

**Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables  
(28<sup>th</sup> Session)**

**12-16 September 2016**

**European Union comments on the**

**Matters Referred to the Committee by the Codex Alimentarius Commission  
and/or its Subsidiary bodies**

**Agenda item 2, CX/PFV 16/28/2**

**70th SESSION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (2015)**

*Mixed Competence  
Member States Vote*

The EU and its Member States do not see a need to develop an approach for the management of the work of CCPFV similar to that used by CCFH.

**47<sup>th</sup> AND 48<sup>TH</sup> SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (2015-2016)**

*European Union Competence  
European Union Vote*

The European Union (EU) would like to provide the following comments:

**Use of “emulsifier, stabilizer, thickener” and “xanthan gum” (INS 415) in food categories 14.1.2 “Fruit and vegetable juices” and 14.1.3 “Fruit and vegetable nectars”**

To the EU knowledge the technological need for emulsifiers, stabilisers and thickeners (E, T, S) for the mentioned food categories and their subcategories is very limited and **with the exception of INS 440 pectins used in certain specific fruit juices or nectars the use of E, S, T is not technologically justified in fruit juices, juice concentrates, nectars and nectar concentrates.**

Some juices or nectars need to improve their colloidal suspension stability and/or to improve or standardise viscosity. This applies in particular to pineapple and passion fruit juice and nectar. In contrast to other stabilisers or thickeners pectin is a natural component of raw

materials used for production of juices, nectars or their concentrates. Therefore, the use and addition of pectins does not have an impact on the indigenous characteristics of juices or nectars. Indeed, this is not the case for any other thickener or stabiliser which could be potentially used in juices or nectars for its functional properties. For example, the use of INS 415 xanthan gum leads to a viscous texture which is different and not characteristic to the original juice or nectar. In addition it could have an impact on the taste of juices or nectars as well. Therefore, the EU questions the technological need for the use of xanthan gum.

### **Technological justification on the use of food additives**

#### a) 04.1.2 “Processed fruit” of:

- antioxidants in processed fruit in general and the use of tocopherols (INS 307a, b, c), specifically in standardized and non-standardized foods for all subcategories.

The category 04.1.2 covers a very broad range of products and consists of 12 subcategories referring to 23 commodity standards/commodities; therefore, it might be quite complex to consider the request at the upcoming Committee session for all subcategories and standardized and non-standardized foods.

In general, the EU considers that the use of antioxidants and in particular tocopherols might be justified for many products falling under category 04.1.2 except for the following categories/foods: 04.1.2.1 Frozen fruit, 04.1.2.4 Canned or bottled (pasteurized) fruit, 04.1.2.5 Jams, jellies, marmalades, 04.1.2.6 Fruit-based spreads, and fruit compotes falling under the category 04.1.2.9 and all the commodity standards that correspond to the mentioned subcategories.

#### b) 04.1.2.2 “Dried fruit” of:

- acidity regulators (general use), and tartrates (INS 334, 335 (ii), 337) specifically, in products conforming to CODEX STAN 177-1991.

Dried fruit category is quite broad and acidity regulators might be needed for certain products. However, as regards the use of acidity regulators and tartrates in products conforming to CODEX STAN 177-1991 the EU would like to point out that the technological need for different functional classes and individual food additives was extensively discussed at CCPFV25 (see REP 11/PFV, paras 28-40) and the need for acidity regulators including tartrates was not identified. Instead, the Committee agreed only on the technological need for sulfites as a preservative/antioxidant and citric acid as an antioxidant. The EU is of the view that this outcome is still valid.

#### c) 04.1.2.3 “Fruit in vinegar, oil or brine” of:

- tartrates (INS 334, 335 (ii), 337) as acidity regulators in products conforming to CODEX STAN 260-2011.

The EU takes note that specific acidity regulators were listed in CS 260-2007 and since the last amendment in 2015 the standard refers to acidity regulators more in general. The EU could accept the use of tartrates in category 04.1.2.3.

#### d) 04.1.2.5 “Jams, jellies, marmalades” of:

- propylene glycol alginate (INS 405) as a thickener in products conforming to CODEX STAN 296-2009.

The EU takes note that CS 296-2009 refers to thickeners used in accordance with Table 3 of the GSFA. Table 3 offers a broad variety of thickeners and the EU is not aware of any specific functionality of INS 405 which could not be achieved by alternative thickeners with “ADIs not specified” listed in Table 3. Therefore, the EU considers that there is no need to amend CS 296-2009, and the request for the use of INS 405 propylene glycol alginate is not justified.

e) 04.1.2.6 “Fruit based spreads (e.g. chutney) excluding products of food category 04.1.2.5” of:  
- tartrates (INS 334, 335 (ii), 337) as acidity regulator in products conforming to CODEX STAN 160-1987.

The EU does not have any information whether the use of tartrates is needed/ justified in such specific products as mango chutney.

#### **Revocation of food additive provisions**

The EU concurs with the principle that food additives shall not be listed in commodity or regional standards without having specifications developed by JECFA. Therefore, the EU supports removing the provisions from the CCPFV standards for INS 228 potassium bisulfite, INS 515(ii) potassium hydrogen sulfate and INS 227 calcium hydrogen sulphite as suggested in paras 14 and 15 of CX/PFV 16/28/2.

#### **Consistency terms pertaining flavourings**

Generally, the EU supports the recommendation made by the CCFA48 to revise the text pertaining to flavourings to ensure consistency with the *Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008) **in those commodities/commodity standards in which the use of flavourings is referred to**. In addition, the revision should **reflect the limitations and restrictions** for the use of flavourings as laid down in the standards.

Such approach would be fully in line with the approach taken by the CCFA in the alignment exercise (e.g. when the meat standards were revised the general reference to the use of flavourings was inserted for those referring to flavourings, i.e. CS 89-1981, CS 96-1981, CS 97-1981 and CS 98-1981 but not to CS 88-1981 – see Appendix VII of REP14/FA; when the cocoa/chocolate standards were revised the restrictions for the use of flavourings were reflected in CS 87-1981, 141-1983 and 105-1981; see Appendix V of REP16/FA).

Therefore, such approach should be applied “mutatis mutandis” also on the standards for processed fruits and vegetables.

For example, the EU considers that **the revised wording for CODEX STAN 17-1981 should read as follows:**

“The flavourings used in products covered by this standard should comply with *the Guidelines for the Use of Flavourings* (CAC/GL 66-2008). Only those flavourings that do not imitate the flavour of apples are permitted at GMP.”