

U.S. Delegate's Report, 41st Session of the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU)

***Düsseldorf, Germany
November 24-29, 2019***

The 41st Session of the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) convened November 24-29, 2019 in Düsseldorf, Germany. Germany chaired the session attended by delegates from 73 Member countries, 1 Member Organization (the European Union), and 41 observer organizations. Dr. Douglas Balentine (U.S. Food and Drug Administration) headed the U.S. Delegation, assisted by Alternate Delegate Dr. Pamela Pehrsson (Agricultural Research Service), nine government advisors, and three non-government advisors. The Committee had an ambitious agenda, and the United States was successful in achieving its key objective on major agenda items.

HIGHLIGHTS

Review of the Standard for Follow-Up Formula (FUF):

- The Committee completed work on essential composition and labeling provisions for FUF for older infants and agreed to hold these provisions at Step 7 (not forwarding the text for final adoption pending completion of other provisions in the revised standard). Based on feedback from the Codex Committee of Food Labelling (CCFL), participants further discussed the proposed labeling provision prohibiting "cross-promotion" and agreed to replace it with alternative text, which now goes to CCFL for endorsement.
- The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft scope, definition, and labeling section for the [name of product] for young children to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) for adoption at Step 5 (allowing for another round of comments and review by the CCNFSDU at its next session), and to forward the labeling provisions to CCFL for endorsement. The draft standard is silent on the issue of whether these products may be considered breast milk substitutes (BMS), but includes a footnote noting that some countries regulate them as BMS.
- The Committee re-established the FUF electronic working group (EWG) to finalize the definition of product for young children and consider the report of the Joint Expert Meeting on Nutrition (JEMNU) on nitrogen-to-protein conversion factors for soy-based and milk-based ingredients used in infant formula and FUF.
- The Committee did not substantively address issues related to the structure of the standard or the inclusion of references in a preamble at this session.

Other agenda items:

- The Committee completed most of its work and agreed to advance the guidelines for Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Foods (RUTFs) for adoption at Step 5 by CAC43 (July 2020), to forward provisions for labeling to CCFL for endorsement, and to forward the food additives section to the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) for endorsement.

- The Committee agreed to recommend that CAC43 approve discontinuation of work on a claim for “free” of trans-fatty acids (TFAs) and on a draft definition of “biofortification.”
- The Committee agreed to continue work on Nutrient Reference Values-Requirements (NRVs-R) for older infants and young children, following the work program as described in the revised project document; to inform the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC) of the revised timeline for completion of work (2025); and to establish an EWG to develop general principles to guide in the establishment of NRVs-R for persons aged 6-36 months. The EWG will explore the most appropriate approach to derive NRVs-R based on analysis of the Daily Intake Reference Values (DIRVs) from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) / World Health Organization (WHO) (2004) and six Recognized Authoritative Scientific Bodies (RASBs), including the U.S. National Academies of Sciences.
- The Committee completed its work on establishing a framework for assessing the technological need for food additives; the framework will be published on the Codex website as an information document. The Committee will send a recommendation to CAC43 for adopting xanthan gum (INS 415) and pectins (INS 440) as thickeners in the Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CXS 72-1981); and inform the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) of the decisions and request CCFA to include xanthan gum (INS 415) and pectins (INS 440) in food category 13.1.3 “Formulae for special medical purposes for infants” of the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) (CXS 192-1995).
- The Committee will use the framework to consider the technological justification of other additives in infant formula and established an EWG to collect information from applicants on the following additives: low acyl clarified gellan gum, ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304); mixed tocopherol concentrates (INS 307b); and phosphates (INS 339 (i), 339 (ii), and 339(iii) and INS 340(i), 340(ii), 304(iii)).
- The Committee discussed a proposed framework for prioritization of its work and agreed to start using it on a pilot basis to assess its usefulness. A physical working group (PWG) will be convened prior to CCFSDU42 to consider new work proposals
- The Committee agreed to establish an EWG to develop a new discussion paper and project document on nutrient profiles, which will more clearly define the scope for developing general guidelines for the establishment of nutrient profiles for use in front-of-pack nutrition labeling (FOPNL).
- Methods of analysis were the focus of the “other business” agenda item. The Committee agreed to submit several methods to the Codex Committee on Methods and Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) for information, review, and/or endorsement.

The following paragraphs provide more detail on the issues discussed by the Committee. The full official report of the session is available on the Codex Alimentarius website: www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCNFSDU&session=41.

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda item 4: Review of the Standard for Follow-Up Formula (CODEX STAN 156-1987)

Agenda Item 4a: Description and Labelling for Follow-Up Formula (FUF) for Older Infants

The 2019 EWG, led by New Zealand and co-chaired by Indonesia and France, noted that it had conducted several rounds of consultations. The Committee recalled that the draft scope, description, and labeling for follow-up formula for older infants had been adopted at Step 5 by CAC42 and circulated for comments at Step 6. The Committee advanced these provisions to Step 7, short of final adoption.

The Committee acknowledged that CCFL had endorsed the labeling provisions with amendments, with the exception of the provision prohibiting “cross-promotion” (the last sentence of paragraph 9.6.4), and noted that it required further consideration.

Views were divided on the inclusion of the provision. Members and observers in support of retaining the text and the term “cross-promotion” expressed concern about practices that had a negative effect on the health of infants and young children, particularly in developing countries; some supported including a definition for “cross-promotion” from World Health Assembly (WHA) resolutions (WHA 63.14 and WHA 69.7 Add.1) and other WHO documents. These delegations also generally preferred referring to “labeling” rather than “label.”

Other delegations, including the United States, agreed with the intent to prohibit misleading labeling and referencing other products on labels, but noted that the use of the term “cross-promotion” should be avoided as it was not defined in Codex and different interpretations of the term could lead to confusion. These delegations also expressed the view that the scope of existing definitions could be beyond the mandate of the Committee and Codex. These delegations had varying views on whether to refer to “label” or “labeling;” the United States preferred “label.” During a break in the Plenary discussion, the Chair requested that the Committee consider alternative text proposed by Australia; several delegations, including one member organization (Helen Keller International), discussed the subject, and many reconsidered their original positions.

After lengthy discussion, and in the spirit of compromise, eleven (11) delegations (i.e., Botswana, Niger, Senegal, Mali, Switzerland, Kenya, Cambodia, Burkina Faso, Nepal, Norway, and Ecuador) that were originally in support of retaining the sentence on “cross-promotion” agreed not to use the term “cross-promotion,” and spoke in support of the Australian proposal, with additional support from 17 members (i.e., the United States, the European Union (EU), Canada, Peru, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Brazil, Cuba, Costa Rica, Argentina, and Nepal). Delegations that did not support this compromise included India, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tanzania. Further discussion clarified that the purpose of paragraph 9.6.4 was to avoid consumer confusion through clearer differentiation in labeling, and that intent of the new paragraph 9.6.5 was to prevent references to other products in FUF labeling for older infants. The United States also clarified its understanding that the product labeling cannot include numbers that refer to the other listed products, or pictures pack shots of them.

The Committee agreed to the following text:

9.6.4. *Follow-up formula for older infants shall be distinctly labelled in such a way as to avoid any risk of consumer confusion with infant formula, [name of product] for young children, or formula for special medical purposes intended for infants, in particular as to the text, images and colours used.*

9.6.5. *The labelling of follow-up formula for older infants shall not refer to infant formula, [name of product] for young children, or formula for special medical purposes intended for infants, including numbers, text, statements, or images of these products.*

The new text of paragraph 9.6.5 will be sent to CCFL46 (October 2020) for endorsement.

Agenda Item 4b: Essential Composition Requirements for Follow-up Formula for Older Infants and [Product] for Young Children)

Two points remained to be resolved by the Committee regarding issues with the sweetness of products: 1) a footnote to the provision for carbohydrates and 2) text on the allowed purposes for optional ingredients.

The EWG Chair (New Zealand) recalled that last year agreement was reached on other parts of the footnote for [name of product] for young children, including the limit for mono- and disaccharides and that sucrose and/or fructose should not be added. Some delegations, notably those from Europe, advocated additional text, expressing concern that these products could still be too sweet and contribute to preferences for sweeter foods and have negative health implications (e.g., obesity and dental caries). The United States (supported by Costa Rica, Argentina, New Zealand, and Canada) pointed out that additional text was not necessary because the footnote already limited mono- and disaccharides to no more than 2.5 g/100kcal, which based on the U.S. evaluation of carbohydrate content and relative sweetness, would ensure that the products would be no sweeter than breastmilk and cow's milk. The United States further clarified its preference for an option that would not require products based on non-milk protein (e.g., soy-based products) to be substantially *less sweet* than milk, which would render them unpalatable. The United States held the position that it would be appropriate for these products to be at least as sweet *but not more* sweet than milk-based products containing lactose.

Delegations generally agreed with these statements in principle, and reached a compromise to include the following statement: "for products based on non-milk protein, carbohydrate sources that have no contribution to sweet taste should be preferred and in no case be sweeter than lactose." The Committee also acknowledged the concern raised by the United States about the need for a method for measuring "sweet taste" and referred the issue to CCMAS.

The Committee discussed supporting text related to optional ingredients (paragraph 3.2.1). The EU pointed out that in addition to known ingredients that enhance or impart a sweet taste, there is considerable momentum to develop new, non-sugar ingredients in light of policies aimed at reducing sugar intake. In their view, while such ingredients might be useful to reduce sugar intake in adults, there may be negative effects for infants and young children. The Committee agreed to the following text, "Ingredients shall not be added with the purpose of imparting or enhancing a sweet taste of [name of product] for young children." The Committee agreed that work on outstanding points on the essential composition for [name of product] for young children had been concluded, to hold the essential composition requirements at Step 7 (short of final adoption, pending completion of other elements of

the revised standard), and that it would ask CCMAS whether any internationally validated methods to measure sweetness of carbohydrate sources for these products exist.

Agenda Item 4c: Proposed Draft Product Definition and Labelling for [Product] for Young Children

The EWG Chair (New Zealand) described the challenges faced in developing a recommendation for the name of the [product] for young children. In addition, delegations expressed differing views regarding whether these products should be considered breastmilk substitutes. The inclusion of the text “in order to contribute to the nutritional needs of young children” also was still under discussion as to whether it appropriately captured the potential role of such a product in the diets of young children. The Committee discussed the issue of the definition first, followed by the name and, after deliberation, arrived at decisions to move forward. The Committee also discussed the labeling provisions; specifically, the text that had already been agreed for FUF for older infants was adapted for [product] for young children.

Delegations were about equally split on whether the product for young children should be considered “a breastmilk substitute” (BMS). As the 2017 EWG supported excluding the text “as a BMS,” given that the nutritional requirements of the proposed standard were not developed to be nutritionally adequate as a BMS; that recommendation remained substantiated. Delegations that argued for its inclusion gave the rationales that, although not intended as a BMS, the observed function of these products in their regions should be considered, noting that these products are often marketed as BMS, that the WHO *Guidance on Ending the Inappropriate Promotion of Foods for Infants and Young Children* classifies these products as BMS, and some national regulations (mainly in low and middle-income countries) classify them as BMS. The United States (along with Thailand, Paraguay, Japan, Panama, Malaysia, Indonesia, and others) stated the view that the product is not a BMS and emphasized that the product is not nutritionally adequate to cover the nutritional requirements of children. The United States noted that it is misleading to describe the product as a BMS and could be harmful to the health of infants and children if it were perceived as such; the product is intended as an alternative to cow’s milk rather than breastmilk and to contribute nutrients that may otherwise be lacking in the diets of some young children.

In the spirit of compromise to reach consensus, the Committee agreed to remain silent on the issue of whether the product was or was not a BMS with the addition of a footnote to state the fact that “In some countries these products are regulated as breastmilk substitutes.” There was contention about this footnote. The Secretariat noted that it was preferable to set clear definitions without footnotes, but that footnotes have been used in Codex on occasion to find consensus and resolve issues around different usages of products in different jurisdictions. The United States recorded a reservation to the footnote, which is documented in the meeting report (paragraph 62):

“...noting that the use of footnotes, when it is difficult to reach consensus, has proven to be problematic in other committees, and given that a footnote does not reflect a conclusion by Codex but simply states that some countries regulate these products in a certain way at this time. In the U.S. view, the Committee had made significant revisions to the existing standards; Codex Standards should be forward looking and global in nature.”

In naming the [product] for young children, the EWG Chair noted that the EWG proposed many names, with none resonating as optimal. Some delegations raised concerns that if a decision was not made in this plenary, another year of EWG discussion would not be likely result in any better name options.

After lengthy discussion of multiple options, it was noted that Section 4.1 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods also provides the option to have more than one name for a product. The Committee agreed to compromise and include two names for the product: ‘Drink/Product for young children with added nutrients’ and ‘Drink for young children,’ with countries able to choose between these options.

The Committee concluded to advance the proposed scope, definition, and labeling sections to Step 5 for adoption by CAC43; to inform CCEXEC79 that the deadline for completion of work on the Review of the Standard for FUF would be CAC adoption in 2022; and to send the labeling provisions to CCFL for endorsement. In addition, the Committee reestablished the EWG, with the same Chair and Co-chairs, to finalize the definition by reviewing the additional text still in brackets ([‘which may contribute to the nutritional needs of young children’]); to consider the linkages between the definition and name; and to consider the report and options JEMNU provided in the nitrogen-to-protein conversion factors for soy-based and milk-based ingredients used in infant formula and FUF. This includes to what extent the JEMNU report needs to be considered in the revision of the draft standard/s for FUF for older infants and “Drink/Product for young children with added nutrients” and “Drink for young children.”

Agenda Item 4d: Proposed Draft Follow-up Formula for Older Infants and [Product] for Young Children

Although the United States was prepared for deliberation and movement on the remaining provisions under this agenda item, time constraints in plenary led the Committee to defer discussion to CCNFSDU42. The Chair also reminded the Committee that it had previously agreed that the structure (i.e., one standard with two parts or two separate standards) and the preamble of the standard(s) would be addressed after the completion of the other sections.

Agenda Item 5: Proposed Draft Guideline for Ready-to-use Therapeutic Foods (RUTFs)

The EWG Chair (South Africa) reported on the in-session meeting, which reached consensus on protein levels and quality and on the approach to additives, as described in [CRD 49](#). The Committee confirmed proposed language on protein in Section 6.2., stating protein should provide 10% to 12% of the total energy, and quality should be determined using Protein Digestibility Corrected Amino Acid Score (PDCAAS). The Committee agreed to adjust the language on quality to require a PDCAAS score of at least 0.9 and include language that allows the use of supplementary amino acids to achieve desirable PDCAAS of at least 0.9. The guideline also retained the provision that high quality protein will be achieved in formulations containing a minimum of 50% of protein from milk. The Committee agreed that only the food additives listed in Section 5.2.2 (Table A: Food Additives in RUTF Formulation) or in the Advisory Lists of Nutrient Compounds for Use in Foods for Special Dietary Uses Intended for Infants and Young Children (CXG 10-1979) may be present in RUTF. The Committee allowed for the presence of food additives in RUTFs resulting from carry-over from a raw material or other ingredient used to produce RUTFs, subject to conditions set out for carry-over in Section 4.1 of the GSFA (CXS 192-1995). The Committee increased maximum levels for calcium, phosphorus, and magnesium to offer enough of these key micronutrients to promote catch-up growth as part of management of children with severe acute malnutrition (SAM).

Agenda Item 6: Discussion Paper on Claim for “free” of *Trans*-Fatty Acids (TFAs)

Canada briefly summarized the history of discussions in the CCNFSDU on the proposed draft claim for “free of” TFAs and then outlined the approach taken in the discussion paper on risk management

options for the reduction of TFAs. Canada proposed that the Committee first consider the Codex risk management roles associated with Option C (prohibiting partially hydrogenated oils (PHOs)); Option E (mandatory declaration of TFA on food labels); and Option G (mandatory distinct declaration of PHO and fully hydrogenated oils in ingredient lists), as these would require amendments to existing standards developed by CCFL and Codex Committee on Fats and Oils (CCFO), which could be completed in a timely manner. Several members – including the EU, Russia, and Malaysia – supported options to set voluntary or regulatory limits on TFAs and/or to prohibit the use of PHOs in processed foods. The Committee agreed to discontinue work on the claim and inform CCFL and CCFO of the decision and the discussion of risk management options that may be considered in those committees.

Agenda Item 7: Proposed Draft Definition for Biofortification

In light of the conclusion of CCFL 45 that there was no need for a definition of biofortification for labeling purposes in Codex, the Committee considered the recommendation of CCEXEC77 – i.e., to clarify how a definition would be useful in the context of Codex work and to consider discontinuation of this work if no use was identified. Zimbabwe, the previous EWG Chair, and also speaking on behalf of the previous Co-Chair South Africa, introduced the history of the discussions, explained that extensive work had been undertaken, and said that the purpose of biofortification was to solve the problem incurred by micronutrient deficiency. Zimbabwe restated the importance of the definition for developing countries and proposed possible approaches for the use of a definition (e.g., in WHO documents and Codex commodity committees). After further discussion, the Committee concurred with the view of CCFL45 that a definition was not necessary. The Committee agreed to propose discontinuation of work to CAC43 and inform CCEXEC79 accordingly.

Agenda Item 8: NRVs-R for Older Infants and Young Children

The EWG, chaired by Ireland and co-chaired by Costa Rica and the United States, had considered Recommendations 3-6 from CX/NFSDU 18/40/10. However, the Committee discussed only age ranges, the location, and the application of NRVs-R for older infants and young children in Codex texts; and that the list of nutrients for NRVs-R should be established at plenary.

The Committee agreed that NRVs-R should be developed for persons from 6 months to not more than 12 months and persons from more than 12 months to 36 months (i.e., from the 1st day after the 1st birthday to day of the 3rd birthday).

Several members (including Canada, Australia, India, Bangladesh, New Zealand, Egypt, Singapore, Jordan, and the United States) expressed support for placing the NRVs-R in the *Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling* where other NRVs-R were already located, and expressed the view that NRVs-R should apply to general foods for young children. In contrast, other members (including the EU, Norway, Brazil and Costa Rica) supported putting the NRVs-R in four individual Codex texts for foods for special dietary uses. The Committee agreed that the general principles for the establishment of NRVs-R would be established in the *Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling* and that, once the NRVs-R were established, consideration should be given to how they were presented in the *Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling* in order to clarify to which foods they applied.

Canada and the United States intervened to include potassium on the list of nutrients for which NRVs-R should be established. With regard to protein, the United States supported prioritizing setting an NRV to provide information to help parents make informed and healthy choices; however, the EU disagreed

expressing concern that high protein intakes could lead to obesity. The Committee agreed to add potassium and gave protein a lower priority.

The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG to develop general principles to guide the establishment of NRVs-R for persons aged 6 to 36 months.

Agenda Item 9a: Mechanism/Framework for Considering the Technological Justification of Food Additives

The EU chaired a PWG that met immediately prior to the session to complete the work on establishing a framework for the technological justification of food additives in CCNFSDU standards, and to apply that framework to pectins (INS 440), xanthan gum (INS 415), and gellan gum (INS 418). The framework was completed and will be published as an information document on the Codex website (see Appendix VIII of REP20/NFSDU). The Committee agreed to forward the provisions for xanthan gum (INS 415) and pectins (INS 440) as thickeners in the Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CXS 72-1981) to CAC43 for final adoption. The Committee also agreed to request that CCFA include xanthan gum (INS 415) and pectins (INS 440) in food category 13.1.3 “Formulae for special medical purposes for infants” of the GSFA (CXS 192-1995).

However, the Committee was not able to agree on the technological justification for the use of gellan gum (INS 418) in infant formula. The United States supported the technological justification; however, the EU, Brazil, and Belgium sought further information. During plenary, the sponsor provided further information to address the questions raised; however, the Committee asked that the additive be considered again at CCNFSDU42 (November 2020) and that the sponsor provide more information on the advantage of the additive over currently permitted food additives.

The EU reminded the Committee of the decision of CCNFSDU39 to consider the technological justification of additives in the Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CXS 72-1981) which had not undergone special safety review by JECFA for infants under 12 weeks (see paragraph 143 of REP18/NFSDU). The EU proposed that the Committee initiate a review of technological justifications the additives included in the infant formula standard that had not undergone the additional JECFA review for use in foods for infants under 12 weeks. The EU recommended that the new framework be used, and that the process begin for additives with a numerical acceptable daily intake (ADI). Industry observers present at the meeting supported the proposal and expressed the need for sufficient time in order to allow them to consult with their members and generate the required information. The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by the EU and co-chaired by the Russian Federation, to collect information for low acyl clarified gellan gum, ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304), mixed tocopherol concentrates (INS 307b) and phosphates (INS 339(i), 339 (ii) and 339(iii) and INS 340(i), 340(ii), and 340(iii)) and provide recommendations to the Committee on the technological justification of each additive.

Agenda Item 9b: Alignment of Food Additive Provisions in CCNFSDU Standards with the GSFA

Germany introduced their document (CX/NFSDU 19/41/9) which provided recommendations for the alignment of the following six (6) commodity standards under the purview of CCNFSDU with the GSFA (CXS 192-1995):

- Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CXS 72-1981),
- Standard for Canned Baby Food (CXS 73-1981),
- Standard for Processed Cereal-based Food for Infants and Young Children (CXS 74-1981),
- Standard for Follow-up Formula (CXS 156-1987),
- Standard for Formula Foods for Use in Weight Control Diets (CXS 181-1991), and
- Standard for Formula Foods for Use in Very Low Energy Diets for Weight Reduction (CXS 203-1995).

The Committee agreed to forward the document (with minor corrections as noted in paragraph 171 of REP20/NFSDU) to CCFA for consideration and use by the CCFA EWG on alignment.

Agenda Item 10: Prioritization mechanism to better manage the work of CCNFSDU

Germany as host Secretariat introduced a proposed framework for prioritization of CCNFSDU work. Some delegations, including the United States, expressed some concern that the process should not be overly complex or burdensome. The Committee agreed to start using the framework on a pilot basis to assess its usefulness. The Committee will inform CCEXEC of the pilot process, as requested. Germany will chair a PWG prior to the next session to both refine and pilot the framework and to review proposals for new work. The United States supported this path forward.

Agenda Item 11: Discussion paper on harmonized probiotic guidelines for use in foods and dietary supplements

The Committee discussed Argentina’s discussion paper and determined that the proposal could be submitted in accordance with the prioritization mechanism (see Agenda Item 10) for consideration by the workgroup on prioritization. The Committee noted the offer of Argentina and Malaysia to prepare a revised proposal. The United States did not object to these developments.

Agenda item 12: Discussion paper on general guidelines to establish nutrient profiles

Costa Rica, speaking also on behalf of Paraguay and the United States, presented a discussion paper on guidelines to establish nutrient profiles. The United States supported moving the work forward and suggested that the EWG develop a project document that clarifies the scope and principles for developing guidelines on establishing nutrient profiles. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to have guidance in order to establish nutrient profiles for use in front of pack nutrition labeling (FOPNL) and that this guidance would be complementary to the work in CCFL on FOPNL.

The Committee agreed: to establish an EWG, chaired by Costa Rica and co-chaired by Paraguay, the EU and the United States, that will analyze the discussion paper presented this session and then develop a discussion paper and project document that defines the scope for developing general guidelines for the establishment of nutrient profiles for use in FOPNL. The EWG will also inform CCFL of the ongoing discussion in CCNFSDU and ask CCFL to what extent the work concerning nutrient profiles in CCNFSDU can support the work of CCFL on FOPNL.

Agenda item 13: Methods of Analysis in the Standard for Infant Formula and Formulas for Special Medical Purposes Intended for Infants (CODEX STAN 72-1981)

The United States conducted a productive in-session working group for this agenda item and made specific recommendations on the methods which formed the basis for the Committee's discussion and decisions. Several of the methods for dietary fiber and select vitamins and minerals will be submitted to CCMAS for technical review. There was no opposition to the recommendations.

Date and Place of the Next Session

The 42nd Session of the CCNFSDU is tentatively set for November 23-27, 2020. The location has not yet been officially announced.