

Recap of Public Comments Submitted to the

**National Organic Standards Board**

Fall 2014 Meeting

October 28-30    Louisville, Kentucky

Compiled by the staff of The Cornucopia Institute



**CORNUCOPIA**  
I N S T I T U T E



## How to Use This Document

For the benefit of National Organic Standards Board members, and other organic stakeholders, The Cornucopia Institute has endeavored to compile, as accurately and objectively as possible, a recap of all formal written comments pursuant to the **Fall 2014 NOSB meeting. This also includes comments made last spring for 2015 sunset materials.**

Cornucopia greatly appreciates the work, dedication and enormous time commitment required to serve on the NOSB. Our hope is to provide a valuable resource for the Board better enabling members to understand the scope and sentiment of organic industry participants, including:

- Farmers/Citizens
- Public Interest Groups
- Food Processors/Handlers
- Manufacturers/Ingredient Suppliers
- Distributors/Retailers
- Trade Associations/Industry Consultants
- Organic Certifiers/Materials Review Organizations

This document is organized by NOSB Subcommittee, in the order presented on the Draft Agenda. Under each agenda item, a table shows the number of comments submitted and the various stakeholder positions on that item. The “Notes” section under each table provides additional explanation.

Thank you for your work on behalf of all organic stakeholders. Please feel free to contact us regarding any of our findings or our methodology.

Will Fantle  
Research Director  
The Cornucopia Institute

# CROPS SUBCOMMITTEE

## Discussion Document: Protecting Against Contamination in Farm Inputs

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	229
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Cornucopia Institute (1) Beyond Pesticides Farmworker Health and Safety Institute (FHSI) (2) National Organic Coalition Food and Water Watch (FWW)(3) Center for Food Safety (CFS)(4)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	PCC Natural Markets
<b>Trade Associations / Consultants</b>	Organic Trade Association (OTA) (5)
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers

**Notes:**

- (1) Cornucopia states: “Many sensitive crop plants show symptoms well below the 1 ppb level.” From the discussion document: “No government or independent lab exists in the United States that can adequately test for aminopyralids in compost at or below the 1 ppb level.”
- (2) FHSI states: “We support research into means of preventing the contamination, which we believe must include restrictions on the way other people use many of those materials.”
- (3) FWW states: “We urge the NOSB and the NOP to convey to the Secretary of Agriculture and the EPA the burden that practices allowed in conventional production create for organic producers who must deal with chemical residues and other contamination in the inputs they rely on in their operations.”
- (4) CFS states: “CFS strongly opposes any policy or regulation that would place undue burden on organic growers.”
- (5) OTA states: “We recognize NOSB’s call to solicit input from experts in this area to assist in the process, and we expect NOSB to take this information seriously.”

## Inerts Verbal Update

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	94
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Beyond Pesticides (BP)(1, 3) Cornucopia Institute (1) Center for Food Safety (CFS)(2) Farmworker Health and Safety Institute (FWSI)(1) Food and Water Watch
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None
<b>Trade Associations / Consultants</b>	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None

**Notes:**

- (1) BP, Cornucopia, FWW request a list of all inerts known to be used in organic production, as determined by the Inerts Working Group, each annotated with an expiration date.
- (2) CFS states: "Pesticide products often consist primarily of "inert" ingredients, suggesting that some of the most hazardous pesticidal components are chemicals that NOSB has not evaluated under the legally-required criteria."
- (3) BP states: "Once again, the NOSB agenda contains only an update on inert ingredients. The NOSB has unanimously agreed upon a plan of action, yet we see no action."

## Research Priorities Proposal for 2014

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	29
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Beyond Pesticides (BP) (1,3) Cornucopia Institute (1,3) National Organic Coalition (NOC) (3) Farmworker Health and Safety Institute Consumers Union (CU)(2) Food and Water Watch (FWW) (3)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	PCC Natural Markets
<b>Trade Associations /Consultants</b>	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers

**Notes:**

- (1) Cornucopia and BP comment that moving mechanical delinting processes from the research stage to commercial availability is a high priority.
- (2) CU provided survey data regarding consumer sentiment when buying products with the organic label and “natural” labels.
- (3) Cornucopia, BP, NOC and FWW also recommend chlorine alternatives, degradation products from biodegradable bioplastic mulch, chelating agents, and alternatives to hydrogen chloride as priorities.

## Sulfurous Acid

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting on §205.601

**Petitioner:** Harmon Systems International

**Purpose:** Correct alkalinity problems in soil and irrigation water

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	4 in spring, 18 in fall (1,2)	194 in spring, 1 in fall
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute (3), Beyond Pesticides (4), California Safe Schools (spring)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	Organic Valley
<b>Ingredient Supplier / Manufacturer</b>	Harmon Systems International (petitioner), Wilbur-Ellis (5)	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	Organic Trade Association (OTA)	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmer (CCOF)	None

**Notes:**

- (1) As one Southern Arizona grower points out: “The quality of our well water is poor but is the only one we have, been able to treat our well water with sulfurous acid produce by our sulfur burner allow us to lower the pH of our irrigation water to a 6-6.5 range where all the nutrients become more accessible, creating an optimal environment for the roots to fully use the available nutrients.”
- (2) Another grower said: “After spending thousands of dollars per acre on a drip irrigation system, and wireless soil moisture monitoring stations to monitor water needs live, I was surprised to even think that someone thought that that we were using a single gallon of water more than we needed. So please take that reasoning and put it where it belongs. Non-sustainable irrigation application does not exist in our operations.”
- (3) The Cornucopia Institute: Sulfurous acid appears to have some usefulness in solving the widespread problems of soil and water alkalinity but fails to pass the human health and environment criterion of OFPA. It is likewise incumbent upon organic growers to attempt to prevent environmental problems rather than using synthetic materials to remediate them after the fact.
- (4) Beyond Pesticides did not feel that the Crops Subcommittee provided the proper OPFA justification for the delisting of this material. Therefore, they believe it should go back to committee.
- (5) Wilbur-Ellis agronomist states: “Amending a poor quality irrigation water is better for the overall health of the soil due to improved soil structure, improved water movement through the soil profile, improved soil oxygen exchange, improved nutrient availability, and ultimately increased sustainability.”

## Ferric Phosphate

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting on §205.601

**Purpose:** A slug and snail bait

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	2, Sunview Vineyards (SV)(1)	48	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Beyond Pesticides (BP) (2) Cornucopia Institute (2)	None
<b>Food Processors / Handlers / Manufacturers</b>	Neudorff USA (3)	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	Organic Produce Wholesalers Coalition (OPWC) (4)	None	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmer (CCOF) (5)	None	Organic Materials Review Institute (OMRI) (6)

**Notes:**

- (1) SV states: "Vineyards bordering citrus can have severe snail outbreaks in some years. Effective snail control is necessary to prevent vine defoliation and crop contamination. No viable alternatives exist."
- (2) BP, Cornucopia ferric phosphate alone is not essential because it is not effective and ferric phosphate in combination with EDTA poses risks to soil organisms, uses highly toxic materials in manufacture, and is not compatible with organic agriculture.
- (3) Neudorff USA states: "Inert ingredients are not a key issue here, nor should they cloud the discussion of the material under consideration: ferric phosphate."
- (4) OPWC states: "Practices used to control slugs and snails include tillage, management of mulch, traps, and physical barriers but these are of limited effectiveness when weather conditions favor slugs."
- (5) CCOF states: "...no less environmentally harmful alternative exists."
- (6) OMRI has 17 products listed with ferric phosphate as the active ingredient. This is one method of measuring demand for such ingredients in the organic sector.



## Hydrogen Chloride

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting on §205.601

**Purpose:** Cottonseed delinting

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	2 Leslie McKinnon, Organic Certification Consulting (1)	55	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Beyond Pesticides (BP) (2)		Cornucopia Institute (3)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers / Manufacturers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	Texas Organic Cotton Marketing Cooperative (TOCMC) (4)	None	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None	None

**Notes:**

- (1) Leslie McKinnon, Organic Certification Consulting: “Since organic cotton growers are a very small segment of the seed processors customer base, it is difficult for individual organic producers to persuade a supplier to retool their processing facility for the benefit of organic farms.”
- (2) Beyond Pesticides states: “In view of the extreme hazard posed by gaseous hydrogen chloride, we ask the NOSB to put its voice behind support for research and development of alternative methods of delinting cotton seed in preparation for planting.”
- (3) Cornucopia states: “The TR is deficient in its discussion of alternatives. USDA/ARS Researcher Greg Holt should be consulted to determine what is needed to bring mechanical delinting from the research stages into commercial production.”
- (4) TOCMC states: “Dr. Holt said that he feels good about the progress being made, but...they are still working on finding the best abrasive materials and configuration.”

## Sodium Carbonate Peroxyhydrate

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting on §205.601

**Purpose:** As an algaecide, disinfectant, and sanitizer including irrigation system cleaning

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>	<b>Neutral / Seeks Clarification</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	194 (last spring)	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Beyond Pesticides (BP)(2) Cornucopia Institute (3) California Safe Schools (last spring)	None
<b>Food Processors / Handlers / Manufacturers</b>	BioSafe Systems (1)	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)	None	Organic Materials Research Institute (OMRI)

**Notes:**

- (1) BSS states: “CA Rice Commission has approved of the use of sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate in CA Rice and recognizes the need for an alternative to copper based chemistries due to concerns about the continued build-up of elemental copper in the Sacramento and San Francisco water sheds.”
- (2) BP states: “It has been found by the NOSB in its 2007 recommendation not to meet the OFPA criteria of essentiality, compatibility with organic production, and no impacts on human health and the environment.”
- (3) Cornucopia states: “Long-term use effects on soil and water pH could be problematic.”

## **Aqueous Potassium Silicate**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting on §205.601

**Purpose:** As an insecticide

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>	<b>Neutral / Seeks Clarification</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None (1)	6; 196 (last spring)	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Beyond Pesticides (BP)(2) Cornucopia Institute (3) California Safe Schools (last spring)	None
<b>Food Processors / Handlers / Manufacturers</b>	BioSafe Systems (1)	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)	None	Organic Materials Research Institute (OMRI)

**Notes:**

- (1) A citizen submitted three peer-review studies demonstrating APS’s effectiveness for reducing powdery mildew on grapes, cucumbers, melons, and squash, and bract necrosis on poinsettia. She also commented that the alternative non-synthetic fungicide, sulfur, is more toxic to humans and the environment than aqueous potassium silicate. She also commented on a mistake in the TR.
- (2) BP states: “It has been found by the NOSB not to meet the OFPA criteria of essentiality and compatibility with organic production.”
- (3) Cornucopia states: “Natural sources of silica amendments are commercially available to U.S. farmers.”

# HANDLING SUBCOMMITTEE

## Glycerin

**Motion:** To remove glycerin from the National List §205.605 and motion to list glycerin at §205.606 instead (only produced by microbial fermentation)

**Petitioned by:** Draco Natural Products Inc. (delisting at §205.605), Handling Subcommittee (listing at §205.606 & classification motions)

**Purpose:** Flavor carrier

	<b>Support Removal</b>	<b>Oppose Removal</b>	<b>Neutral / Seeks Clarification</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	6 in Spring, 1 in Fall	1	
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Cornucopia Institute Beyond Pesticides (1), Consumers Union (Spring)	None	National Organic Coalition (table motion), Food and Water Watch (table motion)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	3	3 in Spring, 4 in Fall (2)	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	Organic Trade Association (OTA) (3)	Flavor & Extract Manufacturers Association of the US	None
<b>Certifiers / Materials Review Organizations</b>	Oregon Tilth (Spring)	QAI (Spring)	Pennsylvania Certified Organic (PCO), California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF), Organic Material Review Institute (OMRI)

**Notes:**

- (1) Beyond Pesticides realizes the complexity of this substance. They state: “We suggest separate listings for glycerin made by hydrolysis of fats and oil and glycerin made by fermentation. We do not support the classification of glycerin made by hydrolysis of fats and oils as agricultural and therefore oppose its listing on §205.606.”
- (2) All oppose removal due to lack of commercial availability. As one commenter points out, “The market for US refined glycerin exceeds 600 million pounds. The petitioner (Draco Natural Products Inc) is only able to produce around 264,000 – 396,000

pounds annually.” That is less than 1% of the projected demand.

- (3) OTA supports the removal of glycerin from the National List at §205.605 and instead listing glycerin on §205.606, classifying them as “agricultural”. The specific wording they seek is: Motion to classify glycerin as agricultural when ~~produced by microbial fermentation~~ derived from agricultural source material and processed using biological or mechanical/physical methods described under §205.270(a).

## **Whole Algal Flour**

**Motion:** To add whole algal flour to the National List §205.606

**Petitioned by:** Solazyme

**Purpose:** Fat replacement ingredient

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	1
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, National Organic Coalition, Food and Water Watch
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	6 (including petitioner)	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None

**Notes:**

- (1) All organizations question the essentiality of this ingredient and cannot properly review a substance where the manufacturing process is unknown due to CBI.

## Sunset-Gellan Gum

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting of High-Acyl Gellan Gum on §205.605(a).

Handling Subcommittee voted against removal of this material (6-0).

**Petitioned by:** CP Kelco      **Purpose:** Thickening/gelling agent

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	1	6 in Spring, 3 in Fall
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, National Organic Coalition, Food and Water Watch
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Hain Celestial, Stonyfield (1), Organic Valley, WhiteWave	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	CP Kelco (petitioner)	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	PCC Markets (3)
<b>Trade Assns / Industry Consultants</b>	Juice Products Association (Spring), Association for Dressings & Sauces (Spring), Organic Trade Association (OTA), International Food Additives Council	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	QAI (Spring)	None

**Notes:**

- (1) Stonyfield, along with Organic Valley companies, both point out that they are replacing carrageenan with gellan gum. If gellan gum is removed from the National List they may be forced to go back to carrageenan.
- (2) NOC states they oppose re-listing of gellan gum until questions regarding genetic modifications of the microorganisms, artificial processing aids and ancillary substances have been adequately addressed. This information was redacted as confidential business information in the original petition, requested in previous comments, and has not been supplied since.
- (3) PCC Markets points out that gellan gum was approved to improve texture but that is not a permissible reason to approve a non-organic food substance. See §205.600 evaluation criteria b(4): **The substance's primary use is not as a preservative or to recreate or improve flavors, colors, textures, or nutritive value lost during processing**, except where the replacement of nutrients is required by law.

## **Sunset-Tragacanth Gum**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting of Tragacanth Gum on §205.606.  
Handling Subcommittee voted against removal of this material (6-0).

**Petitioned by:** Wizard's Cauldron

**Purpose:** Thickening/gelling agent

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	4 in Spring, 2 in Fall
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, Center for Science in the Public Interest (Spring)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	Association for Dressings & Sauces (Spring)	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None

**Notes:**

(1) Beyond Pesticides writes: "The Center for Science in the Public Interest lists tragacanth gum as a food additive that certain people should avoid because it has caused occasional severe allergic reactions."



## **Marsala/Sherry**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting Marsala and Sherry on §205.606.  
Handling Subcommittee voted (6-0) to remove these materials.

**Petitioned by:** Fairfield Farm Kitchens

**Purpose:** Fortified cooking wines

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	5 in Spring, 2 in Fall
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, California Safe Schools (Spring)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None

## Egg White Lysozyme

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting egg white lysozyme on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** Enzyme Technical Association

**Purpose:** Processing aid/preservative

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Neutral / Request More Info</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	2	
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides	National Organic Coalition, Consumers Union (1)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF) (2)	None	None

**Notes:**

- (1) Both the National Organic Coalition and the Consumers Union are neutral on this material but seek more information in order to properly evaluate the relisting of this material. Questions such as inert ingredients, use of conventional eggs, and lack of a TR on this material specifically remain. The Cornucopia Institute and Beyond Pesticides also have numerous questions that should be answered before the next meeting in order to properly evaluate this substance.
- (2) California Certified Organic Farmers supports the relisting of this material because 12 of their clients use it and they deem it essential to grow the organic industry.
- (3) Note: Not a single company that uses this substance wrote in support of it.

## **L-Malic Acid**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting L-Malic Acid on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** Honest Tea

**Purpose:** pH adjuster

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	2
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, National Organic Coalition (1)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)	None

**Notes:**

- (1) All organizations reiterate the need for a Technical Review of this substance. There is only a 2003 TAP report for DL-Malic acid, a different synthetic material.
- (2) CCOF was the only entity that wrote in support of L-Malic acid. Not a single beverage company that uses this substance wrote in support. CCOF supports it because 7 of their clients utilize it and they deem it essential to grow the organic industry.

## Microorganisms

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting microorganisms on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** Kikkoman Corporation

**Purpose:** Processing aid, fermentation aid

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Neutral / Request More Info</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	2	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute (2), Beyond Pesticides	National Organic Coalition (1), Consumers Union
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Hain Celestial	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	International Food Additives Council	None	None
<b>Certifiers/Materials Review Organizations</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF) (2)	None	Organic Materials Review Institute

**Notes:**

- (1) NOC states: The definition of microorganisms should include their function in food. As stated above, there are at least three fundamentally different uses of microbes in food. The first, use of living microbes as starter cultures, is a traditional use that should be allowed. The second, use of living microbes as probiotics only, and the third, use of killed microorganisms as a food source, may be allowed on a case-by-case basis, following NOSB review. Consumers Union would also like to see a more narrow definition of microorganisms.
- (2) The Cornucopia Institute has concerns about bacteriophages, which are used as a post-harvest biocontrol agent. They may have deleterious health effects that were not discussed at all in the technical report. These microorganisms should be removed from the current listing since their use is different than other microorganisms.
- (3) CCOF urges NOSB to allow the ancillary substances listed in the proposal. CCOF does not support any additional National List annotation to limit the ancillary substances allowed in microorganisms.

## Activated Charcoal

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting activated charcoal on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** Canandaigua Wine

**Purpose:** Processing aid, color extractor

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	None	2 (with annotation)
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides (1)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Hain Celestial, WhiteWave, Humboldt Distillery	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	Ciranda Inc.	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None	None
<b>Certifiers / Materials Review Organizations</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)	None	Organic Materials Review Institute

**Notes:**

(1) Beyond Pesticides states: Activated charcoal is a substance that could meet the requirements of the Organic Foods Production Act with few restrictions, including limiting its use to filtering water and requiring steam activation.

## Peracetic Acid

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting Peracetic Acid on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** None

**Purpose:** Antimicrobial / disinfectant

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	4	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, National Organic Coalition	None
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Hain Celestial, Aurora Organic Dairy, Lundberg Family Farms, HP Hood, Organic Valley, WhiteWave, Safeway, Salt River Farming	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	BioSafe Systems, EcoLab	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	None	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF), Organic Materials Review Institute (OMRI)	None

**Notes:**

Not a single public comment was submitted opposing this material.

## **Boiler Chemicals**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting cyclohexylamine, diethylaminoethanol, and octadecylamine on §205.606

**Petitioned by:** Several companies

**Purpose:** Boiler water additive

	<b>Support Relisting</b>	<b>Oppose Relisting</b>	<b>Neutral</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	4	None
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Beyond Pesticides (BP) (1) Cornucopia Institute (2,3,4) National Organic Coalition	None
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	WhiteWave	None
<b>Trade Associations</b>	None	Organic Trade Association (OTA) (4)	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None	None

**Notes:**

- (1) BP states “The HS must determine and evaluate residues of the chemicals in organic food for the allowed use on packaging.”
- (2) BP and Cornucopia request a new TR.
- (3) Cornucopia states that ammonium hydroxide (previously petitioned) is a safer alternative.
- (4) Cornucopia and OTA state non-essentiality because a separate steam generator may be used at the point in which packaging sterilization is needed.

## **Sodium Acid Pyrophosphate**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting SAPP on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** International Food Additives Council

**Purpose:** Leavening agent

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	2
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union, National Organic Coalition (1)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Hain Celestial	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	International Food Additives Council	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	CCOF	None

**Notes:**

- (1) All of these organizations point out that SAPP lacks its own technical review and that is clearly a problem for reviewing this material.
- (2) CCOF has 6 clients that use SAPP and they deem it essential to grow the organic industry.
- (3) Note: Other than Hain Celestial, no other organic processors or handlers wrote in support of this so-called “essential” ingredient.



## **Tetrasodium Pyrophosphate**

**Discussion:** Sunset Review. Comments regarding relisting TSPP on the National List §205.605

**Petitioned by:** Kansas City Ingredients Technologies

**Purpose:** Emulsifier, dough conditioner

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	None	2
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	None	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides, Consumers Union
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Material Manufacturers</b>	None	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None	None
<b>Trade Associations / Industry Consultants</b>	International Food Additives Council (IFAC) (1)	None
<b>Certifiers</b>	None	None

**Notes:**

(1) IFAC considers this material “essential” for extruded meat products.

(2) Note: There are many vegetarian meat-replacement products on the marketplace, such as seitan and tempeh, along with many veggie burgers and soy hotdogs that do not use this substance.

# MATERIALS SUBCOMMITTEE

## Excluded Methods Terminology Discussion Document

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	112 (1)
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Beyond Pesticides Cornucopia Institute (2) National Organic Coalition (NOC) (3) Center for Food Safety (CFS) (4) Non-GMO Project Farmworker Health and Safety Institute
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	Nature's Path
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	PCC Natural Markets
<b>Trade Associations / Consultants</b>	Organic Trade Association
<b>Certifiers</b>	Oregon Tilth (OTCO) (5) Midwest Organic Services Association (MOSA) (6) California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF) (7)

**Notes:**

- (1) A consumer comment states: “The use of MON87411 and other GMO plant(s) with any kind of animal gene proposed for commercialization in the US, is alienating a significant and growing segment of consumers, namely vegans and vegetarians (including those with a religious basis).”
- (2) Cornucopia states: “Discrepancies between techniques that are not allowed and the realities of the techniques used throughout the history of crop breeding should be addressed.”
- (3) NOC states: “It is the responsibility of the NOSB to develop this guidance, and the job cannot be delegated to the NOP.
- (4) CFS states: “The NOSB should take precautionary action and adopt a moratorium on techniques that have yet to be evaluated until clarification is possible”
- (5) OTCO states: “How far back should a material be evaluated for the use of excluded methods? For example, the production of citric acid or vitamins and the organisms used to produce these materials.”

- (6) MOSA states: "Without full disclosure, ACAs will struggle to determine what is Made With Excluded Methods. How would we know to ask for disclosure when the end product is indistinguishable from conventionally bred plants?"
- (7) CCOF states: "The standards should also establish a time frame that specified how far back in the development of a breeding line the excluded methods prohibition should apply."

# CACs SUBCOMMITTEE

## Assessing Soil Conservation Practices Discussion Document

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	1
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Cornucopia Institute (1), National Organic Coalition (4), Wild Farm Alliance, Center for Food Safety (6), Beyond Pesticides, Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service (MOSES) (7)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	None
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None
<b>Trade Associations / Consultants</b>	Organic Trade Association (OTA), Accredited Certifiers Association, International Organic Inspectors Association, Organic Produce Wholesalers Coalition
<b>Certifiers</b>	California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF) (2), Midwest Organic Services Association (MOSA)(3), Northwest Organic Farming Association of Vermont (NOFA-VT)(5)

**Notes:**

- (1) The Cornucopia Institute makes several suggestions to improve soil conservation on organic farms. One of these includes: “Organic producers with CAFO permits should be required to submit their EPA or state CAFO permit along with their OSP and provide more detailed information about how they will prevent contamination of crops, soils, or water by nutrients, pathogens, heavy metals, or prohibited substance residues.”
- (2) CCOF states: “The nature of organic inspections limits opportunities for assessment. Inspections at different times of the year reveal different compliance issues, and not all inspectors have the same level of expertise in conservation.”
- (3) MOSA states: “Our clients document a simple soil conservation plan in their Farm Organic System Plan. This plan is reviewed by a certification specialist for apparent compliance with the applicable Standards. Then our inspectors provide visual

inspection of the fields, primarily looking for erosion events. Observation usually only identifies serious erosion events. With attention to maintaining a sensible timeframe for the inspection, it is challenging to do much more than this. Likely, the organic certification process does not fully assess all soil loss issues on a farm.”

- (4) NOC states: “We suggest that CACS develop standards for education, training, and experience for Inspectors and reviewers, items that are assessed during NOP audits but for which there are no clear benchmarks.”
- (5) NOFA-VT states: “When we identify soil or water conservation problems on organic farms, we often initially issue the farmer a condition for continued certification and ask them to develop a plan with a timeframe to address the issue. We generally issue non-compliances when the issue is not being addressed or the problem is getting worse.”
- (6) CFS states: “... soil building and conservation practices on organic farms occur in the larger, highly variable context of the entire organic system. NRCS metrics are not developed within a systems approach and therefore not necessarily relevant to organic systems.”
- (7) MOSES states: “While there has been great progress made within NRCS to learn more about organic agriculture, there are still many local and regional personnel that have a negative bias towards organics, believing instead that no-till farming with GMOs and the accompanying pesticides is more ecologically beneficial than organic farming.”

# LIVESTOCK SUBCOMMITTEE

## Livestock Vaccines Made with Excluded Methods Discussion Document

	<b>Commented</b>
<b>Farmers / Citizens</b>	5 opposed to any GMO methods/ingredients in livestock vaccines
<b>Public Interest Groups</b>	Cornucopia Institute, Beyond Pesticides (2), National Organic Coalition, Center for Food Safety Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service (MOSES) (3)
<b>Food Processors / Handlers</b>	Organic Valley
<b>Ingredient Suppliers / Manufacturers</b>	None
<b>Distributors / Retailers</b>	None
<b>Trade Associations / Consultants</b>	Organic Trade Association (OTA)
<b>Certifiers</b>	Midwest Organic Services Association (MOSA) (1) Pennsylvania Certified Organic, NOFA-VT

**Notes:**

- (1) MOSA states: “If the task of developing a list of MWEM vaccines is challenging for a group of highly specialized and trained individuals in the NOSB Working Group, it is overly burdensome to pass this task onto certifiers. If certifiers are unable to clearly determine if a vaccine is MWEM, the use of such vaccines may be limited by some ACAs.”
- (2) BP states: “It is the job of the NOSB to assist in the development of standards for substances to be used in organic production and to advise the Secretary on any other aspects of the implementation of this chapter. It appears that the NOSB may be powerless to solve the problem, but it is not clear that the NOP can solve it either. However, the role of the NOSB is to advise the Secretary, and the Secretary clearly has more authority over the production and sale of vaccines than does the NOP. BP suggests that the NOSB adopt a two-stage process. First, the definition of excluded methods must be clear enough to form the basis for regulatory action. The investigations of the LS and Vaccines MWEM Working Group will certainly be valuable input into the ongoing efforts of the Materials/GMO Subcommittee in that regard. Second, the NOSB should recommend to the Secretary that he establish a registry, labeling system, or some other mechanism for identifying vaccines that meet that definition. It does no good to make this kind of recommendation to the NOP because they do not have the authority to

implement it.”

- (3) MOSES states: “agree with the direction you are heading in allowing for GMO vaccine use as long as it is administered only due to a Federal or State emergency pest or disease program ... would also like to see that the GMO vaccine would only be allowed if was the only option and there were no non-GMO vaccines available that served the same purpose.”