

Final - 29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (a)

Class C – Primary feed commodities
Type 11: primary feed commodities of plant origin
Proposed draft groups 050, 051, 052

(CL 2019/01-PR)
(CX/PR 19/51/6)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

The EU acknowledges the work done by the eWG to harmonise and to check the internal coherence of various decisions taken by the CCPR in the period 2010-2018 on the revision of the classification of food and feed, in particular of the commodities of the three groups of Class C – Primary feed commodities.

The EU welcomes the new structure of the feed commodities with a differentiation in high and low water content and processed products. The EU proposes to distinguish between high and low water in terms of percentage of water content (e.g. low water content < 20% and high water content ≥ 20%). Moreover, the EU proposes to align the introductory description within Groups 050, 051 and 052, concerning the fact that MRLs should preferably be set and expressed on a “dry-weight” basis. For the purpose, the wording currently reported for Group 50 should be used.

The EU does not understand the benefits of separating grasses from cereal grains within Group 51 nor the need to distinguish between cool and warm grasses. However, since such separation will not pose a major impact in the EU, except for an increase in terms of

administrative burden, the EU does not oppose the proposal being made. The EU recalls that the term “grasses” is already attributed to Type 03. In case a new subgroup will be created a different name could be used such as “grasses for feeding only”.

29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (b)

Class D – Processed foods of plant origin

All types in Class D

Proposed draft groups in different types

(CL 2019/02-PR)

(CX/PR 19/51/7)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

On the revision of the classification of food and feed, in particular of the commodities of Class D “Processed foods of plant origin” the EU proposes the following additions.

Group 55 Dried fruits

As regards dried fruits, the EU notes that for several commodities consumption data are available and included in the IESTI. However, Codex Classification codes were not yet attributed. The EU proposes adding those fruits to the classification. See overview below.

Group 56 Dried vegetables

As regards dried vegetables, the EU notes that for several commodities consumption data are available and included in the IESTI. However, Codex Classification codes were not yet attributed. The EU proposes adding those vegetables to the classification. See overview below.

Dried Chili Peppers (HS 0444 Peppers, Chili, dried (*Capsicum* spp.)) are classified in the group of herbs and spices, subgroup 028I. In order to clarify that also sweet peppers are covered by this subgroup, the EU proposes to refine the existing entry as follows:

“Dried Chili Peppers, see HS 0444 Peppers, Chili, dried (*Capsicum* spp.) subgroup 028I”.

Group 57 Dried herbs

As regards dried herbs, the EU notes that for several commodities consumption data are available and included in the IESTI. However, Codex Classification codes were not yet attributed. The EU proposes adding those herbs to the classification. See overview below.

Group 58 Milled cereal products (early milling stages)

The EU proposes that some explanation is added to describe the cereal grain milling fractions for the sake of clarity.

Group 069 Miscellaneous derived edible products of plant origin

The EU notes that the spelling of the processed products DM 1215, DM1216 and DM0715 is inconsistent with the unprocessed product SB 0715 (i.e. “cacao” should be used instead of “cocoa”).

Group 79 Miscellaneous processed foods of plant origin

The EU supports the deletion of hops from the group of Dried herbs (Group 57) and its re-classification in Group 79.

Overview of commodities proposed to include in Class D

Add to group	Commodity	Proposed code
055	Banana, dry	DF 0327
	Blackberries, dry	DF 0264
	Blueberries, dry	DF 0020
	Carambola, dry	DF 0289
	Cranberry, dry	DF 0265
	Litchi, dry	DF 0343
	Mango, dry	DF 0345
	Nectarine, dry	DF 0245
	Papaya, dry, candied	DF 0350
	Pear, dry	DF 0230
	Persimmon, Japanese, dry	DF 0307
	Pineapple, dry	DF 0353
	Raspberries, red, black, dry	DF 0272
	Strawberry, dry	DF 0275
	Subgroup of Cherries, dry	DF 0013
Table olives, dry	DF 0305	
056	Asparagus, dry	DV 0621
	Beans with pods (<i>Phaseolus</i> spp) (immature pods and succulent seeds) , dry	DV 0061
	Broccoli, dry	DV 0400
	Cabbages, head, dry	DV 0041
	Carrot, dry	DV 0577
	Cauliflower, dry	DV 0404
	Celeriac (Turnip rooted celery), dry	DV 0578
	Eggplant, dry	DV 0440
	Fungi, edible, except mushrooms (mainly wild) , dry	DV 0449
	Goji berry, dry	DV 2704
	Kale (Borecole, Collards) , dry	DV 0480
	Leek, dry, dry	DV 0384
	Melons, except watermelon, dry	DV 0046
	Mushrooms (cultivated) , dry	DV 0450
	Onion, bulb, dry	DV 0385
	Parsley, turnip-rooted (Hamburg roots), dry	DV 0587

Add to group	Commodity	Proposed code
	Parsnip, dry	DV 0588
	Peas without pods (Pisum spp) (succulent seeds) , dry	DV 0064
	Peppers, sweet (incl. pimiento) (Bell pepper, Paprika), dry	DV 0445
	Potato, dry	DV 0589
	Spinach, dry	DV 0502
	Squash, Summer, dry	DV 0431
	Sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob) (kernels plus cob with husks removed), dry	DV 0447
	Sweet corn (whole kernel without cob or husk), dry	DV 1275
	Turnip, garden, dry	DV 0506
057A	Coriander leaves, dry	DH 3209
	Lemongrass, dry	DH 3233
	Tarragon, dry	DH 0749

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (c)

Transfer of commodities from Class D to Class C

(CL 2019/19-PR)

(CX/PR 19/51/8)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

The EU agrees that commodities should be included or retained in Class D and not transferred to Class C “also when a small part of the total quantity of a product is used as food and most of it is intended as animal feed”.

The EU does not express its support on the proposed transfer of commodities from Class D to Class C, as it needs more time to assess whether some of the items can reasonably be expected to be consumed as food.

29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (d)

Proposed table on examples of representative commodities for commodity groups in different types under Class C and Class D (for inclusion in the Principles and Guidance for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Group (CXG 84-2012))

(CL 2019/03-PR)

(CX/PR 19/51/9)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the proposed draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

The EU understands the difficulties to identify a representative crop for several groups, due to the broad diversity within crops. In addition, the EU has recommendations on the individual tables, as outlined below.

Table 7

The EU proposes to select the representative commodities for the feed items in line with the ones applicable to Group 020, as follows:

-“Forage of wheat or barley” for the group of “forage of wheat and barley and similar grains and grasses (including pseudocereals)”;

-“Forage of Rice” for the group of “forage of rice cereals”;

-“Forage of sorghum Grain” for the group of “forage of sorghum grain and millet”;

-“Forage of maize” for the group of “forage of maize cereals and sweet corn”;

-“Hay or straw of wheat or barley” for the group of “hay or straw of wheat and barley and similar grains and grasses (including pseudocereals)”;

-“Hay or straw of Rice” for the group of “hay or straw of rice cereals”;

-“Hay or straw of sorghum Grain” for the group of “hay or straw of sorghum grain and millet”.

The EU proposes to include “Alfalfa” in the list of the proposed representative commodities within Group 50A (products of legume feeds with high water).

Table 8

The EU can agree with the created subgroups and their representative crops in dried herbs and milling fractions analogous to the groups in primary food commodities of plant origin.

The EU proposes to increase flexibility within the footnote for representative crops for processed products in Class D to also be able to use a representative raw commodity in Class A. The relevant footnote could be re-drafted as follows:

“It is not possible to set a group-CXL for this group because of the broad diversity of crops. However, when a group contains a number of processed commodities originating from raw commodities from one (sub)group in Class A (primary food commodities), the representative commodity from that (sub)group in Class A can be used as a representative crop for the corresponding commodities in processed form.”

29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (e)

Impact of the revised types in Class C and Class D on CXLs

(CX/PR 19/51/10)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

The EU would like to point out that the proposed adjustments to the commodities may have an impact on the database.

29.03.2019

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (f)

Type on miscellaneous commodities not meeting the criteria for crop grouping

Proposed groups (including any possible impact of the new types on CXLs)

(CL 2019/04-PR)

(CX/PR 19/51/11)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

The EU can agree on this item.

European Union Comments

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

51st Session

Macao, P. R. China, 8-13 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7 (g)

Class B – Primary food commodities of animal origin Common definition of edible animal tissues for the establishment of MRLs of pesticides and veterinary drugs for compounds with dual uses as pesticides and veterinary drugs for use by CCPR and CCRVDF

(CL 2019/05-PR)

(CX/PR 19/51/12)

European Union Competence

European Union Vote

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the revision of the Classification of food and feed chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by the Netherlands in collaboration with the eWG of CCRVDF on definition of edible tissues chaired by Kenya and co-chaired by New Zealand for the preparation of the draft on the revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds.

In reply to the questions raised by the eWG, the EU has the following positions:

1. CCRVDF uses the term muscle, while CCPR uses meat. Can these terms be consolidated? If so, what is the appropriate term to use?

The EU is of the opinion that “muscle” is the appropriate term to use. This also corresponds to the terminology used in the EU.

The EU supports the definition of muscle as follows: “Muscle is the skeletal tissue of an animal carcass or cuts of these tissues from an animal carcass that contains interstitial and intramuscular fat. The muscular tissue may also include bone, connective tissue, tendons as well as nerves and lymph nodes in natural portions. It does not include edible offal or trimmable fat”. The EU proposes the following wording for the annotation “fat”: “for monitoring and regulatory purposes, muscle (including interstitial and intramuscular fat) is to be analyzed and the result compared to the sum of the [MRL for muscle × (1-fraction fat)] +

[MRL fat × fraction fat], based on a determination of the fraction of fat present in the muscle”.

2. Is the proposed consolidated edible offal definition acceptable: “Those parts of an animal, apart from meat from the carcass, that are considered fit for human consumption”?

The EU supports the proposed description. The EU notes that the term “meat” should be replaced if it is agreed to use the term “muscle”. Within the definition, the EU proposes using the term “skeletal muscles” instead of “meat from the carcass” to clarify that also hearts are covered by edible offal.

3. Should a consolidated edible offal hierarchical classification be used for CCPR and CCRVDF and how can this be accomplished?

The EU would welcome a consolidated classification to be used by CCPR and CCRVDF without prejudice to the current extrapolation rules. The EU acknowledges that in veterinary medicine studies contain more information, for instance on metabolism, compared to studies on pesticides. Also the administration of the substances may be different. Therefore, although extrapolation rules may differ, a common hierarchical structure should be envisaged.

4. Can animal extrapolation rules be developed for both CCPR and CCRVDF using representative animal edible offal tissues?

The EU welcomes the development of common rules. The EU however considers that in practice this may not always be feasible given the different circumstances for findings of veterinary medicinal products (administered to animals on purpose) and pesticides residues present in animal products resulting from feed. These specific circumstances should be reflected in the first place and extrapolation rules only harmonised if there no contradictions with those.

5. What is the best procedure to establish harmonized descriptors? Examples include different descriptors such as “fat”, “fat with skin”, “fat/skin” and “skin”.

The EU needs more time to decide on the appropriate descriptors. In particular, JECFA and JMPR should be consulted on the matter. As a preliminary comment, the EU notes that descriptors vary among animal species. For instance, for ruminants it would be appropriate to use “fat” as a descriptor, whereas for pigs and poultry also skin is relevant and the descriptor could be “fat with skin”.

6. Should honey be included in the Classification system as a miscellaneous commodity? If so, should honey be included in Class B (primary food commodities of animal origin) or Class E (processed food of animal origin)?

The EU supports the inclusion of honey in Class B as a primary food commodity of animal origin. It is however acknowledged that often residue definitions for honey are more likely to be similar to those of plant commodities. This would need to be taken into account when residue definitions are established.