



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET
L'AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y
LA ALIMENTACION
00 100 Rome, Via delle Terme di Coracaila. Cobles: FOODAGRt, Rome.Tel.
5797



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE
1211 Genève, 27 Avenue Appic. Câbles: UNISANTE Geneve. Tel. 34 60 61

ALINORM 72/3

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Ninth Session, Rome, 6-17 November 1972

REPORT OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Rome, 15-18 May 1972

Introduction

1. The Executive Committee held its Eighteenth Session at FAO Headquarters, Rome, from 15 to 18 May 1972. The Commission was presided over by the Chairman of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Mr. G. Weill (France), and in the presence of the three vice-chairmen, Dr. N. de Heer (Ghana), Mr. A. Miklovicz (Hungary) and Mr. G.R. Grange (United States of America). The following representatives from the geographic locations mentioned were present: for Africa, Ing. A. Amraoui from Tunisia; for Asia, Mr. K. Mimura from Japan; for Europe, Dr. D. Eckert from the Federal Republic of Germany; for Latin America, Mr. J.C. Vignaud from Argentina; for North America, Dr. D.G. Chapman from Canada; for South-West Pacific, Mr. W.C.K. Hammer from Australia.

Adoption of Agenda

2. The Committee adopted the provisional agenda with a slight re-arrangement in the order of items.

Membership of the Commission

3. The Committee noted that seven more countries had become Members of the Commission since the Eighth Session of the Commission. These were Central African Republic, Malawi, Mauritius, Zambia, Malaysia, Nicaragua and Fiji. There were now 96 Members of the Commission,

4. In connection with the decision of the Government of Fiji to become a Member of the Commission, the Committee noted that the Commission had, at an earlier-session, decided that the geographic location of South-West Pacific should be comprised of Australia and New Zealand, This was appropriate at the time, but as Fiji had now become a Member of the Commission, the question of whether Fiji should be grouped with Australia and New Zealand to comprise the geographic location of South-West Pacific arose. The Committee noted that the geographic locations listed in the Rules of procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and defined by the Commission, in terms of what countries comprised these geographic locations, did not correspond with the geographic regions of FAO, which in turn did not correspond with the geographic regions of WHO, The Committee agreed, therefore, that the Secretariat should write to

the authorities in Fiji drawing their attention to the geographic locations of Asia and South-West Pacific, as defined for the purposes of the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and asking them in which of these two geographic locations they would wish to be grouped. It was also agreed that the Secretariat should, in addition, write to Australia and New Zealand which comprise the South-West Pacific region, into which Fiji appeared to fall, informing them that Fiji had become a Member of the Commission and might wish to be grouped in the geographic location of South-West_Pacific.

5. The representative of WHO informed the Committee that the Twenty-Fifth World Health Assembly, at its meeting early in May 1972, had decided to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only government having the right to represent China in the World Health Organization. The Secretariat indicated that as soon as it received an official communication from WHO on this subject, it would take appropriate action, which would include advising host governments of Codex Committees on the question of the representation of China at Codex Committee sessions.

Rationalization of work on Codes of Technological Practice and Codes of Hygienic Practice for Fish and Fishery Products

6. The Committee had before it a document prepared by the Secretariat setting out the background to the elaboration of codes of technological practice for fish and fishery products by four consecutive Ad Hoc Expert Consultations convened by the FAO Department of Fisheries and to the elaboration of codes of hygienic practice for these products by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, which had started work in this field at the request of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products.

7. At the eighth session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, Washington (June 1971), the delegation of Canada expressed concern about the duplication of effort in producing separate codes of technological and hygienic practice. It was the view of the Canadian delegation that food hygiene experts should be asked to take part in the work of the Expert Consultation, and that as technology and hygiene were inter-related, both subjects should be integrated and dealt with in one and the same code, to achieve maximum usefulness to fish handlers and processors. The FAO Fisheries Department representative at the session, while he pointed out that the codes being developed by the Expert Consultation did contain some provisions on hygiene, agreed that these provisions might be incomplete or might be capable of being developed in more detail. He thought, therefore, that there would be no difficulty in including any further provisions on hygiene which the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene might consider necessary. The Food Hygiene Committee concluded by agreeing that the codes of technological practice should be taken into account in the development of the corresponding codes of hygienic practice.

9. At the eighth session of the Commission (July 1971), the delegation of Canada drew the attention of the Commission to paragraph 14 of the Report of the 5th session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (October 1970), in which the concern of some delegations attending the Committee was recorded regarding the possible duplication of work and overlap as between the FAO codes of technological practice and the codes of hygienic practice in the fish and fishery products field. The delegation of Canada drew attention to the difficulty of attempting to draw a line of distinction between technological matters and matters of hygiene and added that, at some stage of the work, the codes of technological practice and the codes of hygienic practice would have to be made into one publication. The Commission agreed, on the

proposal of the delegate of Canada, supported by the delegate of Australia, that the question of how to proceed with the development of these codes should be considered by the Executive Committee at its eighteenth session.

9. At the Sixth Session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (October 1971), it was noted that the Fisheries Department of FAO would be prepared to elaborate hygiene provisions in existing and future codes if this was the wish of the Committee and the decision of the Executive Committee. On the proposal of the delegation of the U.S.A., the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products agreed:

- (i) to advise the Commission that, in its opinion, the principle of a code incorporating both technological and hygiene provisions was most desirable for fishery products; and
- (ii) that FAO, through Expert Consultations, had a unique capability for drafting technological codes and recommended acceleration of this work.

The Committee also considered that:

- (i) such codes drafted by FAO should be referred to it for consideration as regards their suitability for entering into the Codex Procedure;
- (ii) it should refer codes acceptable to it to the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene for review, evaluation and any necessary amplification of the hygiene recommendations contained therein; and
- (iii) at such time as the two Committees concerned were satisfied with the contents of the combined codes, they should jointly submit them to the Commission.

10. The remarks made by several delegations at recent Codex Committee sessions had, therefore, reflected concern at the duplication of effort caused by the present division of responsibilities between the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene and the Expert Consultation. A further concern was that separate codes of hygiene and technology were not so helpful to the intended users of such codes.

11. The Executive Committee agreed that it was important to avoid this duplication and (i) discussed the question of how to rationalize between an Expert Consultation and the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene the work on the development of hygiene provisions and (ii) considered how best the texts being elaborated by an Expert Consultation could be incorporated into the Codex Procedure.

12. Taking into account the willingness of the Expert Consultation to extend the scope of their work by including a section or sections specifically devoted to hygiene in their technological codes, the Executive Committee agreed that the best approach to the problem would be for the Expert Consultation to assume, in the future, initial responsibility for elaborating codes, which would cover both technology and hygiene for all fish products for which the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products and the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene think that codes of hygienic practice should be developed. It would be understood that the hygiene provisions of any combined code would follow, as far as practicable, the lay-out of the General Principles of Food Hygiene. The Committee also agreed that under this arrangement, it would be highly desirable to include experts in food hygiene as well as fishery technologists in the Expert Consultations and to include, as far as possible, food hygienists who actually participate in and are familiar with the work of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene. The frequency of the meetings of the Expert Consultation and the rhythm of work would need to be suitable for Codex purposes (i.e. annual).

13. The present state of the work on the elaboration of codes of hygienic practice and codes of technological practice was as follows:

<u>Codex Committee on Food</u> <u>Hygiene Codes of Hygienic Practice</u>	<u>Expert Consultation</u> <u>Codes of Technological Practice</u>
1. Handling of Fresh and Frozen Fish (Step 2)	1. Fresh Fish (published)
2. Canned Fish (Step 2)	2. Frozen Fish (in course of publication)
3. Molluscan Shellfish (Step 2)	3. Canned Fish (finalized by Expert Consultation)
4. Smoked Fish(Step 2)	4. Smoked Fish (future work)
	5. Shrimp (future work)
	6. Dried and Salted Fish (future work)

The codes of technological practice on (a) fresh fish, (b) frozen fish, and (c) canned fish had been finalized by the Expert Consultation and had been published or would be in the relatively near future. The codes of technological practice already contained certain hygiene provisions, but the Executive Committee agreed that these codes should be revised to take into account the draft codes prepared by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene before advancing any of these codes in the Codex Procedure.

14. The Executive Committee agreed that the method of working would be as follows. The corresponding codes of hygienic practice (a) fresh and frozen fish and (b) canned fish would be referred immediately after consideration by the Hygiene Committee in June 1972 to the FAO Fisheries Department. The combined codes, when completed, would then be put before the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products at Step 2. Having obtained one round of government comments at Step 3, it would then be a matter for decision by that Committee whether to recommend to the Commission the omission of Steps 6, 7 and 8. The Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products would, before submitting the codes to the Commission for final adoption, refer them to the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene for endorsement of the hygiene content of the codes. The Executive Committee considered, however, that the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene should continue to develop the code of practice for molluscan shellfish independently, because the considerations were mainly in the field of hygiene and no parallel technological code was so far in the programme of future work of the Expert Consultation.

15. The remaining code in the programme of work of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene was the Code of Hygienic Practice for Smoked Fish, The future programme of the Expert Consultation included a parallel code of technological practice, and the Executive Committee agreed that the Expert Consultation should prepare a combined code. The method of working would be as in para. 14 above.

16. As regards the remaining two codes of technological practice on the programme of future work of the Expert Consultation, i.e. shrimp and Dried and Salted Fish, the Executive Committee considered that the Expert Consultation should also cover the hygiene field relating to these products, as proposed by the Expert Consultation itself.

17. The Executive Committee also considered that, in determining priorities for its future work, the Expert Consultation should take fully into account the wishes of the two inter-governmental Codex Committees concerned.

Mode of Publication of certain Codes of Hygienic Practice

18. At the Eighth Session of the Commission, several delegates had questioned the need for issuing individual codes of hygienic practice as separate booklets in view of the fact that for products of vegetable origin, in particular, the various codes differed only marginally from and, in the main, consisted of a repetition of the General Principles of Food Hygiene. The matter was referred to the Executive Committee for consideration. (See also paras 193-195 of ALINORM 71/31)

19. The Executive Committee noted that whilst the codes of hygienic practice which the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene had elaborated for certain products of vegetable origin did vary only in a few details from the General Principles of Food Hygiene, the codes presently under elaboration by the Food Hygiene Committee covered products mainly of animal origin which called for different hygienic provisions and practices and therefore should be published as separate booklets. The Secretariat was instructed to carefully examine how best to publish each code and it was agreed that each case should be judged on its merits.

Status of Lists of Food Additives

20. At its Eighth Session, the Commission requested the Executive Committee to consider the question of the status of Codex lists of food additives so that guidelines could be drawn up to assist the Codex Committee on Food Additives in the preparation of such lists (see paras 208-210, ALINORM 71/31).

21. In discussing the desirability of harmonizing legislation on food additives on an international basis, the Executive Committee agreed that this was the aim of the Commission but that, in view of the fact that the work of the Codex Committee on Food Additives was not sufficiently advanced in this field, the establishment, at this stage, of Codex lists of food additives for submission to governments with a view to their acceptance as the basis of food additives regulations did not appear feasible. The Executive Committee considered, in this respect, that lists of food additives could probably not be complete in view of changing food technology and progresses in food chemistry. The Executive Committee also took note of the fact that the acceptance of general Codex lists of food additives would also be considered by some governments in the light of their national food policy relating to the use of food additives and other aspects such as the technological requirement for particular additives in the light of good manufacturing practices existing in those countries.

22. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that countries, which were not in a position to establish the safety or otherwise of food additives would find lists of food additives, fully referenced to publications of the Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives, recommended as safe or unsafe for use in food by the Commission, of assistance in drawing up regulations on food additives. In this connection, the Executive Committee was informed that, in response to Resolution WHA 23.50, WHO had set up a warning plan according to which governments were informed concerning developments of an urgent nature in the field of food additives. The Executive Committee also noted that the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives was publishing monographs on the efficacy of food additives. The Committee noted, furthermore, that the technological justification for the use of food additives in certain foods and their maximum level would be covered by Codex commodity standards elaborated by the Commission.

23. The Executive Committee agreed that the Codex Committee on Food Additives should draw up lists of classes of food additives as shown below which should be submitted to governments as advisory lists with the request that governments indicate

which additives were permitted in their national legislation, together with the specific food in which the additives were permitted and the levels of use. The Executive Committee further agreed that the drawing up of such advisory lists need not follow the Codex Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex standards and should be presented as follows:

- List A - Additives which have been cleared for use in food or given temporary clearance by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives.
- List A - Additives currently under consideration by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and/or the Codex Committee on Food Additives, the clearance of which by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives is pending; and
- List A - Additives which have been found to be unsafe for use in food by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives.

24. It was also agreed that the document containing these lists should include reference to the relevant reports and monographs of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives. In connection with List A, it would be made clear that while the additives listed had been found to be safe for use in food, this was without prejudice to the question of technological justification for their use. Specifications of identity and purity for additives on List A would also be submitted to governments for their acceptance in accordance with the Steps of the Procedure approved by the Commission at its Eighth Session.

International Referee Methods of Analysis with special reference to methods to determine pesticide residues

25 The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, which has the responsibility within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to elaborate Codex referee methods of analysis for pesticide residues, decided at its fifth-session to postpone the elaboration of such methods according to the Codex Procedure and to aim at the selection of suitable methods for the purpose of verifying compliance with Codex tolerances for pesticide residues (paras 137-142, ALINORM 71/24). This decision was reached in view of certain technical and other difficulties regarding the drawing up of standard methods of analysis for pesticide residues and also in view of the need for further detailed consideration by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and other international expert bodies of the subject of pesticide residue analysis.

26. The Executive Committee was informed that the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (a) had considered the question of standard methods to be adopted as "Codex referee" methods and (b) was of the opinion that it was desirable to leave it open to government authorities to select methods of analysis appropriate to (i) the nature of the dispute, (ii) available laboratory facilities and expertise, and also to take into account the rapid progress which characterized the field of pesticide residue analysis. It was considered by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting more important to specify "referee procedures of action", as it was thought to be impracticable to attempt to specify any method as a "referee method of analysis".

27. The representative of the region of the South-West Pacific drew the Executive Committee's attention to an apparent inconsistency between para. 1 of the General Principles for the Establishment of Codex Methods of Analysis (Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2nd edition) in which it is stated that Codex referee methods were "intended for use in case of disputes" and the introductory statement in

Recommended Codex Standards according to which such methods were "intended for use in case of international disputes". In the opinion of the representative of the region of the South-west Pacific the anomaly arose when the intended use of recommended Codex methods of analysis was considered in the light of the acceptance procedure of the Codex Alimentarius, since in accepting a Codex standard there was the implication that a government would undertake to apply the Codex referee methods whenever a dispute arose whether such a dispute had an international or national character.

28. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that a country when accepting Codex referee methods, undertook to use them in cases of dispute involving food moving in international trade. In this respect a "dispute" should be taken to mean dispute regarding all aspects of the analysis used in connection with imported food and involved the authorities of the importing country and the exporter or exporting country of the food. The Executive Committee agreed that it was not up to the Commission to influence national authorities regarding the choice of methodology for the settlement of national disputes. In this respect, it was noted that the acceptance of Codex referee methods did not preclude governments from using other methods of their choice for routine inspection and other control purposes. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that the term "other control purposes" did, in fact, include disputes at a national level.

29. In order to achieve a greater degree of flexibility in the choice of an analytical method for the settlement of disputes concerning foods moving in international trade, it was suggested that Codex referee methods should be intended for use only when the parties in dispute could not agree on a suitable method. It was also pointed out that all the above considerations could equally apply to methods of sampling, a field in which further work was required within the framework of the Commission.

30. As regards the problem facing the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (see para. 25 above) in trying to reach agreement on referee methods of analysis to verify the maximum levels for pesticide residues recommended by the Commission, the Executive Committee requested the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to examine how best it could proceed with the elaboration of such methods, including collaboration with international organizations such as IUPAC so that appropriate methods could be developed which might eventually be adopted as Codex referee methods for pesticide residues.

Boneless Meat

31. At its eighth session in July 1971, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, when discussing the programme of work for the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene, agreed that this Committee should also deal with the hygienic aspects of the international trade in boneless meat. The delegate of Austria proposed that, in addition to the hygienic aspects, the compositional aspect should be dealt with too, and proposed that the Codex Committee on Meat should elaborate a standard for boneless meat. The Commission, however, was of the opinion that the question of composition was a matter covered in commercial specifications and contracts between buyers and sellers and that there was no need, therefore a standard covering the compositional aspects of boneless meat (see para. 165 of ALINORM 71/31).

32. At the sixth session of the Codex Committee on Meat (formerly Sub-Committee I) in November 1971, the delegate of Austria again proposed that the Codex Committee on Meat consider elaborating compositional criteria for boneless meat. Of the 21 delegations present, 13 expressed themselves in favour of such a standard, whereas 5

were against. The Committee on Meat agreed to request the Commission to re-examine at its ninth session the decision which it had taken at its eighth session that work on boneless meat should be confined to hygiene (see para. 60 of ALINORM 72/17).

33. The representative from the South-West Pacific region supported by the representative of the region of North America and by one of the Vice-chairmen, Mr. Grange, reiterated that boneless meat in international trade was mainly used for manufacturing purposes and that the composition would thus be covered by the end product specifications laid down for the various processed meat products. It was further pointed out that so far no evidence of fraudulent practices in the trade in boneless meat had been brought forward and that in the report of the Codex Committee on Meat no new arguments had been put forward which would justify the Commission changing its decision. The representatives of the regions of Europe and Latin America were of the view that as the majority of the delegates present at the sixth session of the Codex Committee on Meat were in favour of having a compositional standard for boneless meat, this matter should be rediscussed by the Commission at its next session and that the Executive Committee should not take any position on the issue. Taking into account both points of view, the Executive Committee agreed to take no position on this matter.

Step 5 Standards for Cocoa Products and Chocolate

34. The Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate, at its ninth session, held from September to 1 October 1971, had advanced most of the standards for cocoa products and chocolate to Step 5 for consideration by the Commission at its ninth session in November 1972. It noted, however, that its tenth session had been scheduled for the spring of 1973. Thus, if the Commission were to decide, at its ninth session, to advance the standards to Step 6, the period of time between the ninth session of the Commission and the tenth session of the Committee would not be sufficient to enable comments to be obtained from governments on the standards, and to have them assembled in a working paper and subsequently sent out to governments in good time before the Committee session. The Committee had requested the Executive Committee, in its capacity as the executive organ of the Commission between sessions of the Commission, to authorize the Secretariat to seek comments on the standards in advance of their consideration by the Commission at its ninth session, but without prejudice to any action the Commission might take on these Step 5 standards.

35. In view of the circumstances described above and in the interest of advancing the work on the development of the standards, the Executive Committee decided, as an exceptional measure, to authorize the Secretariat to seek government comments on the standards so that, whether the Commission decided to advance them to Step 6 or return them to an earlier step, they could be discussed meaningfully by the Committee at its next session. This action would not affect the fact that the standards would have to be considered by the Commission at Step 5 at its ninth session.

Draft Standard for Table Olives

36. The Executive Committee had before it the report of the Joint Codex/IOOC Meeting on the Standardization of Table Olives, which had been held in Madrid from 13 to 16 December 1971 (document ALINORM 72/21). The Committee considered the points raised in paras 45, 46 and 47 of the report.

37. At the Joint Meeting, it had not been found possible to reach agreement on a minimum quality level for table olives which would be acceptable to all countries. Some delegations at the Joint Meeting stated that the minimum quality level laid down in the

standard was too low and that, therefore, the standard would not be acceptable in their countries. Other delegations pointed out that it was essential to retain the specific level laid down in the standard, in view of the fact that under the Codex Acceptance Procedure the standard also applied domestically. To enable both groups of countries to accept the standard, the Joint Meeting agreed that it was necessary to incorporate in the standard quality classes superior to the minimum laid down in the standard. Thus, the intention was that those countries which did not regard the Codex quality level as being acceptable could still accept the standard in respect of the higher quality levels. The two higher quality levels would correspond to the First Class and Standard. Class in the IOOC international trading standard for table olives, whilst the Codex quality level would correspond to the Market Class in the IOOC standard. It had been pointed out at the Joint Meeting that this was the first occasion on which a proposal had been put forward to include different quality classes in a Codex standard. It had also been pointed out that the general philosophy in the Codex was not to include quality classes in Codex standards. It was agreed at the Joint Meeting to seek the views of governments on this matter and also to have the matter examined by the Executive Committee in the light of the Acceptance Procedure of the Commission.

38. Three countries (Greece, United Kingdom and United States of America) had communicated their views in writing on this matter. Greece was in favour of incorporating the higher quality classes in an Annex to the standard. The United Kingdom was in favour of including in the Codex standard the more stringent tolerances of the higher quality classes in the IOOC standard, so as to enable countries to decide and to notify on acceptance which set of tolerances would be applicable to them. The United Kingdom was not, however, in favour of using distinguishing names which could be regarded as quality grades. The U.S.A. was not in favour of the multiple quality level approach in Codex standards and stated that this concept could defeat the basic principles of "full acceptance" under the Codex Acceptance Procedure and did not promote the harmonization of food standards on a world-wide basis. The representative of Africa informed the Executive Committee that Tunisia shared the views of the U.S.A.

39. After a full exchange of views, the Executive Committee agreed, taking into account the meaning of Acceptance as laid down in the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius, that it was essential to uphold the principle that Codex standards contained only one level of quality. At the same time, it was anxious to find a solution to the problem posed by the Joint Meeting. The Executive Committee agreed on the following formula. The Codex standard should include a notation which would, in substance, state (i) that the quality requirements of the Codex standard corresponded to the Market Class in the IOOC standard and (ii) that the two higher quality classes in the IOOC standard, which would be set out in an Annex to the Codex standard, were there for information purposes, but did not form part of the Codex standard. Some members of the Executive Committee were of the opinion that some countries which might not be able to accept the Market Class might make a deviation and accept only the higher quality classes in the Annex.

40. Taking into account that the standard had already been considered within the framework of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables at Step 4. and had subsequently been considered by the Joint Meeting in the light of further government comments, the Executive Committee agreed that the standard, when put before the Commission at its ninth session should be regarded as being at Step 5. It was also agreed that if the Commission decided to advance the standard to Step 6, the

notation referred to in paragraph 39 above should be included in the standard before seeking government comments at Step 6.

Edible Ices

41. The Executive Committee took note of the decision of the eighth session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe, which was to recommend to the Commission that a standard for edible ices should be elaborated on a European regional basis and that the responsibility for the elaboration of that standard should be entrusted to a Regional Codex Committee for Edible Ices, with Sweden as the Host Government (ALINOEM 72/19, para.9). The Executive Committee also took note of the viewpoint which had been expressed by the delegations of Denmark and the United Kingdom to the Coordinating Committee for Europe to the effect that, in principle, they preferred world-Wide standards. These delegations had drawn attention to the fact that the decision of the seventh session of the Commission not to proceed with the elaboration of a world-wide standard for edible ices had been based on information concerning international trade in these products which was no longer up-to-date. They had proposed, therefore, that Member Countries should be asked to furnish the ninth session of the Commission with the latest available information on international trade so as to assist the Commission in its deliberations on this subject.

42. The Executive Committee agreed that the Commission would be better informed on the proposal of the Coordinating Committee if it had before it up-to-date information on the international trade in edible ices. It therefore instructed the Secretariat to seek this information from governments and to make it available to the next session of the Commission.

FAO/WHO Food Standards Conference in Africa

43. The Secretariat informed the Executive Committee of the progress which had been made in relation to the selection of a suitable venue for the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Regional Conference in Africa. Taking into account the basic criteria which had been laid down at the eighth session of the Commission, namely maximum attendance from the African countries as well as available facilities and financial support, information had been sought from a number of countries through the FAO Country Representatives. These countries were the following: Cameroon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal and Uganda. All had replied except Cameroon and Ivory Coast. In addition, information had also been received from Zambia. Bearing in mind the financial and administrative problems, the most favourable replies to date appeared to be those from Kenya and Senegal in that order. A member of the Executive Committee stressed that a major factor which should be taken into consideration was the technical problem of communication.

44. The representative of Africa considered that in relation to the preparation for the Conference the problems of the African countries were so diverse that it would be best if they were approached on a sub-regional basis. African member countries should be asked to give information and available documentation on the infrastructure of their food control arrangements, including details of national food legislation. This information could be collected on a sub-regional basis and assembled and analysed by the the Secretariat in advance of the Conference. Dr. N.A. de Heer concurred with this viewpoint and stated that in his capacity as Rapporteur of the Conference he had already been in touch with some countries. He further suggested that the assistance of sub-regional organizations such as ASMO and ECA might be sought in relation to the planning of the Conference.

45. The Deputy Director of the Nutrition Division of FAO indicated his Division's willingness to assist in gathering information in those countries where they had current projects, e.g. Zambia and that use could also be made of their Sub-Regional Seminars on Food Control in order to collect information on systems of food control and national legislation. The Secretariat pointed out that it had already amassed a certain amount of information from various sub-regional organizations and that they considered that this information could be further supplemented with the assistance of the various FAO and WHO Country Representatives, Headquarters' Divisions and the FAO and WHO Regional Offices for Africa.

46. The Executive Committee agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a letter setting out the information already gathered on the Conference, together with its aims, and that this letter should be sent to all African member countries drawing their attention to the importance of the Conference. It was also agreed that notice of the Conference should be brought to the attention of the Seventh FAO Regional Conference for Africa, to be held in Gabon in September 1972 and that the Executive Committee would, in November, review the situation further.

Progress report on the use of the Spanish language at Codex Committee sessions

47. The Executive Committee had before it a progress report on the use of the Spanish language at Codex Committee sessions. The report indicated progress as follows:

(i) Brazil- " The Government of Brazil, which had undertaken to host the 1972 session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues had indicated that it would provide simultaneous interpretation facilities in Spanish, as well as in English and French. Taking this into account and bearing in mind the likelihood of a large attendance of delegations from Spanish speaking countries because the session would be held in South America, the Codex Secretariat had made a special effort, within the confines of the budget, to make the working documents for the session available in Spanish also.

(ii) Canada - The Government of Canada had provided simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, as well as in English and French, at the sixth session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling held in Geneva, on 28 and 29 June 1971. The Government of Canada would provide the same facilities at the seventh session of the Committee to be held in Ottawa from 5 to 10 June 1972 and this information had been included in the letter of invitation to the session. In addition, the working documents for the session were being made available in Spanish at the expense of the Government of Canada.

(iii) Germany, Federal Republic - The Federal Republic of Germany had provided simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, as well as in English and French, at the sixth session of the Codex Committee on Meat, held in Kulmbach from 1 to 5 November 1971. Notice of intention to provide simultaneous interpretation in Spanish at that session had been included in the letter of invitation.

(iv) Hungary - The Government of Hungary had recently assumed responsibility for hosting the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. It was understood that, in addition to providing simultaneous interpretation facilities in English and French, the Hungarian Government was prepared to give sympathetic consideration to providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish also, if there was a need for these facilities, at the seventh session of the Committee to be held in Budapest in September 1972.

(v) New Zealand - The Government of New Zealand, which had recently assumed responsibility for hosting the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene, had provided simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, in addition to English and French, at the first session of the new Committee held in London from 10 to 15 April 1972. This information had been included in the letter of invitation to the session. Taking into account that the New Zealand Government had been prepared to bear the cost of providing interpretation facilities in Spanish; that the urgent need for work in the field of meat hygiene, resulting ultimately in the establishment of a Codex Committee devoted to this subject, had first been stressed in the Council of FAO by South American meat exporting countries; that there was a likelihood that a significant number of Spanish speaking countries would be represented at the session, the Codex Secretariat had made the working documents for the session available in Spanish also. /It was understood, however, that the Government of New Zealand would be prepared to bear the cost of providing the working documents in Spanish at the second and any ensuing sessions of the Committee.

(VI) Norway - The Government of Norway made some important documentation available in Spanish, at its own expense, for the sixth session of the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, held in Bergen in October 1971.

(vii) Switzerland - The delegation of Switzerland had stated at the eighth session of the Commission that the Government of Switzerland would be prepared to provide simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, in addition to English and French, at sessions of the Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate, provided that a minimum of two Spanish speaking delegations expressed their intention to attend the sessions at least two months prior to the sessions. As only one delegation from a Spanish speaking country (Venezuela) had attended the last (ninth) session of the Committee held in Neuchâtel from 27 September to 1 October 1971, simultaneous interpretation facilities in Spanish were not provided at the session.

(viii) United Kingdom - The Government of the United Kingdom had indicated that when the Codex Committees on Sugars and Fats and Oils would be re-convened, it would in principle continue the practice of providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, in addition to English and French, if requests were received from Spanish speaking countries.

(ix) United States of America - The Government of the United States of America had indicated that it would provide simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, as well as in English and French, at the 1972 sessions of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene and the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.

48. The Executive Committee noted with satisfaction the progress recorded in para. 47 above. These facilities would encourage participation of Spanish speaking countries in the Codex Committees concerned. The Executive Committee expressed the hope that the governments responsible for hosting the remaining Codex Committees would be able to respond equally favourably to the recommendations of the Commission at its eighth session (ALINORM 71/31, para. 258), so that in the future facilities in Spanish would be provided at all Codex Committee sessions. The Executive Committee also noted that the Secretariat had made successful efforts, within the confines of the budget, to make as much documentation as possible available in Spanish over and above the documentation in the ALINORM series, which constituted the major part of Codex documentation and which had always been available in Spanish. It was noted, however, that there was a limit to what the Secretariat could do in this regard in respect of the

current biennium. The representative of the region of North America indicated that to-date no Spanish speaking countries had indicated their intention of sending representatives to the seventh session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling to be held in Ottawa from 5 to 10 June 1972. He hoped that Spanish speaking countries would be represented at the session since arrangements to engage Spanish interpreters had been completed sometime ago. He stressed the need for Spanish speaking countries to indicate well in advance of the session their intention of sending representatives. Mr. G.R. Grange made a similar point and stressed that, if Spanish speaking countries were not adequately represented at sessions for which interpretation facilities in Spanish had been provided, it would be difficult to convince the authorities concerned of the justification for continuing the provision of these facilities.

49. The Executive Committee expressed the hope that, in the budget estimates for the 1974/75 biennium, it would be possible to provide sufficient funds to enable the Secretariat to comply with the recommendation of the Commission in para. 258 of the Report of the Commission's Eighth Session.

Budget for 1972/73

50. The Executive Committee noted that the governing bodies of FAO and WHO had approved the proposed budget which had been placed before the Commission at its eighth session. The governing bodies had approved a programme increase in respect of publications and documents to enable the printing of Step 9 standards adopted by the Commission at its eighth session. The other increases in the approved budget had been attributable to cost increases common to FAO and WHO.

51. The Executive Committee further noted that the Directors-General of FAO and WHO had decided that in future all Step 9 standards and Codex standards should be published as priced publications at a nominal charge of \$1 per copy. The Executive Committee was informed of the quota, free of charge, which would be made available to Member Governments of FAO and WHO in accordance with the formula established by the FAO Conference. Additional copies could be purchased by governments at a discount of 50%.

52. The Executive Committee further noted that approval had been given for the holding of an FAO/WHO Food standards Conference for Africa in 1973 and tentative approval, as part of a medium-term programme, had been given to the holding of a similar conference in Asia in 1975. The Executive Committee further noted that the holding of all Codex sessions proposed by the Commission for 1972/73 had been approved by the FAO Conference.

FAO/WHO Food Additives Conference

53. The Executive Committee enquired what progress had been made concerning the arrangements for the holding of a proposed FAO/WHO Food Additives Conference. The Committee was informed that the FAO Conference had approved a budgetary provision for this Conference in the 1972/73 budget of the Nutrition Division. The representative of WHO informed the Executive Committee that WHO had under consideration a request to the Executive Board (WHO) to approve a budgetary provision for the conference in respect of the 1974 budget of WHO.

16th FAO Conference

54. The Executive Committee noted that the FAO Conference at its 16th Session had agreed with the recommendation of the Commission that it be left to the

Commission to judge when, it would be appropriate to consider further any amendment to Rule VI.3 concerning the elaboration of regional standards. The Executive Committee further noted that the FAO Conference had expressed its satisfaction at the fact that the Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products had fully brought into line its procedures with those of the Commission

FAO Nutrition Division Activities of Interest to the Commission

55. The Executive Committee noted with satisfaction the rôle of the FAO Nutrition Division, Food Control, standards and Additives Section in the fields of:

- (a) assisting developing countries to set up or strengthen their food control setup for consumer protection and development of trade;
- (b) organizing training courses and seminars in different aspects of food control;
- (c) evaluation of food additives and contaminants;
- (d) preparations for the Stockholm Conference in the field of control of food contamination.

56 It was further informed of the Division's activities in the fields of food science, food consumption surveys, dietary habits and the proposal to set up a Lord Boyd Orr Nutrition Library which would provide a special section on matters of special interest to the Codex Programme. Information on food legislation, standards, food additives, pesticide residues would be disseminated by means of a Food and Nutrition Newsletter each quarter consisting of contributions on these subjects from FAO and outside scientists and experts.

57 As all the above work of the Nutrition Division was intimately linked with the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Committee felt that there should be a very close collaboration between the two and, in fact, any strengthening of the former will mean the strengthening of the Commission's activities. The Committee laid the greatest stress on the need for improving the food control at a national level in developing countries to protect the consumer, facilitate trade and make their acceptance of recommended Codex standards meaningful.

FAO Legislation Branch Activities of Interest to the Commission

58. The Executive Committee was also informed of the work carried out by the FAO Legislation Branch in the field of food legislation of interest to the Commission, notably the dissemination of legislative information in the form of various publications, research studies and the preparation of draft legal enactments to assist developing countries in drawing up specific regulations.

59. The Executive Committee noted with satisfaction the work carried out by the Legislation Branch and expressed the view that this service might require to be strengthened so as to be in a better position to respond to requests for information and ad-vice concerning food legislation.

World Health Organization Activities of Interest to the Commission

60. The Executive Committee was informed of the association of WHO with the work of the International Project in the Field of Food Irradiation. A brief description of the project's protocol for wholesomeness testing was presented. In addition, the interest of WHO in strengthening the association with FAO/WHO food colour reference laboratories and with its interest and support in developing a training course in pesticide residues were cited. A copy of a report of the Joint FAO/Who Food Standards Programme

prepared for the 47th session of the WHO Executive Board was distributed to the Executive Committee.

U.N. Conference on the Human Environment, 1972

61. The Executive Committee received a report from the Nutrition Division of FAO on the proposal developed jointly by FAO and WHO in consultation with IAEA on the identification and control of food contamination for the UN Secretariat of the UN Conference on Human Environment to be held in Stockholm, during June 1972.

62. The Executive Committee was in general agreement with the proposals made by FAO/WHO, and considered that two of these proposals had a special significance to the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Executive Committee agreed that:

- (a) at the national level, there was an urgent need to set up or strengthen food control systems, particularly in developing countries not only for general consumer protection but also to make the acceptance of the recommended Codex standards meaningful, and
- (b) at the international level, it was desirable to establish a system which would enable the collection, evaluation and dissemination of statistically valid and comparable data concerning the extent and level of food contamination in different parts of the world affecting food supplies and health of man. Such a system of international monitoring and data retrieval could only be based on national monitoring programmes and hence the need for priority to encourage, and where necessary, assist national authorities in setting up such programmes. The evaluation of data at an international level would be an integral part of the system, and the Commission would play an important rôle in view of its unique machinery for acceptance of limits of contaminants in food at an international level.

63. The Executive Committee noted that, while the work of the OECD in the field of environmental contaminants was more of a regional nature and did not include their toxicological evaluation per se, the monitoring proposals developed by FAO/WHO were more specifically for food contamination at a global level and provided for the evaluation of data by the existing relevant Joint Expert Committees of FAO/WHO and IAEA, as an important element in that system. The Executive Committee stressed the need to avoid duplication of efforts and also suggested that it would be worthwhile to exchange relevant data between different monitoring programmes such as those concerned with monitoring of food contamination and the general environment - air, water, etc.

64. The Executive Committee noted that the United Nations Conference on Human Environment to be held in Stockholm in June 1972 would very likely attach great importance to the subject of control of food contamination and to the role which the Codex Alimentarius Commission can play in accelerating the establishment of the necessary infrastructure in this regard in the developing countries, and the Food Standards Conference in Africa could discuss this.

Proposed Synopsis of Work of International Organizations in the Field of Food Standards

65. The Executive Committee examined a report prepared by the Secretariat on the question of preparing a synopsis of work being done by other international organizations in the food standards and related fields. The Executive Committee concluded that in view of the present work programme of the Commission and its priorities of work, the

Secretariat should not proceed at this time with the preparation of such a synopsis. The Executive Committee requested that the Secretariat, from time to time, make available to Members of the Commission such information on the activities of other organizations as seemed appropriate to any subject which the Commission might have under consideration and propose to include in its programme of work or which might be of general interest to the Members of the Commission.

Problems Raised by the Appearance of Non-Conventional Food Products on the International Market

66. In the light of a working paper prepared by Dr. M.L. Debatisse, the Committee considered the problems raised by the appearance of non-conventional foods on the international market and of their likely interest to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Committee took note of the rapid development in the trade in non-conventional foods, namely meat and dairy products¹ substitutes, sugar substitutes and synthetic citrus drinks and considered the possible implications these products had for the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

67. The Committee discussed in particular the problems which the "novel" foods might pose with regard to informing the consumer and protecting his health. The Committee was informed that the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses had already undertaken some work with regard to special products falling within its terms of reference and that the Joint FAO/WHO/UNICEF Protein Advisory Group (PAG) was studying the nutritional and toxicological aspects and the health implications - mainly on children - of non-conventional foods.

68. The representative of North America informed the Committee that in his opinion the interest of the consumer was, at present, largely protected by various provisions of the Recommended International General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.

69. The Committee agreed to await the outcome of the studies of the PAG on this matter and further agreed that subsequently the issue would have to be considered by the Codex Committee on Food Labelling. At the appropriate time the Executive Committee would re-examine this matter.

Codex Mark or Symbol

70. The Executive Committee received and noted an oral interim report concerning information which was being collected on the use of marks or symbols by other international organizations or trade associations. A number of such bodies had been approached. Replies had been received from the International Wool Secretariat, the International Institute for Cotton and the International Seed Testing Association. Replies were awaited from other bodies and it was hoped that a full report on this subject could be presented for consideration by the Executive Committee at its next session.

Appellations d'origine

71. The Executive Committee expressed its appreciation of the document which had been prepared by the Legal Office of FAO on the subject of "appellations d'origine" in relation to the work of the Commission. The Executive Committee considered that this subject would need to be further considered by the Executive Committee at its next session and requested that in the meanwhile the Secretariat should make copies of the document available to the Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products for information.

Working Group on Temperature Problems - Quick Frozen Foods

72. The Executive Committee considered a proposal for the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods to hold a meeting of a technical working party on temperature problems during transport, storage and distribution of quick frozen foods. The Executive Committee took note that the purpose of this working group would be to enable technical experts to discuss in detail these problems and to try and expedite the work of the Joint Group, particularly in connection with the proposed Draft Code of Practice for the processing and handling of quick frozen foods. It was noted that the Secretariat had pointed out to the Joint Group that as this was an unscheduled meeting, both FAO and WHO would have budgetary difficulties in servicing such a meeting.

73 The Executive Committee agreed that such a meeting, open to all Members of the Commission, could be held and that all participants should be informed that for budgetary reasons there would be strictly limited facilities available. However, the Executive Committee emphasized that the meeting should be held only if adequate information and working documents would be available in order that the meeting should be productive and assist the Group of Experts to proceed with the consideration of these matters. The Executive Committee further emphasized that the holding of this meeting should in no way be considered as constituting a precedent.

Memorandum of Professor E.J. Bigwood on the Progress of Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

74. The Executive Committee considered a memorandum from Professor E.J. Bigwood, Director of the Centre de Recherches sur le Droit de l'Alimentation in Brussels, concerning the concept of a food standard. The memorandum suggested that less detailed standards for foods should be elaborated, which would deal mainly with compositional aspects. Other provisions of standards, such as those dealing with hygiene, weights and measures, labelling, analysis and sampling, should be dealt with elsewhere in appropriate texts of general application to foods. In the author's opinion, very detailed and elaborate standards would be likely to lead to acceptances with many reservations.

75. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that the format and content of standards being elaborated by the Codex Committees reflected in the main the current practice of a number of governments concerning national standards and regulations. While recognizing the interest Professor Bigwood had shown in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Executive Committee agreed not to advise, for the time being, any modifications in the format and content of Codex standards. The Executive Committee was informed that the Government of France was intending to make proposals to the Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products regarding the elaboration of a text which would contain provisions common to certain processed fish products. This might lead to a need to elaborate less detailed individual standards which would contain only those provisions specific to the product concerned. The Executive Committee agreed that this approach might prove to be a practical one and could if necessary be a topic for consideration at a future session of the Codex Committee on General Principles.

Progress Report on Acceptances of Recommended Codex Standards

76. The Executive Committee had before it document CX/EXEC 72/18/2 and Addendum which set out the positions of twenty-four countries as at 30 April 1972 in regard to the

acceptance of the forty-two Recommended Codex Standards which had been sent to governments for acceptance to date. The countries concerned were Argentina, Bahrain, Bolivia, Cameroon, F.R., Central African Republic, China (Taiwan)¹, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Monaco, Morocco, Philippines, Portugal, Sudan, Rep. of, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Yemen, People's Rep. of, and Rep. of Zaire. Many of the countries listed, a significant number of which were developing countries, had indicated that they gave Full Acceptance to the standards. Others had given Target Acceptance to several of the standards and a number had given Acceptance with Minor Deviations. In connection with Acceptances with Minor Deviations, the Secretariat stated that some of the deviations appeared to be based on a misunderstanding and could probably be resolved by way of correspondence between the Secretariat and the country concerned. The Executive Committee did not enter into a discussion on the substance of the replies received, for the reasons indicated hereafter, but it agreed that, in presenting a progress report on acceptances to the Ninth Session of the Commission, the Secretariat should set out the position on a standard-by-standard basis rather than on a country-by-country basis.

¹ See paragraph 5 of this Report.

77. The Executive Committee opened its discussion on this item by considering what the Commission had decided at its eighth session (para. 22 of ALINORM 71/31) and what the Executive Committee, at its 17th session, had recommended to the Commission (para. 11 of Appendix II of ALINORM 71/31). The Executive Committee had been entrusted with two basic tasks by the Commission (i) to advise the Commission whether, in its view, a given Recommended Codex Standard should be published in the Codex Alimentarius, and (ii) to examine the problem of what criteria should be applied for determining whether a deviation seated to be minor, was, in fact, minor.

78. Thus, as regards the first point mentioned above, the question before the Executive Committee was whether, in the light of the replies received to date, it was appropriate for the Executive Committee to recommend to the Ninth Session of the Commission that any of the Recommended Standards sent to governments for acceptance should be published in the Codex Alimentarius. The Executive Committee recognized that no criteria had, as yet, been established on which to base a recommendation to the Commission that a given Recommended Codex standard should be published in the Codex Alimentarius. Step 10 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards simply stated that "the Recommended Codex standard will be published in the Codex Alimentarius as a world-wide Codex standard when the Commission determines that it is appropriate to do so in the light of the acceptances received" While the Executive Committee expressed its satisfaction at the replies received from governments (see Appendix to this Report), it was nevertheless clear to the Executive Committee - and no member of the Committee dissented - that, even in the absence of any criteria, there was no case, at present, for recommending to the Commission that any of the Recommended Standards should be published in the Codex Alimentarius.

79. The Executive Committee re-examined the concept of Acceptance with Minor Deviations. Attention was drawn to the fact that the countries which had given Acceptance with Minor Deviations had made it clear that even though a product might be fully in conformity with the relevant Recommended Codex Standard, it would not be permitted to circulate freely in the country giving this form of acceptance unless it also complied with the minor deviations stipulated in the country's reply. It mattered little whether or not the deviation was minor; the fact was that unless the deviation was complied with the product could not be distributed in the

country concerned under the name and description laid down in the relevant Recommended Codex Standard. On the basis of the replies received to date, it could reasonably be expected that many countries would take deviations of one kind or another. Taking into account that there were now 96 Members of the Commission and that 42 Recommended Codex Standards had been sent out to governments for acceptance, with more to follow shortly, it was obvious that the number of deviations could be considerable and that the task of reviewing them - not to speak of the task of determining whether in fact they were minor - would be complicated and considerable. Under the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius, the task of recognizing deviations as being minor was a matter for the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Apart from the fact that it was obvious that the Commission could not itself physically undertake this task, the Executive Committee considered that, even if the Commission could, it would not be productive to determine whether in fact a deviation was minor, since in all probability, it would have to be complied with, whether it was "minor" or "major". The point was made that essentially a government should be requested to furnish the following information in relation to any given Recommended Codex Standard:

- (1) Has the government a national standard for the commodity covered by the Recommended Codex Standard?
- (2) Is the national standard the same in all respects as the Recommended Codex Standard insofar as substance is concerned?
- (3) If the national standard is not the same, in what respects does it differ from the Recommended Codex Standard?
- (4) If the product meets the Recommended Codex Standard, will it be permitted to be distributed freely in the country concerned or must the product meet deviations from the Recommended Codex Standards in order to gain entry?

80. The Executive Committee recognized that, at the time when this concept was established, it was hoped that this form of acceptance would enable many countries, which would not be in a position to give Full Acceptance, to give acceptance which would not be too far removed from Full Acceptance. It was thought, at the time, that without the qualification "minor", this form of acceptance might prove to be so liberal that it would lack the stimulus to encourage governments to bring their standards into line with the international standards. The Executive Committee considered now that the weight of this argument was more than counter-balanced by the weight of the facts as illustrated in government replies to date, the magnitude of the task of reviewing deviations coupled with the difficulty of laying down criteria for determining what constituted a minor deviation, which could well vary depending on whether one was examining deviations as an economist, a hygienist, a toxicologist, etc. The Executive Committee agreed that any amendment of this form of acceptance would have to be such as would encourage acceptances, but would not, at the same time, be such as to open the door to acceptances which, in reality, might well be regarded as non-acceptances. Much depended on the nature of the deviation. A deviation relating to the definition of the product would seem to be tantamount to a non-acceptance. A deviation relating to essential composition and quality factors could also, perhaps, be tantamount to a non-acceptance. On the other hand, a deviation in connection with the use of food additives or in connection with labelling might well be regarded as permissible within the framework of acceptance. It might well be, therefore, that any deviation to some portions of standards might constitute non-acceptance in reality. The point was also made that a deviation could be invoked for trade purposes, thus constituting a barrier to trade.

81. The Executive Committee considered the position of the developing countries. A number of developing countries had given Full Acceptance, but there was a question of whether they had the means of implementing this form of acceptance. The Executive Committee emphasized the importance of informing the newer members of the Commission, especially those countries which were establishing food control arrangements for the first time to implement Codex standards, what would be the full implications of the various forms of acceptance open to them under the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius. The Executive Committee thought that the Secretariat should do as much as possible to assist and advise these governments when considering which form of acceptance to give to the standards. Dr. N. de Heer thought that where a number of countries in a region all had deviations in common, it might well be desirable to amend the standard accordingly and have a regional standard for the commodity concerned. In this connection, the representative for Latin America stressed that the multidisciplinary nature of the subject matter of Codex standards and their far-reaching implications concerning development and trade was a matter of paramount interest to those countries wishing to develop their food industries and exports. He thought therefore that the Commission and the Secretariat should consider how best to assist these developing countries

82. The Executive Committee stressed that experience over the years since the Commission was set up had led it to believe that the time had come to re-examine the Acceptance Procedure. In view of the difficulties connected with Acceptance with Minor Deviations, the Executive Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission that a meeting of the Codex Committee on General Principles be convened to re-examine the Acceptance Procedure, as discussed above. The Executive Committee emphasized that the aim of the Food Standards Programme was to achieve international harmonization of food standards in the interest of protecting the health of consumers and of facilitating international trade. The Executive Committee also recommended that the Codex Committee on General Principles should examine Step 10 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of World-Wide Codex Standards, with a view to developing criteria which might be suitable for determining when it would be appropriate to recommend to the Commission that a Recommended Standard be published in the Codex Alimentarius.

83. The Executive Committee stressed the need for ensuring that any modified form of acceptance would have to be such as to encourage the greatest possible number of acceptances. At the same time, the procedure would have to be such as to enable the Commission to say that it did not consider any given acceptance as, in fact, an acceptance. The point was made by one member of the Executive Committee that "acceptance" might not be the best term to use. The Executive Committee agreed, however, that what was important was that governments indicate what steps they were taking to implement the Recommended Standards. If a government could not implement every facet of a standard, the other Member Governments would wish to know what those exceptions were.

84. The Executive Committee further recommended that the Codex Committee on General Principles should also study the way in which minority opinion should be considered in subsidiary bodies of the Commission.

85. The Executive Committee stressed that it would be important that a good basic document be prepared by the Secretariat including the various ideas and suggestions of the Executive Committee on the above matters, as recorded in this report. The Executive Committee agreed that this document should be sent to governments for their observations,

which should also be placed before the proposed session of the Codex Committee on General Principles.

86. The Executive Committee instructed the Secretariat to follow up, as a matter of routine, any clarifications that might be necessary in connection with replies from governments on the subject of acceptance.

87 The Executive Committee noted that Recommended Standards for the following commodities would shortly be sent out to governments for acceptance: Tolerances for Pesticide Residues - 3rd series; Apricot, Peach and Pear Nectars; Orange, Grapefruit and Lemon Juices; Apple Juice; Tomato Juice; Quick Frozen Fillets of Cod and Haddock; Quick Frozen Fillets of Ocean Perch; Quick Frozen Strawberries; and Foods with Low Sodium Content.

Provisional Agenda for the Ninth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

88. The Executive Committee examined a draft provisional agenda for the ninth session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and approved it subject to revision by the Secretariat in the light of progress of work of the Commission's subsidiary bodies concerning standards at Steps 5 and 8. The Executive Committee considered whether it would be necessary for it to hold a session on Monday, 6 November and to schedule the next session of the Commission to commence on Tuesday, 7 November. The Executive Committee agreed that, in view of the probable heavy workload of the Commission's ninth session, the Commission should meet from Monday, 6 to Friday, 17 November. The Executive Committee briefly reviewed the items which, to its knowledge at this stage, would come before it for discussion at its next session, but concluded that these items were not such as to warrant the convening of a session of the Executive Committee immediately prior to the Commission's session. The Executive Committee agreed, however, that if in the meantime other matters requiring the urgent attention of the Executive Committee arose, a meeting of the Executive Committee should, if judged to be necessary, be held on the evening of Monday, 6 November.

Other Business

89. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Executive Committee to the fact that the Group of Experts on Standardization of Fruit Juices had differentiated between grapes of the "vinifera" type and grapes of the "Concord" type and that they had advanced the separate standards for vinifera type grape juice, single-strength and concentrated, to Step 8 of the Procedure. The Joint Group of Experts had requested the Executive Committee to consider whether the standards for single-strength and concentrated Concord and Concord type grape juices could be considered as having the status of Step 6 standards, in view of the fact that they had already been examined by governments as part of the former standards for single-strength and concentrated grape juice. A difficulty still outstanding was the need to find a suitable name in French for this product.

90. The Executive Committee agreed that these standards should be considered as being at Step 6 of the Procedure.

Proposal of the Coordinator for Europe that European Regional Standards be Developed for Salt, Vinegar and Eggs

91. The Executive Committee noted that the above proposal had been communicated to the Secretariat by the Coordinator for Europe. The proposal had not been considered by the Coordinating Committee for Europe. Having regard to Rule VI.3 of the Rules of Procedure of the

Commission, the Executive Committee agreed to advise the Coordinator for Europe that he should put his proposal before the Coordinating Committee for Europe for consideration.

COUNTRY POSITIONS AS AT 30 APRIL 1972 REGARDING
ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

Recommended Standard	Form of Acceptance as Indicated by Accepting Country			Acceptance given but not stated specifically to be Full Acceptance
	Full Acceptance	Target Acceptance	Acceptance with Minor Deviations	
General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (Ref.No. CAC/RS 1-1969)	Bahrain, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, People's Dem.Rep.of Yemen	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina, U.S.A.	Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal
International Tolerances for Pesticide Residues (Ref.No. CAC/RS 2-1969)	Argentina, Bahrain, Iran, Liberia, Monaco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem Rep. of Yemen	Cyprus, Israel		Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal
Canned Pacific Salmon (Ref.No. CAC/RS 3-1969)	Bahrain, Iran, Liberia, Morocco, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen	Cyprus	Argentina, Japan ¹	Bolivia, Philippines, Portugal
White Sugar (Ref.No. CAC/RS 4-1969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Peoples Dem.Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina	Hungary
Powdered Sugar (Icing Sugar) (Ref.No. CAC/RS 5-1969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem.Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina	Hungary
Soft Sugars (Ref.No. CAC/RS 6-1969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem.Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary
Dextrose Anhydrous(Ref.No. GAC/RS (7-1569)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan People's Dem.Rep.	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary

	of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Dextrose Monohydrate Ref..No. CAC/RS (8-1969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast. Rep. of Sudan, People's Den.Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary
Glucose syrup (Ref. No., CAC/RS 9-1969)	Bahrain Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast. Morocco. Rep. of Sudan People's Dem Rep. of Yemen Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary
Dried Glucose Syrup(Ref.No. CAC/KS 10-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep of Cameroon, Central African Rep.Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, people's Dem. Rep of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary
Lactose (Ref.No. CAC/RS 11-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Peopled Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus	Argentina	Hungary
European Regional Standard for Honey (Ref.No. CAC/HS 12-1969)	Bahrain, Iran, Liberia Monaco, Rep of Sudan people's Dem*Eepii of Yemen	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina	Bolivia, Philippines Portugal. 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 Tomato(Ref.No. CAC/Rs es 13-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep, of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary
Canned Peaches (Ref. Ho. CAC/R3 14-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African R&P., ivory coasts	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary, Israel

	People's Dem. Rep, of Yaneij Hep. of Zaire			
Canned Grapefruit {Reff No. CAC/KS 15-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon. Central African Rep, Ivory Coast, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary, Israel
Canned Green Beans and Wax Beans (Ref.No. CAC/RS 16-969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, central African Rep. Ivory Coast, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary
Canned Applesauce (Ref, No. CAC/RS 17-1969)	Bahrain Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast People's Den.Rep. of Yemen,Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary
Canned Sweet Corn (Ref.Ko, CAC/R 1-1969)	Bahrain, Fed.Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rap, of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary, Israel
General Standard for Fats and Oils not covered by individual standards (Ref. No, CAC/RS 19-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep . of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan! People's Dem Rep, of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad & Tobago (intention o passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Argentina	Hungary
Edible Soya Bean Oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 20-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon. central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan People's Dem. Rep. of Saire Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago (intention of passing to full Acceptance within two years)		Hungary
Edible Arachig oil (Ref No. CAC/RS 21-1969)	Sahrain, Fed Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad. and Tobago (intention of passing to full Acceptance within two years	Portugal	Hungary

	Zaire			
Edible Cottonseed Oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 22. 1369)	Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem.Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Argentina Portugal	Hungary
Edible Sunflower seed Oil (Ref.No, CAC/RS 23-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Den.Rep. of Yemen Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Portugal	Hungary
Edible Rapeseed Oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 24-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon Central African Rep Ivory Coast Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yenen, Rep* of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)		Hungary
Edible Maize Oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 25-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep.. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory coast, Rep of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep, of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad & Tobago {intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Portugal	Hungary
Edible Sesame ssed oil (Ref.NO. CAS/RS 26-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Hep.,I vory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep, of Yemen, Rep, of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)		Hungary
Edible safflower seed oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 27-19S9)	Bahrain, Fed. Sep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Portugal	Hungary
Lard (Ref.NO. CAC/RS 28-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem.	Cyprus, Trinidad & Argentina, Tobago (intention of Portugal passing to Full acceptance	Argentina, Portugal	Hungary

	Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	within two years)		
Rendered Pork Pat (Ref.No. CAC/RS 29-1969)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, ep, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem, Rep, of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Argentina, Portugal	Hungary
Premier Jus (Ref. No. CAC/RS 30-1969)-	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon., Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep- of Sudan, People's Dem Rep, of Yemen, Rep- of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Argentina, Portugal	Hungary
Edible fallow (Ref.No. CAC/RS 31-i969}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Trinidad a 'Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Portugal	Hungary
Kargarine (Ref. No. CAC/RS 32-1969	Bahrain, Fed. Rep, of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Trinidad &Tobago, people's Dem.,. Rep, of Yemen, sep, of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco	Argentina, Portugal	Hungary
Olive Oils (Ref. No, CAC/RS 33-1969	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan,, People's Dem. Rep of Yemen, Rep, of Zaire	Trinidad -and Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance within two years)	Cyprus, Morocco	Hungary
Mustard seed Oil (Ref.No. CAC/RS 34-1969}	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep. Ivory Coast, Rep of Sudan, People's Dem, Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco, 'Trinidad & Tobago (intention of passing to Full Acceptance Within two years)		Hungary
International Tolerances for	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed.	Cyprus Morocco		Hungary

Pesticide Residues (second series) (Ref. No CAC/RS 35-1970)	Rap. of Cameroon Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Quick-Froasen Guttred Pacific Salmon (Ref. No CAC/RS 36-1970)	Argentina, Bahrairi, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, Peoples Dem .Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			Hungary
Canned Shrimps or Prawns (Ref.No. CAC/RS 37-1970)	Bahrain Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast, Morocco, Rep of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire		Argentina	Hungary
General Standard for Fungi and Fungus Products (Ref. No. CAC/RS 30-1970)	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon., Central African Rep., ivory Coast, Morocco, Rep, of sudan People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			Hungary
Edible Dried Fungi (Ref. No. CAC/RS 39-1970)	Argentina! Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African Rep., Ivory Coast Morocco , Rep of Sudan, People's Den. Rep. of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire .			Hungary
European Regional Standard for Fresh Fungus "Chanterelle" (Ref. No. CAC/RS 40-197 0)	Argentina, Bahrain, Fed. Rep. Cameroon, Central African Rep. ivory Coast, Rep. of Sudan, People's Dem. Rep. of Ycsnen, Rep. of Zaire			Hungary
Quick Frozen Peas (Ref. No. CAC/RS 41-1970)	Bahrain, Fed. Rep. of Cameroon, Central African. Rep., Ivory Coast, people's			Hungary.

	Dem. Rep, of Yemen, Rep. of Zaire			
Canned Pineapple (Ref.No. CAC/RS 42-1970}	Bahrain, Fed Rep. of Cameroon, central African Rep., Ivory Coast, People's Dem.Rep. of Yemen, Rep of Zaire	Cyprus, Morocco		Hungary

¹ Japan has indicated that it accepts subject to certain conditions - appears to Secretariat to be Acceptance with Minor Deviations

Note: In addition to the twenty-one countries mentioned in this table, namely, Argentina Bahrain, Bolivia, Fed, Rep. of Cameroon, central African Republic, Cyprus, Hungary, Iran, Israel Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Monaco, Morocco, Philippines, Portugal, Rep. of Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, U.S.A. People's Dem. Rep. of Yemen and Rep, of Zaire replies were also received from Costa Rica and the U.S.S.R, but these two replies do not constitute acceptance at this stage.