1) Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal
Canned Pacific Salmon (Ref. No. CAC/RS 3-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, Morocco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina, Canada, Japan, U.S.A.	1) Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal
White Sugar (Ref. No. CAC/RS 4-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Thailand, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	Argentina, Canada	1) Hungary
Powdered Sugar (Icing Sugar) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 5-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	Argentina, Canada	1) Hungary

	Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Soft Sugars (Ref. No. CAC/RS 6-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana	Argentina, Canada	1) Hungary
Dextrose Anhydrous (Ref. No. CAC/RS 7-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana,	Argentina, Canada, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Dextrose Monohydrate (Ref. No. CAC/RS 8-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana	Argentina, Canada, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Glucose Syrup (Ref. No. CAC/RS 9-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Morocco, Rep. of Sudan, Thailand, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana	Argentina, Canada, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Dried Glucose Syrup (Ref. No. CAC/RS 10-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of	Cyprus, Ghana	Argentina, Canada, U.S.A.	1) Hungary

	Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Lactose (Ref. No. CAC/RS 11-1969) ¹	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana	Argentina, Canada, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
European Regional Standard for Honey (Ref. No. CAC/RS 12-1969)	Bahrain, Ghana, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina, Canada	1) Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal ³ 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but honey fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Canned Tomatoes (Ref. No. CAC/RS 13-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco		1) Hungary
Canned Peaches (Ref. No. CAC/RS 14-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		1) Hungary, Israel
Canned Grapefruit (Ref. No. CAC/RS 15-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast,	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	U.S.A.	1) Hungary, Israel

	Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Canned Green Beans and Wax Beans (Ref. No. CAC/RS 16-1969) ¹ , ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	Portugal	1) Hungary

¹ The position of Japan is given in ALINORM 76/6-Part I.

² Earlier information supplied by Canada is given in ALINORM 74/6-Part II.

³ Portugal states that the Recommended Standard merits their entire approval.

Recommended Standard	Method of Acceptance			1) Acceptance given, or where there is a footnote to this column, presumed to be given, but not stated specifically to be Full Acceptance 2) Other Remarks
	Full Acceptance	Target Acceptance	Acceptance with Specified Deviations	
Canned Applesauce (Ref. No. CAC/RS 17-1969) ¹ , ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Portugal, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Canned Sweet Corn (Ref. No. CAC/RS 18-1969) ¹ , ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	Portugal, U.S.A.	1) Hungary, Israel

	Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
General Standard for Fats and Oils not covered by Individual standards (Ref. No. CAC/RS 19-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina, Arab Rep. of Egypt	1) Hungary
Edible Soya Bean Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 20-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Canada, Arab Rep. of Egypt	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard but soya bean oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Edible Arachis Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 21-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Canada, Arab Rep. of Egypt, Portugal	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but arachis oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Edible Cottonseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 22-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina, Canada, Arab Rep. of Egypt, Portugal	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but cottonseed oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.

Edible Sunflowerseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 23-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Canada, Arab Rep. of Egypt, Portugal	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but sunflowerseed oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Edible Rapeseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 24-1969) ^{1, 2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago		1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard. Only hydrogenated rapeseed oil has been used for food in the U.S.A. There would be some question of the acceptability of untreated rapeseed oil until the significance of its erucic acid content and toxicity has been more fully explored.
Edible Maize Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 25-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Canada, Arab Rep. of Egypt, Portugal	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but maize oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Edible Sesameseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 26-1969) ^{1, 2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Arab Rep. of Egypt	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but sesameseed oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.

	Zaire			
Edible Safflowerseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 27-1969) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago	Canada, Portugal	1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but safflowerseed oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.
Lard (Ref. No. CAC/RS 28-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina, Portugal	1) Hungary
Rendered Pork Fat (Ref. No. CAC/RS 29-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina, Portugal	1) Hungary
Premier Jus (Ref. No. CAC/RS 30-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Trinidad and Tobago	Argentina, Portugal	1) Hungary
Edible Tallow	Bahrain, Fed.	Cyprus,	Portugal	1) Hungary

(Ref. No. CAC/RS 31-1969) ^{1,2}	Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Trinidad and Tobago		
Margarine (Ref. No. CAC/RS 32-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco	Argentina, Portugal, U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Olive Oils (Ref. No. CAC/RS 33-1969) ^{1,2}	Algeria, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Portugal, Romania ⁴ , Rep. of South Africa, Spain, Rep. of Sudan, Turkey ⁵ , People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Argentina, Trinidad and Tobago	Bulgaria ⁶ , Colombia, Cyprus, Arab Rep. of Egypt, Italy, Morocco, Tunisia ⁷	1) Hungary, Iran, Iraq ⁸ , Dominican Rep. ⁹ , Jordan ³
Mustardseed Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 34-1969) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago		1) Hungary 2) The U.S.A. does not accept the standard, but mustardseed oil fully conforming to the standard may be distributed in the U.S.A.

Quick-Frozen Gutted Pacific Salmon (Ref. No. CAC/RS 36-1970) ²	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			1) Hungary
Canned Shrimps or Prawns (Ref. No. CAC/RS 37-1970) ²	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Morocco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Ghana	Argentina	1) Hungary
General Standard for Fungi and Fungus Products (Ref. No. CAC/RS 38-1970) ²	Argentina, Bahrain Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Morocco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Ghana		1) Hungary
Edible Dried Fungi (Ref. No. CAC/RS 39-1970) ²	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Morocco, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of	Ghana		1) Hungary

	Zaire			
European Regional Standard for Fresh Fungus "Chanterelle" (Ref. No. CAC/RS 40-1970) ²	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			1) Hungary
Quick-Frozen Peas (Ref. No. CAC/RS 41-1970) ^{1,2}	Baharain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dam. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire		U.S.A.	1) Hungary
Canned Pineapple (Ref. No. CAC/RS 42-1970) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central Afric on Rep., Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, Thailand, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Ghana, Morocco		1) Hungary
Apricot, Peach and Pear Nectars preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 44-1971) ^{1,2}	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Cyprus, Romania		1) Liberia
Orange Juice	Bahrain, Central	Cyprus,		1) Liberia

preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 45-1971) 1 , 2	African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Romania		
Grapefruit Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 46-1971) 1 , 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Cyprus, Romania		1) Liberia
Lemon Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 47-1971) 1 , 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Cyprus, Romania		1) Liberia
Apple Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 48-1971) 1 , 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Portugal, Swaziland	Cyprus, Romania		1) Liberia
Tomato Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 49-1971) 1 , 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Portugal, Swaziland	Cyprus, Romania		1) Liberia
Quick Frozen Fillets of Cod and Haddock (Ref. No. CAC/RS 50-1971) 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Cyprus		1) Liberia
Quick Frozen Fillets of Ocean Perch (Ref. No. CAC/RS 51-1971) 2	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait, Swaziland	Cyprus		1) Liberia
Quick Frozen Strawberries (Ref. No. CAC/RS	Bahrain, Central African Rep., Iran, Kuwait,	Romania		1) Liberia

52-1971) ^{1,2}	Swaziland			
Special Dietary Foods with Low Sodium Content (including Salt Substitutes) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 53-1971) ²	United Rep. of Tanzania, Yemen Arab Rep.	Western Samoa		2) Canada has given a non-acceptance to the standard
Powdered Dextrose (Icing Dextrose) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 54-1971) ^{1,2}	United Rep. of Tanzania, Yemen Arab Rep.	Western Samoa		
Canned Mushrooms (Ref. No. CAC/RS 55-1972)	Costa Rica, Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire		2) Finland has indicated that it cannot accept the standard
Canned Asparagus (Ref. No. CAC/RS 56-1972)	Costa Rica, Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire		2) Finland, As above.
Processed Tomato Concentrated (Ref. No. CAC/RS 57-1972)	Coasta Rica, Honduras	Bahreïn, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire		2) Finland, As above.
Canned Green Peas (Ref. No. CAC/RS 58-1972)	Honduras	Bahreïn, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire	Coasta Rica	2) Finland. As above.
Canned Plums (Ref. No. CAC/RS 59-1972)	Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire	Costa Rica, U.S.A.	2) Finland. As above.
Canned Raspberries (Ref. No. CAC/RS 60-1972)	Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep.	Costa Rica	2) Finland. As above.

		of Zaire		
Canned Pears (Ref. No. CAC/RS 61-1972)	Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire	Costa Rica	2) Finland. As above.
Canned R strawberries (Ref. No. CAC/RS 62-1972)	Honduras	Bahrain, Bolivia, Iran, Madagascar, Rwanda, Rep. of Zaire	Costa Rica	2) Finland. As above.
Concentrated Apple Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 63-1972) ^{1,2}	United Rep. of Tanzania, Yemen Arab Rep.	Western Samoa		
Concentrated Orange	United Rep. of	Western Samoa		
Concentrated Orange Juice preserved exclusively by physical means (Ref. No. CAC/RS 64-1972)	United Rep. of Tanzania, Yemen Arab Rep.	Western Samoa		

¹ Earlier information supplied by Canada is given in document ALINORM 74/6-Part II.

² The position of Japan is given in document ALINORM 76/6-Part I.

³ Jordan states that it is in agreement with the Recommended Standard.

⁴ Romania has indicated that it is in agreement with the Recommended Codex Standard and from subsequent correspondence it is inferred that Romania has given Full Acceptance.

⁵ Turkey has indicated that the national standards have been revised in accordance with the Recommended Codex Standard. From subsequent correspondence it is inferred that Turkey has given Full Acceptance.

⁶ Bulgaria has indicated to the IOOC that it accepts the standard but that it has a reservation about one particular provision, i.e. the free acidity figure for virgin olive oil (sub-section 3.2.2). This reservation may be the result of a misunderstanding and the matter has been taken up by the IOOC with the authorities concerned in Bulgaria.

⁷ Oils meeting the Recommended Codex Standard will be permitted to be distributed freely in Tunisia.

⁸ Iraq indicated in March 1973 that the Iraqi Organization for Standards had issued Iraqi specifications for olive oils which would come into force in the very near future and which are in complete accordance with the Recommended Codex Standard for Olive Oils.

⁹ The Dominican Republic states that since it is not a producer country of olive oil, it sees no obstacle in the way of accepting the Recommended Standard.

Recommended Standard	Method of Acceptance			1) Acceptance given, or where there is a footnote to this column, presumed to to be given, but not stated specifically to be Full Acceptance 2) Other Remarks
	Full Acceptance	Target Acceptance	Acceptance with Specified Deviations	
Table Olives (Ref. No. CAC/RS 66-1974)				
Raisins (Ref. No. CAC/RS 67-1974)				
Canned Mandarin Oranges (Ref. No. CAC/RS 68-1974)				
Quick Frozen Raspberries (Ref. No. CAC/RS 69-1974)				
Canned Tuna and Bonito in Water or Oil (Ref. No. CAC/RS 70-1974)				

NOTE: The following 48 countries are listed in the above Table: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Federal Republic of Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Arab Republic of Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Monaco, Morocco, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Western Samoa, Singapore, Republic of South Africa, Republic of Sudan, Spain, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Trinitad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.A., Yemen Arab Republic, Democratic People's Republic of the Yemen and Republic of Zaire.

Some of the countries listed in the Table have also provided information additional to that given in the Table, but this information does not appear to constitute any form of acceptance at this stage. This appears to be the position also with regard to the information given in the replies received from the following 21 countries not listed in the Table: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Ireland, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of South Vietnam, Senegal,

Sweden, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela.

All of the replies on acceptances received up to the commencement of the Eleventh Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission have been published. Details of country positions on acceptances including details of specified deviations, are to be found in the following documents:-

Prepared for 11th Session of the Commission

- i. ALINORM 76/6 - Part I (Japan)
- ii. ALINORM 76/6 - Part II (U.S.A.)
- iii. LIM.2 (re-published as ALINORM 76/6- Part VI) (U.S.A.)
- iv. ALINORM 76/6 - Part III (Canada)
- v. ALINORM 76/6 - Part IV (Singapore)
- vi. ALINORM 76/6 - Part (V) (covered the following 20 countries: Bahrain, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Arab Republic of Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Honduras, Iran, Republic of Korea, Madagascar, New Zealand, Rwanda, Senegal, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen Arab Republic, Republic of Zaire).
- vii. ALINORM 76/6 - Part VII (Portugal)

Secretariat Note

The reply of Portugal was conveyed verbally to the 11th Session of the Commission, but there was not sufficient time to publish the reply for the session. Because it contains a number of Full Acceptances and Acceptances with Specified Deviations, the reply is now published as ALINORM 76/6 - Part VII.

Secretariat Note

Replies were also received from Switzerland and the United Kingdom. These replies have been incorporated in the body of the Report of the Commission's 11th Session.

Prepared for 10th Session of the Commission

- viii. ALINORM 74/6, Part I and Corrigendum (covered the following 23 countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Liberia, Norway, Romania, Spain, Swaziland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela)
- ix. ALINORM 74/6, Part II (Canada)
- x. ALINORM 74/6, Part II, Addendum (Canada)
- xi. ALINORM 74/6, Part III (Japan)
- xii. ALINORM 74/6, Part IV (U.S.A.)
- xiii. ALINORM 74/6, Part IV, Addendum (U.S.A.)
- xiv. ALINORM 74/6, Part IV, Addendum 2 (U.S.A.)
- xv. ALINORM 74/6, Part V (Greece, Ireland, New Zealand)
- xvi. ALINORM 74/6, Part VI (Switzerland)

- xvii. ALINORM 74/6, Part VII (Federal Republic of Germany)
- xviii. ALINORM 74/6, Part VIII (United Republic of Tanzania, Western Samoa)
- xix. ALINORM 74/6, Part IX (Sweden)
- xx. ALINORM 74/6, Part X (France)
- xxi. ALINORM 74/6, Part XI (Italy)

Prepared for 9th Session of the Commission

- xxii. ALINORM 72/6, Part I (Progress Report on Acceptances as at 30 April 1972 covered the following 21 countries: Argentinian, Bahrain, Bolivia, Federal Republic of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Monaco, Morocco, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, U.S.S.R., U.S.A.)
- xxiii. ALINORM 72/5, Part II (Progress Report on Acceptances between 1 May 1972 and October 1972 covered the following 17 countries: Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Italy, Jordan, Netherlands, Senegal, Republic of South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Republic of Sudan, Thailand, Republic of South Vietnam, U.S.A.)
- xxiv. ALINORM 72/5, Part III (Canada)
- xxv. ALINORM 72/6, Part IV (U.S.A.)
- xxvi. ALINORM 72/5 - Part V (covered the following 6 countries: Australia, Austria, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Ireland, United Kingdom)

Prepared for 8th Session of the Commission

- xxvii. ALINORM 71/6 (Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Monaco, Philippines, Portugal, U.S.S.R., U.S.A.)

ACCEPTANCE OF CODEX MAXIMUM LIMITS FOR PESTICIDE RESIDUES
AS AT 9 APRIL 1976

Recommended Standard	Method of Acceptance		
	Full Acceptance	Target Acceptance	Limited Acceptance
International Tolerances for Pesticide Residues (First Series) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 2-1969)	Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia ¹ , Ghana, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, Philippines ¹ , Portugal ¹ , Rep. of Sudan, Thailand, United States of America ² People's Dem. Rep. of the Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Israel	
International Tolerances for Pesticide Residues (Second Series) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 35-1969)	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ghana, Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, United States of America ² ,	Cyprus, Morocco	

	People's Dem. Rep. of the Yemen, Rep. of Zaire		
International Tolerances for Pesticide Residues (Third Series) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 43-1971)	Bahrain, Central African Republic, Greece, Iran, Kuwait, Liberia, Swaziland, United States of America ²	Cyprus	
International Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues (Fourth Series) (Ref. No. CAC/RS 65- 1974) ⁵	Canada ³ Singapore. ⁴		

¹ Bolivia, the Philippines and Portugal have not stated specifically that they have given Full Acceptance, but it is assumed from the replies that this is the intention. Bolivia, in its reply which covered various Recommended Standards including the First Series of International Tolerances for Pesticide Residues, stated that it accepted the standards. The Philippines has likewise stated that it has accepted the recommended maximum limits in the First Series. Portugal indicated that the recommended maximum limits in the First Series merited acceptance.

² For precise details of the extent of the acceptances of the U.S.A., see ALINORM 74/6 - Part IV, Addendum 2 and ALINORM 76/6 - Part VI.

³ For precise details of the extent of the acceptances of Canada, see ALINORM 76/6 -Part III.

⁴ For precise details of the extent of the acceptances of Singapore, see ALINORM 76/6 - Part IV.

⁵ The Fourth Series includes all maximum limits contained in the First, Second and Third Series and, therefore, supersedes the first three series.

Secretariat Note

The replies from individual countries are to be found in the ALINORM documents identified previously in this Appendix. Replies were also received from the Netherlands and Switzerland and these have been incorporated in the body of the Report of the Commission's 11th Session.