

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

E



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of  
the United Nations



World Health  
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

Agenda Item 6a

CX/CAC 15/38/9 Add.1

March 2015

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

38<sup>th</sup> Session, CICG

Geneva, Switzerland, 6-11 July 2015

### CODEX WORK MANAGEMENT AND FUNCTIONING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Status of Implementation of the Recommendations related to Codex of the 2002 Joint FAO/WHO  
Evaluation

(prepared by the Codex Secretariat in collaboration with FAO and WHO)

**Part 1 - Status of Implementation of Recommendations (1-31) related to Codex of the 2002 Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation**

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<b>CODEX</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b> The scope of Codex should fully cover health-related aspects of food standards. It will, therefore, need (subject to availability of resources for Codex and expert scientific advice and prioritization on the basis of expert scientific advice as to the importance of alternative risks) to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strengthen work on foods for special dietary uses, health claims and nutrient addition; and</li> <li>• undertake new work on packaging materials; and on industrial processing agents and bioagents in foods.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 1</u></p> <p>FAO Management appreciates Recommendation 1, that Codex give high priority to food safety and health. Regarding health-related issues, it acknowledges the need to gradually increase work on the role of diet and nutrition in the prevention of chronic, non-communicable diseases. This work would be supported by FAO's ongoing programmes on good agricultural, manufacturing and veterinary practices within a food chain approach (para. 6).</p> <p><u>Recommendation 1</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation 2</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation 3</u></p> <p>FAO Management accepts the priority accorded to the health and safety aspect, bearing in mind the expectation of members that international food trade issues also need to be given due consideration as</p>			<p>The consolidation of GSFA and GSCTF as well as the use of a uniform format for commodity standards has contributed to concentrating responsibilities for food safety issues to selected general subject committees.</p>	<p>A new commodity committee (CCSCH) was established in 2013, instead of a Task Force or enlarging the mandate of an existing committee.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
required by the existing WTO agreements, particularly TBT. In this respect, it notes that certain aspects of Codex work on product descriptors and informational labelling would need to continue, and recommends that those aspects of trade that require international regulation but cannot be established by the trading partners alone should be addressed by Codex (para. 7).				
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b> It is recommended that Codex does not take on additional work in non-health related areas. (Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p>				
<i>See Rec. 1 above</i>				<p>Codex continued to pick up new commodity work including regional standards; CCSCH was established in 2013</p> <p>Since 2009, 25 new commodity standards have been adopted, including 11 regional standards developed by CCASIA (6), CCNEA (3) and CCLAC(2).</p> <p>The Critical Review process has been effective in checking if proposal for new work on commodity standards presented by regional Coordinating Committees were for products moving in global trade.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> In determining its standard-setting work programme, Codex should prioritize as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) standards having an impact on consumer health and safety;</li> <li>2) commodity standards responding to the expressed needs of developing countries;</li> <li>3) commodity standards responding to the expressed needs of developed countries; and</li> <li>4) informational labelling relating to non-health and non-safety issues.</li> </ol>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 38:</b> “Criteria for the establishment of work priorities” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, paras 53-54)</p> <p>j) Option 38.1 - Revision of the Criteria for the establishment of work priorities</p> <p>The Commission may wish to instruct the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to redraft the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities to reflect the current priorities of the Commission. The revised criteria should provide explicit judgment tools for assessing work proposals against priorities.</p> <p>k) Option 38.2 - Inclusion of the priorities in the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts</p> <p>The Commission may wish to instruct the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to include a statement reflecting its priorities in the introductory paragraphs of the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts and delete the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities from the Procedural Manual. Also in this case, the criteria should provide explicit judgment tools for assessing work proposals against priorities.</p>				
See <i>Rec. 1 above</i>	<p><u>Recommendation 3</u></p> <p>CAC25 reasserted that the first priority in the development of Codex standards was the protection of consumers' health and food safety and noted that the other priorities would require further discussion in the future. (<i>para. 15</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal 38</u></p> <p>CAC26 requested CCGP to redraft the Criteria for Work Priorities to reflect the current priorities of the Commission and in a manner that would provide explicit judgment tools for assessing work proposals against priorities. (<i>para. 182</i>)</p>		<p>Project documents for new work include an entire section on assessment of the proposal against the <i>Criteria for the establishment of work priorities</i>.</p> <p>In 2010, CAC33 adopted amendments to the <i>Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities</i> (addition of two additional criteria related to the amenability of the proposal to standardisation and to the global magnitude of the problem) and the <i>Guidelines on the application of the Criteria for the establishment of work priorities applicable to commodities</i> for inclusion in the Procedural Manual. (<i>ALINORM 10/33/REP para. 11</i>)</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> It is important that a comprehensive and clear mandate be developed for Codex and ratified by the FAO Conference and the World Health Assembly. The mandate should be quite simple, for example:</p> <p>"The formulation and revision of international standards for food, in collaboration with other appropriate international organizations, with priority to standards for the protection of consumer health while taking into full account the needs of developing countries."</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p> <p>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 24:</b> "Amendment of the Codex Mandate" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, paras 9-10)</p> <p>c) Option 24.1 - Amendment of the mandate (Article 1 of the Statutes)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to invite the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to propose a revision of Article 1 of the Commission's Statutes with a view to submitting a formal proposal for consideration of the Governing Bodies of the parent organizations in 2005.</p> <p>d) Option 24.2 - Retention of the current mandate</p> <p>The Commission may wish to decide not to change the current mandate but to work within the priorities determined by the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan. Such a decision should not prejudice the possibility of taking the matter up at a future date.</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 4</u></p> <p>FAO Management shares the Evaluation's view that a comprehensive and clear mandate needs to be developed for Codex. It considers that this mandate should be developed by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and submitted to the Governing Bodies of FAO and WHO for decision. (<i>para. 3</i>)</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 4</u></p> <p>CAC25 agreed that the current mandate should be retained but that it might be discussed in the future. (<i>para. 14</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 24</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that the current Codex Mandate as expressed in Article 1 of the Statutes of the Commission, should be retained but that it might be discussed in the future. (<i>para. 170</i>)</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b> FAO and WHO should define how formal recommendations of Codex for consideration by FAO and WHO Governing Bodies may be brought to their attention (for example in FAO through one of the Committees of the Council).</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 5</u></p> <p>FAO Management notes that the decisions of the Commission, which is a joint</p>			<p>Codex matters were discussed at FAO/WHO governing bodies only in the following instances since 2003.</p> <p>WHA56 (2003) - Report on the Codex</p>	<p>Occasionally reports on Codex and food safety issues were presented at WHA and FAO Council.</p> <p>FAO COAG and Council (2014) –</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>body of FAO and WHO, are reported, as necessary, to the respective Governing Bodies of these organizations through their Directors-General - in the case of FAO, to the Conference. FAO Management is of the view that while this hierarchy of reporting does not necessarily need to be changed, ways of improving the efficiency and transparency of the process should be explored. In order to ensure that the implications for other FAO work related to food standards be appropriately addressed, the FAO Conference could decide that certain types of issues/recommendations contained in reports of Codex be regularly considered by appropriate specialized FAO Committees. (<i>para.8</i>)</p>			<p>Evaluation (Resolution WHA56.23 adopted)</p> <p>33<sup>rd</sup> FAO Conference (2005) - Amendments to Codex Statutes (Amendments approved)</p> <p>WHA59 (2006) – Amendments to Codex Statutes (Resolution WHA59.16 adopted).</p>	<p>Concerns of the Commission regarding adequate and sustainable support to scientific advice to Codex and the importance of continued strengthening of developing country participation in Codex.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6:</b> Codex, supported by FAO/WHO independent expert advice, should intensify efforts to develop guidelines on determination of acceptable levels of protection (ALOP) for use by risk assessors in giving scientific advice to committees and to reduce the scope of disputes in the WTO.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 4:</b> “Acceptable Level(s) of Protection” (ALINORM 03/26/11, para. 33)</p> <p>In view of the comments received, the Secretariat proposes that no action be taken at this time.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal 4</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to take no further action at this stage, with the understanding that the issue might be considered again in the future if required. (<i>para. 153</i>)</p>	<p>Although no attempts have been made to “define” ALOP within Codex, Codex has streamlined its risk analysis process by adopting general risk analysis principles and sector-specific documents.</p>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 7:</b> Codex should remain within FAO and WHO but should have more independence, authority and responsibility over priority setting and management of its work programme. FAO and WHO Governing Bodies should endorse the overall Codex programme of work and the budget on a biennial basis.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 7</u></p> <p>FAO Management also agrees that Codex should continue to be “housed within FAO and WHO” (para. 3)</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 7</u></p> <p>CAC25 agreed that it should have greater independence, within the overall structure of FAO and WHO, for proposing and executing its work programme and budget, once approved by the two parent organizations. (App.II, para. 7)</p>		<p>In terms of priority setting Codex had always had responsibility for priority setting. The process was made more formal and transparent through the elaboration of the <i>Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities</i>.</p> <p>Since 2002, the Codex programme has become a separate programme entity within the FAO programme of Work and Budget. .</p> <p>The Codex Secretary was upgraded to D-1 and given is “Budget Holder” responsibility for the for the implementation of Codex</p>	<p>From 2013, the Codex Secretariat has been placed within the Office of the Assistant Director General, Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department, following the dissolution of the FAO Food and Consumer Protection Division.</p> <p>The head of the Codex Secretariat is administratively reporting directly to the ADG of FAO in charge of the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 8:</b> Codex and OIE should intensify their collaboration to minimize overlaps and avoid gaps in standard setting with:</p> <p>a) delineation of work and specific modalities of collaboration should be defined by Codex and OIE within the near future and formalized in a memorandum of understanding;</p> <p>b) where work is in both Organizations’ interest it should be pursued through joint task forces.</p> <p>Continued close collaboration between Codex and IPPC should also be maintained.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex/OIE)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 37:</b> “Relations with OIE” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 49)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to endorse the recommendation in principle, noting the on-going work on modalities of cooperation with other international intergovernmental standards-setting bodies.</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 8</u></p> <p>FAO Management agrees that Codex and OIE should intensify collaboration to minimize overlaps and avoid gaps in</p>		<p><u>Proposal No. 37</u></p> <p>CAC26 endorsed the recommendation of the Evaluation Team and Panel that Codex and OIE should intensify their</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 37</u></p> <p>CAC28 adopted the <i>Guidelines for Cooperation with International Intergovernmental Organizations</i>.</p>	<p>CAC37 (2014) endorsed the guidance to promote collaboration between Codex and OIE as proposed by CCGP28. (REP14/CAC, para. 104)</p> <p>Both Codex Strategic Plans (2008-2013</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
standard setting relating to food safety and animal health. ( <i>para. 9</i> )		collaboration to minimize overlaps and avoid gaps in standard setting, so as to ensure a farm-to-fork approach to the safety of foods of animal origin. ( <i>para. 181</i> )	<p>In accordance with and applying the above Guidelines, CAC28 endorsed the following recommendation related to the collaboration between Codex and OIE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- OIE be encouraged to continue to participate actively in the standard-setting work of the Commission, namely through the work of relevant subsidiary bodies of the Commission;</li> <li>- OIE be invited to regularly submit, to relevant Codex subsidiary bodies, reports on its activities relevant to the work of these subsidiary bodies, while these subsidiary bodies continue to seek ways to improve cooperation with OIE in their respective area of work and inform CCEXEC of their decisions/recommendations accordingly; and</li> <li>- OIE be invited to submit a summary report to the regular sessions of the Commission on its activities of relevance to the work of the Commission, including the outcome of the OIE Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 43-44 and 200-203</i>)</li> </ul> <p>The Codex Secretary participates as a member of the OIE Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety (APFSWG) since its first meeting in 2002.</p> <p>APFSWG was established to coordinate animal production food safety activities of OIE and advise the OIE Director-General and the OIE Terrestrial Animals Code Commission</p>	and 2014-2019) includes goals aiming at promoting collaboration between Codex and relevant international organizations and include specific activities related to the cooperation and interactions with OIE and IPPC.



FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			<p>("Code Commission") on technical matters. The APFSWG has also a mandate to: consider all foodborne hazards arising from animal before slaughter; identify gaps and duplication in the OIE and Codex texts and ensure their harmonisation; and strengthen the collaboration between the OIE and Codex.</p> <p>The FAO/OIE and the WHO/OIE Cooperation Agreements, mentioning Codex, were both updated in 2004. According to FAO and WHO legal opinion an MOU between Codex and OIE was possible. The strengthened framework for collaboration among FAO, WHO and OIE (see comments) facilitates collaboration in the context of Codex work.</p>	

**Recommendation 9:** The Executive Committee should be replaced with an Executive Board, meeting every six months, charged with strategic and managerial responsibility but without the authority to consider standards. The function of the board would be to improve speed and efficiency by assisting the Commission in strategic planning, budgeting and monitoring, including:

- preparation of the work plan and budget and the medium-term plan;
- make recommendations to improve management and working procedures in Codex, including its committees and task forces; and
- monitor and take corrective action for the delivery of the programme of work.

(Primary Responsibility: Codex, FAO/WHO)

This recommendation was dealt by the following:

**Proposal No. 7:** "Strategic and Managerial Functions" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, paras 10-12)

The Executive Committee/Board should make recommendations to the Commission in the following areas:

- strategic planning over a period of 5-7 years;
- medium-term planning over a period of 3 years;
- monitoring the implementation of the strategic and medium-term plans.

As part of its function of monitoring and implementation, it should have the ability to make recommendations directly to Codex Committees concerning the organization of work.

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>The Executive Committee/Board should also be consulted by the Secretariat in the preparation of its annual work plans.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 8:</b> “Budgetary, Planning and Programming Functions” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, paras 8-9)</p> <p>The Executive Committee/Board should be consulted by the Secretariat during the formulation of the biennial programmes of work and budgets to be presented to the Governing Bodies of FAO and WHO. Programming and budget proposals should include the budget(s) available for the provision of expert scientific advice to the Commission.</p> <p>The Executive Committee/Board, together with the Secretariat, should prepare annual work plans based on the biennial programme and the available budget, that will ensure the adequate delivery of the Commission’s programme of work (including the need for scientific advice) and submit these to the Commission for approval.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 9:</b> “Executive Committee” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, paras 19-20)</p> <p>Option 9.1 – Retention of the Executive Committee as a Strategic Management Body</p> <p>The Executive Committee should be retained as described in Article 6 of the Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Executive Committee should assist the Commission in implementing its programme of work by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making recommendations on strategic and medium-term planning;</li> <li>• advising on budget and work plans;</li> <li>• monitoring the implementation of the strategic and medium-term plans; and</li> <li>• monitoring expenditures and the status of agreed work plans.</li> </ul> <p>Option 9.2 – Retention of the Executive Committee as a Strategic and Standards Management Body</p> <p>As above, together with the responsibility for critical review of proposals to undertake work, and monitoring progress of standards development.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 10:</b> “Additional functions of the Executive Committee” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, paras 21-22)</p> <p>The Executive Committee should no longer have the power to establish Codex Committees and Task Forces under Rule IX.1.(b)(i) or to designate Host Governments for these Committees, as these functions have never been used. The Rules of Procedure should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Except for its role as a standards management body the Executive Committee should not have the authority to consider standards and the Uniform Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts should be amended accordingly.</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 9</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation 10</u></p> <p>FAO Management agrees to the proposed replacement of the Codex Executive Committee by a Codex Executive Board (Rec. 9 and 10) charged with more strategic and managerial responsibilities. It agrees that</p>		<p><u>Proposal No. 7</u></p> <p><u>Proposal No. 8</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that the Executive Committee should work together with the Secretariat for both activities. The need to consider the development of performance measures for both itself and the Executive Committee at a future</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 7</u></p> <p>CAC27 adopted the following texts developed by CCGP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Criteria for the appointment of Chairpersons</i></li> <li>- <i>Guidelines to Host Governments of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i></li> </ul>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>the Executive Board should not have the authority to adopt standards. FAO Management agrees to the proposed composition of the Executive Board but suggests that the participation of observers would need to be addressed by the Commission. (<i>para. 10</i>)</p>		<p>session was noted. (<i>para. 155</i>).</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 9</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to retain the Executive Committee as a Strategic and Standards Management Body, on the basis of the support expressed by majority of countries. (<i>para. 156</i>).</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 10</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that the Rules of Procedure should be amended to remove the obsolete functions of the Executive Committee (<i>para. 157</i>).</p>	<p>- <i>Guidelines on the Conduct of Meetings of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i></p> <p>- <i>Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces.</i></p> <p>CAC27 endorsed the decision of the CCEXEC53 to discontinue the elaboration of the Medium-Term Plan, with the understanding that its elements would be used as a basis for a list of programmes/activities to be incorporated into the new Strategic Plan 2008-2013. In the absence of a Medium-Term Plan, CAC27 agreed that CCEXEC would exercise its critical review functions, closely coordinate work between different Codex Committees and monitor the progress of standards development in accordance with the current Strategic Framework and the <i>Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities</i> (<i>ALINORM 04/27/41 paras 10-14 and 120-123</i>)</p> <p>CAC29 adopted the following texts:</p> <p>- <i>Amendments to the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts</i> including the guide to the consideration of standards at Step 8; consideration of any statement relating to economic impact; and <i>Guide to the Procedure for the Revision and Amendment of Codex Standards.</i></p> <p>- Consequential Amendments to</p>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			<p>the Guidelines on the <i>Conduct of Meetings of Codex Committees and Ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 21-25</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposals Nos. 8, 9 and 10</u></p> <p>CAC28 adopted the amendment to Rule V.2, concerning the enlargement of the Executive Committee and the functions of the Executive Committee and consequential amendments to current Rule X, as submitted by CCGP (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 21-25</i>)</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 10:</b> The Executive Board should be small and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-3 observer representatives for consumers, industry and perhaps primary producers;</li> <li>• formal participation of the Secretary of Codex and FAO and WHO.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 11:</b> “Executive Committee – Membership” (<i>ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, paras 32-35</i>)</p> <p>Option 11.1 – Enlarged Executive Committee</p> <p>The Executive Committee should be enlarged by appointing the Regional Coordinators as Members. Meetings would be open to observers.</p> <p>Option 11.2 – Restricted participation in the Executive Committee</p> <p>Participation in meetings of the Executive Committee should be limited to one delegate representing the Members.</p> <p>Option 11.3 – Establishment of a Sub-Committee on Programming, Budget and Planning</p> <p>A Sub-Committee on Programming, Budget and Planning of the Executive Committee consisting of the Vice-Chairpersons of the Commission and the seven Members elected on a Regional basis should be established. Meetings of the Sub-Committee should be held in private. The Sub-Committee should be chaired by the Vice-Chairpersons on a rotational basis. The Sub-Committee should report to the Executive Committee.</p> <p>Option 11.4 – Funding the participation of members of the Executive Committee</p> <p>The budget of the Codex Alimentarius Commission should make provisions for the funding of participation of members of the Executive Committee and its Sub-Committee on Programming, Budget and Planning at meetings of these bodies.</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Proposal No. 12:</b> "Participation of observers in the Executive Committee" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2, para. 36)</p> <p>Members of the Commission that are not Members of the Executive Committee and interested international organizations should be invited to meetings of the Executive Committee. They should have the right to submit papers on matters before the Executive Committee but should not have the right to speak unless invited by the Chairperson to do so.</p>				
<p>See Rec. 9 above</p>		<p><u>Proposal No. 11</u></p> <p>a) Enlarged Executive Committee</p> <p>CAC26 decided that the Executive Committee should be enlarged by appointing the Regional Coordinators as Members. A number of countries questioned the effectiveness of an enlarged committee as a strategic management body and it was noted that the respective roles of the regional coordinators and the regional members may require clarification. The Commission deferred a discussion of the presence of observers to its discussion of Proposal 12.</p> <p>b) Restricted participation in the Executive Committee</p> <p>CAC26 did not achieve a consensus on the proposal to limit participation in meetings of the Executive Committee to one delegate representing the Members.</p> <p>c) Establishment of a Sub-Committee on Programming, Budget and Planning</p> <p>CAC26 decided that the Executive Committee should have the flexibility to establish subcommittees from among its</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 11</u></p> <p>CAC28 (2005) adopted the amendment to Rule V.2, concerning the enlargement of the Executive Committee and the functions of the Executive Committee and consequential amendments to current Rule X, as submitted by CCGP. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 21-25</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 12</u></p> <p>CAC28 recalled that CCGP had agreed not to proceed with the consideration of the active participation of Observers in the CCEXEC, but to consider the possibilities of publicizing the proceedings using Internet facilities. The Secretariat informed the Commission that it was currently studying the feasibility of making the audio recording of the proceedings of the Commission available on the Codex website on an experimental basis. When all financial and practical aspects had been solved, the extension of these arrangements to the recording of the Executive Committee's proceedings could be considered (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 para. 122</i>)</p> <p>CAC30 (2007) noted that recent sessions of CCEXEC had been audio-recorded and the audio-recording posted on the Codex</p>	<p>Meetings of the Chair and vice-Chairs of the Commission ("bureau"), Codex Secretariat and FAO, WHO have been held regularly since 2009.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
		<p>members. It was noted that any proposed new body would be subject to analysis of costs and that there would only be a limited number. It was noted that a sub-committee could be established for programming, budget and planning.</p> <p>d) Funding the participation of members of the Executive Committee</p> <p>CAC26 decided that budget of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (not the FAO/WHO Trust Fund) should make provisions for the funding of the participation of members of the Executive Committee at its meetings. A number of countries considered that this should be limited to members from developing countries. (<i>paras 158-160</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 12</u></p> <p>A majority of members of the Commission agreed to the participation of Members of the Commission that are not members of the Executive Committee and recognized international organizations as observers in Executive Committee meetings with limited clearly defined rights to address the Committee. A few members expressed in principle objections to the presence of observers at Executive Committee meetings. It was also decided by the Commission that the exact modalities of this participation</p>	<p>website on a experimental basis. In view of the positive outcome of this arrangement which allowed publicizing of the proceedings of CCEXEC, CAC30 recommended that the current arrangements for audio-recording and web-posting of the sessions of CAC and CCEXEC be implemented on an ongoing basis. (<i>ALINORM 07/30/REP para. 140</i>)</p>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
		needed further elaboration and consultation with FAO and WHO. ( <i>para. 161</i> )		
<p><b>Recommendation 11:</b> The standards development management function should receive much greater attention in Codex and should be delegated from the Commission to a smaller body. In this context, consideration should be given to the creation of a Standards Management Committee to perform functions that otherwise would need to be undertaken in the Executive Board.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 13:</b> “Strategic Planning” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 10-12)</p> <p>A strategic plan for Standards Development should be submitted to the 27<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission (2004) and subsequently at two-yearly intervals on a rolling basis.</p> <p>Option 13.1 – Secretariat</p> <p>The Secretariat should submit a draft Strategic Plan for consideration by the Executive Committee and subsequently by the Commission.</p> <p>Option 13.2 – Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee</p> <p>The Sub-Committee on Programming, Budget and Planning of the Executive Committee should submit a draft Strategic Plan for consideration by the Executive Committee and subsequently by the Commission.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 14:</b> “Critical review of proposals to undertake work” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 15-16)</p> <p>A critical review process should ensure that draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption meet the strategic priorities of the Commission and can be developed within a reasonable period, taking into account the requirements of scientific expert advice. The critical review should therefore include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• examination of proposals for development/revision of standards, taking into account the strategic priorities of the Commission and the required supporting work of independent risk assessment;</li> <li>• identifying the standard setting needs of developing countries;</li> <li>• advice on establishment and dissolution of committees and task forces, including ad hoc cross-committee task forces (in areas where work falls within several committee mandates); and</li> <li>• assessment of the need for expert scientific advice and the availability of such advice from FAO, WHO or other relevant expert bodies.</li> </ul> <p>Each major standard or revision of a major standard approved for development should have a small project document on purposes of the standard, why it was important, the main aspects to be covered and the time-line envisaged for the work. Monitoring can then take place against the time line revised as necessary and revisions in the coverage of the standard etc. would need to be specifically endorsed.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 15:</b> “Monitoring progress of standards development” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, para. 17)</p> <p>The critical review process should also ensure that progress of the development of standards is consistent with the envisaged time frame, that draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption have been fully considered at Committee level, and that they are technically and legally sound. This should therefore include:</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• monitoring of progress in developing standards and advising if corrective action should be taken or work suspended due to lack of progress;</li> <li>• examining proposed standards from Codex committees for coherence with basic texts and other international legal instruments ; technical consistency with General Standards and similar texts ; format and presentation; conformity with major decisions of the Commission ; and lingual consistency; before they are submitted to the Commission for adoption.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposal No. 16:</b> “Responsibility for Standards Management” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 20-24)</p> <p>Option 16.1 – Standards Management Committee</p> <p>Should the Commission wish to establish a Standards Management Committee, it may wish to consider the following membership for the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty Members elected on a regional basis (three from each region except North America (2)); and</li> <li>• Five Chairpersons of Codex Committees/Task Forces established under Rule IX.1.(b) appointed on a rotating basis.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee should be established under Rule IX.1(a) and meet on an annual basis, not less than six weeks before the commencement of any Commission session and should report to each Commission session. The Committee should elect its own Chairperson. The Committee should have the power to invite Chairpersons of Committees/Task Forces, not members of the Committee to attend its sessions. The Committee should be open to participation of international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations as observers.</p> <p>The functions of the Committee would be to undertake the critical reviews of new work and the monitoring of progress in standards development as described above.</p> <p>Option 16.2 – Executive Committee</p> <p>Under this option, the Executive Committee would undertake the critical reviews of new work and the monitoring of progress in standards development as described above and report its findings to the Commission.</p> <p>Option 16.3 – Executive Board</p> <p>Same as Option 16.2 in the case that the Commission decides to establish an Executive Board in place of the Executive.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 17:</b> “Time-bound decision-making” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, para. 30)</p> <p>At the time of deciding to undertake new work on a standard (including preparation of so-called “discussion papers”), the Commission shall indicate the time frame for the work to be carried out, normally not more than five years from the date of the decision. At the end of this time frame, the body responsible for standards management shall automatically review the status of the work and report its findings to the Commission. The body responsible for standards management may propose an extension of the time frame; cancellation of work; or propose that the work be undertaken by a Committee other than the one to which it was originally entrusted.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 25:</b> “Revision of the Rules and working procedures governing the Executive Committee to enhance overall management” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 13)</p> <p>The Commission should request the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to draft amendments and additions to the Rules of Procedure on the above matters as a matter of priority, with a view to their adoption by the Commission in 2004.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 26:</b> “Subsequent revision of the Rules and working procedures of the Executive Committee” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 14)</p> <p>The Commission should request the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to draft amendments and additions to the Rules of Procedure dealing with the remaining issues contained in ALINORM 03/26/11: Part 2 with a view to their adoption by the Commission in 2005.</p>				



FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><u>Recommendation 11</u></p> <p>FAO Management supports in principle the proposal for the establishment of a Standards Management Committee, which would facilitate the Commission's work with regard to priority setting and work planning for standards development. Its proposed functions and composition would need further consideration by the Commission. (<i>para. 11</i>)</p>	<p>CAC25 requested the Secretariat to analyze comments dealing with standards management and the procedures for standards development, including the establishment of priorities recommended by developing Member Nations, and recommend strategies for the early implementation of more efficient and effective processes, providing options for consideration by the Commission at its next Regular Session. (<i>App.II, para. 13</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 13</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that the Secretariat should work with the Executive Committee in the preparation of strategic planning documents. It was noted that the strategic planning process in the Executive Committee should consider the special needs of developing countries. (<i>para. 162</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 14</u></p> <p><u>Proposal No. 15</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to endorse the critical review process, including the preparation of project documents for major standards, as proposed as well as the closely related proposal to revise the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities (Proposal No. 38) in order to ensure the relevance of Codex standards at the international level. (<i>para. 163</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 16</u></p> <p>CAC26 recalled that there had been no support for the establishment of a Standards Management Committee at the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission. The current session did not support the establishment of such a Committee and decided that the Executive Committee be the body to undertake the critical review of new work. CAC26 did not favour the replacement of the Executive Committee with an Executive</p>	<p><u>Proposals Nos. 14 and 15</u></p> <p>CAC27 adopted the amendments to the <i>Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts</i> (<i>ALINORM 04/27/41, para. 13</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposals Nos. 25 and 26</u></p> <p>CAC28 adopted the amendment to Rule V.2, concerning the enlargement and the functions of CCEXEC and consequential amendments to current Rule X, as submitted by CCGP. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 21-25</i>)</p>	<p>Information on discussion papers was added to the Critical Review from 2011.</p> <p>The Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019 includes Objective 1.2 to proactively identify emerging issues and member needs and where appropriate develop relevant food standards</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
		<p>Board. (<i>para. 164</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 17</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that the body responsible for standards management (i.e. the Executive Committee) should review the status of development of draft standards at the end of a specified time-frame, normally not more than five years, and report its findings to the Commission. The time-frame could be less than five years, where this was appropriate or had been established during the critical review process for new work. (<i>para. 165</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal 25</u></p> <p><u>Proposal 26</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to request CCGP when reviewing the Procedural Manual to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- draft amendments and additions to the Rules of Procedure as described in Proposal 25 as a matter of priority, for adoption by the Commission in 200477, and</li> <li>- draft amendments and additions to the Rules of Procedure dealing with the remaining issues contained in ALINORM 03/26/11: Part 2 for adoption by the Commission in 2005. (<i>para. 171</i>)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation 12:</b> It is desirable that the Codex Alimentarius Commission meets every year, but if the Executive Board and possibly Standards Management Committee perform their functions effectively it might be possible to reduce costs by continuing to hold meetings every two years.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 1:</b> "Annual meetings of the Commission" (ALINORM 03/26/11, para. 10)</p> <p>It is proposed that the Commission meet on an annual basis and the Executive Committee biannually. Commission sessions would alternate between sessions devoted to standards development (almost exclusively) and mixed sessions dealing with both standards issues, general direction of work and policy matters. These meetings could be 4 days and 5-6 days in length respectively. Regional Committees would continue to meet biennially and would report to the mixed standards/policy meeting.</p>				
	<p><u>Recommendation 12</u></p> <p>CAC25 supported the idea of holding annual meetings but noted the relationship between annual meetings and the operation of the Trust Fund, as it was essential to facilitate developing country participation if the Commission met annually. (<i>para. 19</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 1</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that each session would consider the timing for the following session and the general nature of the agenda in order to achieve the appropriate balance between standards issues, general direction of work and policy matters, and taking into account the resources available for adequate participation. (<i>para. 150</i>)</p>	<p>CAC has been meeting annually since CAC27 (2004).</p> <p>CAC agenda is essentially the same every year. The alternating (longer and shorter) agenda of CAC has not been studied or implemented by the secretariat.</p> <p>CCEXEC started to meet biannually since 2003 with two sets of alternating agendas, with the one focusing on the monitoring of standards development and the other on the critical review of new work proposals; CCEXEC no longer adopts draft standards at Step 5 although it is still legally capable of doing it.</p>	<p>Biannual meetings of CCEXEC were held until 2010, then reduced to three times per biennium and since 2013 to annual meetings in conjunction with CAC.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 13:</b> The Codex secretariat should be able to carry out managerial, strategic and communication functions. To attract someone of the calibre needed to provide continuing executive leadership and support in Codex and manage and motivate the enhanced secretariat, a senior person should be appointed as Executive Secretary. The overall seniority of the secretariat staff should also be raised.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 13</u></p> <p>FAO Management acknowledges the Evaluation's appreciation of the Codex Secretariat's effective and member-oriented work. It agrees with the observation that resources and manpower available to it are insufficient</p>	<p><u>Recommendation 13</u></p> <p>CAC25 strongly supported the recommendation that the Secretariat be expanded and that the seniority and composition of its staff should match the</p>		<p>After the 2002 Evaluation, Codex became an independent Service, first in ESN and from 2006 in AGN.</p> <p>The posts of Secretary (D-1) and Senior Officer (communication) (P-5) were created and another post were upgraded (1 P-2 to P-3), thus resulting in a Secretariat with one D-1, two P-5, two P-4 and two P-3.</p>	<p>In 2013 the Codex Secretariat has become a Unit ("Codex unit") in the office of the ADG of the FAO Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>compared to the steadily increasing workload, which is resulting in “certain functions as being inadequately served”. In this regard, FAO Management notes the proposed upgrading of the post of Secretary to the Commission to Executive Secretary. While the rationale given is appreciated - the complexity of Codex work, the technical and managerial expertise required, and the need for international visibility - FAO Management feels that, in view of the recent upgrading, it would be premature to further upgrade the post at this time. (<i>para. 12</i>)</p>	<p>Commission’s increased requirements. (<i>App.II, para.8</i>)</p>		<p>The number of General Service staff has remained unchanged (total of seven GS), with some changes in the level of seniority (one G-4 was upgraded to G-5 and three G-3 to G-4).</p> <p>Since late ‘90s Japan and the Republic of Korea have supported the Codex Secretariat through the secondment of professional staff.</p> <p>USA has seconded a professional officer in 2005.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 14:</b> The secretariat would better achieve the independent identity, high status and authority it needs by becoming a separate FAO unit rather than continue under the Food and Nutrition Division. The secretariat would continue to report to FAO and WHO but in line with plans to give Codex more independence, the appointment of the secretary would be carried out in consultation with Codex.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 14</u></p> <p>FAO Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is of the view that the current location is appropriate, given that ESN remains the principal area of relevant expertise in FAO and that relations with other expertise in FAO can be reinforced by other means.</li> <li>- notes the proposal that “the appointment of the Secretary would be carried out in consultation with Codex”, but would need to examine specific</li> </ul>			<p><i>See Recommendation 13</i></p> <p>Since 2002, the Codex programme has become a separate programme entity within the FAO Food and Nutrition Division (later renamed as FAO Food and Consumer Protection Division) and the head of the Codex Secretariat has been granted the role of “Budget Holder” in the implementation of the FAO Programme of Work and Budget.</p> <p>The appointment of the Codex Secretary has been made jointly by FAO and WHO in 2003, 2009 and</p>	<p><i>See Recommendation 13</i></p> <p>From 2013, the Codex Secretariat has been placed within the Office of the ADG of the FAO Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department, following the dissolution of the Food and Consumer Protection Division.</p> <p>The head of the Codex Secretariat is administratively reporting directly to the ADG of FAO in charge of the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>procedures in order to consider this proposal further. It recalls that the appointment of the Secretary is the prerogative of the Directors-General of FAO and WHO</p> <p>- agrees that employment of part of the Secretariat by WHO would be “administratively cumbersome” (para. 105) and supports the current practice whereby all job descriptions are prepared jointly, and Secretariat staff selected jointly, by FAO and WHO. It would be pleased to consider any additional measures that would make this “joint nature” of the Secretariat still more visible and effective.(paras 13-15).</p>			2014.	
<p><b>Recommendation 15:</b> As a matter of priority more human and financial resources must be put into the Codex secretariat to enable it adequately to perform existing functions and meet expanding demands.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 15</u></p> <p>FAO Management is fully aware of the increasing demands being placed upon Codex and of the need to increase the current staff and financial resources. In this context, and as recognized by the Evaluation, attention is drawn to the current Joint FAO/WHO Programme budget in which the FAO share is about 75 percent. (para. 16)</p>			See Recommendation 13	<p>Since 2000-2001, the Codex biennial budget has increased by approximately 75% (from 5,068,000 to 8,756,000 USD). The share of WHO increased in 2013 but has never exceeded 20%.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 16:</b> Codex should undertake a review, including a detailed study by consultants of the work of general subject and commodity committees as soon as possible, and thereafter on a fixed schedule, with a view to rationalization where appropriate. The review should in particular examine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the existing committee mandates with a view to rationalization;</li> <li>• any need for redistribution of tasks and responsibilities between committees; and</li> <li>• any need to split committees.</li> </ul> <p>Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) commodity work should be handled through time bound task-forces;</li> <li>b) no new committee should be established even in a horizontal area of work until the possibilities for progress and the need for continuing work have been established through a task force;</li> <li>c) the treatment of health issues in commodity committees should be reduced to the essential minimum and wherever possible handled through a task force with the relevant horizontal committee.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 5:</b> "Review of the mandates of Codex Committees and Task Forces" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.1, paras 13-14)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to instruct the Secretariat to recruit a small team of consultants to undertake a detailed review, based on the recommendations of the Evaluation Report and the above discussion, that would report through the Executive Committee to the next Regular Session of the Commission. The review should concentrate on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adequacy of the current structure of general subject committees to meet member countries' needs in a flexible and timely manner;</li> <li>• areas of overlap and areas where coverage of the subject matter is inadequate;</li> <li>• adequacy of the current structure of commodity committees to meet member countries' needs in a flexible and timely manner;</li> <li>• areas of overlap and areas where coverage of the subject matter is inadequate; and</li> <li>• relations between commodity and general subject committees (task forces).</li> </ul> <p>The report to the Commission should also take into account the ability of all member countries to participate in the standards development process and therefore concentrate on the sustainability of the subsidiary body structures and their work programmes.</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 16</u></p> <p>FAO Management agrees that Codex should undertake a review of General Subject and Commodity Committees. With regard to the suggested</p>		<p><u>Proposal No. 5</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that all the Committees and Task Forces would be reviewed together, based on the proposals set out in the working paper, bearing in</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 5</u></p> <p>CAC27 endorsed the TOR for review of Codex Committees and Task Forces. CAC27 agreed that the recruitment of a small team of consultants would be initiated after</p>	<p>A new Committee on Spices and Culinary Herbs (CCSCH) was established in 2013.</p> <p>Most of the work of commodity committees focuses on quality provisions of standards. Safety provisions of commodity standards make reference to</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
possible reduction of the treatment of health-related work in the commodity committees/task forces, it would emphasize that such a reduction should not lead to a decline in scientific soundness of standards which would still require the input of commodity-specific expertise, including that for best practices. (para. 17)		mind the objective of reducing the number of meetings while also keeping them short and focused. The key role of Regional Coordinating Committees was recognized, as well as the importance of ensuring that Codex Committee chairs were able to provide input to the review process.(para. 154)	CAC in order that recommendations could be submitted to CAC28 ( <i>ALINORM 04/27/41, para. 132</i> ).  CAC28 endorsed a number of recommendations (see <i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 136-159</i> )  The Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC) was split into CCFA and CCCF; the Committee on Meat Hygiene (CCMH) was adjourned <i>sine die</i> and some of its tasks assigned to the Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH).  A number of commodity committees was adjourned <i>sine die</i> , e.g. Committees on Natural Mineral waters (CCNMW), Cocoa Products and Chocolate (CCCP), Milk and Milk Products (CCMMP).	texts developed by general subject committees, e.g. CCFH, CCPR, CCRVDF, CCFA.
<p><b>Recommendation 17:</b> Codex should undertake a review of the mandate and work of regional committees within the next two years.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 6</b> “Review of the Regional Coordinating Committees” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.1, para. 15)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to instruct the Secretariat to provide a report to the next Regular Session of the Commission with proposals for the review of the Regional Coordinating Committees. These proposals should be discussed by the Regional Coordinating Committees and final proposals made to the next following session of the Commission.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 6</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided that all the Committees and Task Forces would be reviewed together, based on the proposals set out in the working paper, bearing in mind the objective of reducing the number of meetings while also keeping them short and focused.</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 6</u></p> <p>CAC27 agreed to issue a CL to invite comments. RCC would consider comments and report to CAC28 (<i>ALINORM 04/27/41, paras 135-136</i>).</p> <p><u>Role of Regional Coordinating Committees in furthering the objectives of the Codex Alimentarius</u></p>	the FAO/WHO/Codex secretariats prepared proposals for revitalization of Regional Coordinating Committees for discussion in the 2014-15 cycle of RCCs (Ref. CX/NASWP 14/13/4)

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
		<p>The key role of Regional Coordinating Committees was recognized, as well as the importance of ensuring that Codex Committee chairs were able to provide input to the review process. (para. 154)</p>	<p>CAC28 agreed to reassert the important role the Coordinating Committees play in furthering the objectives of the Commission and encourage countries to participate more actively and effectively in the work of Coordinating Committees. CAC28 further agreed to encourage Coordinating Committees to consider any particular items regarding problems arising from food control, food safety concerns and approaches for strengthening food regulatory systems, in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committees and preferably in consultation of the Regional Offices of FAO and WHO.</p> <p><u>Terms of reference of the Regional Coordinating Committees as set out in the Procedural Manual, including the relevance of developing regional standards</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed to refer the proposed amendment to the terms of reference of the CCLAC and its possible extension to the other Coordinating Committees to CCGP for further consideration.</p> <p>CAC28 agreed that Coordinating Committees were invited to keep under review their programme of work, taking into account priorities of Committees' work.</p> <p><u>Membership of Regional Coordinating Committees, including their current geographic coverage</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed that no further action</p>	



FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			<p>needed to be taken on this matter.</p> <p><u>Effectiveness of Regional Coordinating Committees in respect of country participation record and of venues and meeting intervals</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed to retain the current periodicity of meetings of Coordinating Committees and invited Coordinating Committees to consider the use of complementary mechanisms which would improve regional and/or sub-regional communication and coordination.</p> <p><u>Respective roles of the Regional Coordinator as ex officio Chairperson of the Regional Coordinating Committee and the Member(s) of the Executive Committee elected on a geographic basis</u></p> <p>CAC28 recognized the need for clarification of the respective roles of the Coordinator and the Member elected on a geographical basis, especially in view of the new status of the Coordinator as Member of CCEXEC. The Commission therefore agreed to recommend that CCGP consider this issue at its next session and develop proposals for consideration by the 29<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.</p> <p>CAC28 agreed to encourage Regional Coordinators, FAO and WHO to consider organizing relevant regional events such as seminars or workshops in conjunction with the sessions of Coordinating Committees. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 129-135</i>)</p>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 18:</b> All committee and task force work should be time-bound. It is proposed that no standard be permitted more than 5 years' work before decision by the Commission on whether further work is justified.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p>				
		See Recommendation 11		
<p><b>Recommendation 19:</b> Codex must continue to strive for a clearer separation of the risk management and risk assessment functions to ensure transparency, the usefulness of scientific advice and the speed of decision-making.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex, FAO/WHO)</p>				
				All relevant Committees completed the revision of the respective risk analysis principles. CCGP29 will consider a document (CX/GP15/29/5) on the consistency of the risk analysis texts across the relevant committees, prepared by the Codex Secretariat.
<p><b>Recommendation 20:</b> The emphasis in Codex should switch from writing standards in meetings to developing standards through a consultative process between meetings. Much greater use should be made of consultants/facilitators to progress work between committee sessions, with the cost borne by host countries. As well as speeding up work, greater inclusiveness would be ensured by full consultation including, where appropriate, the organization of local workshops and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• written comments should be fully taken into account;</li> <li>• where between-session working groups are used they should be electronic, not generally physical meetings which are not inclusive in possible participation;</li> <li>• greater use should be made of knowledgeable NGOs in preliminary standard development.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 19:</b> "Use of facilitators" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 34-35)</p> <p>At any time in the process of elaboration of standards, a Codex Committee or the body responsible for standards management, should have the ability to appoint a facilitator to help parties to reach consensus. The role of the facilitator would be to consult among members and to develop re-drafts for further consideration by committees. A main part of the function of facilitators would be to understand dissenting views, including all written comments, and facilitate the development of consensus. This could have very positive benefits both in terms of ensuring greater inclusiveness and in speeding up work, provided facilitators have the clear function of consulting members widely. Facilitators should report to the Committee entrusted with development of the draft standard. The facilitator's report should explicitly show how the written comments received on draft standards have been addressed.</p> <p>This proposal could be implemented immediately, without changes to the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts in the Procedural Manual, but in the longer term it would be preferable to amend these Procedures especially to define the role of facilitators. In the interim, the Secretariat suggests that facilitators could be appointed on an experimental basis</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Proposal No. 20:</b> "Establishment of electronic working groups" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, para. 36)</p> <p>Codex Committees, when deciding to undertake work between sessions, should give the first priority to the establishment of electronic working groups to be coordinated by the Host Government Secretariat. Such working groups should be open to all members of the Commission and interested international organizations as observers providing comments. The terms of reference and the expected output of the Working Group should be explicitly stated. Such working groups should be disbanded once their specific task has been achieved.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 21:</b> "Establishment of physical working groups" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 37-38)</p> <p>If Codex Committees decide to undertake work between sessions by means of physical working groups, such working groups should be representative of the membership of the Commission. It is therefore proposed that the membership of such working groups be limited to two or three members from each of the Commission's regions. Interested international organizations may be invited to participate as observers, provided that the number of observers does not exceed one half the number of countries participating as members. The composition of the working group should be explicitly defined, as should its terms of reference and the expected output. Such working groups should be disbanded once their specific task has been achieved.</p> <p>The options concerning working groups could be implemented immediately, but in the longer term it would be preferable to amend the Guidelines for Codex Committees so as to clarify the role of working groups.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 19</u> <u>Proposal No. 20</u> <u>Proposal No. 21</u></p> <p>CAC26 agreed in principle to all three proposals but decided that the modalities would require clarification by the body responsible for reviewing the Procedural Manual. With respect to electronic working groups, the Commission noted that these were an avenue for exchanging views and not for decision making. Physical working groups should be ad hoc, open to all members, take account the problems of developing country participation and only be established where there is consensus in the Committee to do so and other strategies have been considered.(<i>para. 167</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 19</u></p> <p>CAC28 supported the conclusion of the CCPG21 that Committees consider the use of facilitators on an experimental basis. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 122</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposals Nos. 20 and 21</u></p> <p>CAC28 adopted the <i>Guidelines on Physical Working Groups and the Guidelines on Electronic Working Groups</i> (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 41</i>)</p> <p>CAC26 (2003) adopted <i>Measures to facilitate consensus</i> .</p>	<p>A facilitated session was held by CCFL to solve the issue of GM labelling.</p> <p>A "Friends-of-the-Chair" approach was used to address the issue of the MRL for ractopamine.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 21:</b> Although Codex is very effective in producing and agreeing full meeting reports before the end of meetings, the trend towards action-oriented reports of meetings which focus on decisions and not discussion, should be further reinforced. Such reports facilitate a task-orientation as well as freeing up meeting time for more productive use than report writing.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 35:</b> "Conduct of meetings: Reports" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 43)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to ask the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to take into account the opinions of the countries that have commented on this matter when drafting the text dealing with reports.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 35</u></p> <p>CAC26 agreed in principle to [all] of the proposals. (<i>para. 178</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 35</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed that no further revision was recommended to the Procedural Manual. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 126</i>)</p> <p>The length of reports and timely availability of documents has been discussed on several occasions in CCEXEC, CCGP and other committees.</p> <p>In 2008, CCEXEC61 made specific recommendations on the length and content of the Session reports of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its Subsidiary Bodies (<i>ALINORM 08/31/3A, para. 26</i>), which were endorsed by CAC31 (<i>ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 9</i>).</p> <p>CAC32 agreed that Chile supported by other countries would prepare a discussion paper including recommendations on ways to approach the timely and simultaneous distribution of documents and the length and content of reports taking into account concerns raised at the present Session and those from the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee</p>	<p>Following CAC32 the length of reports and timely availability of documents continued to be discussed on several occasions in CCEXEC, CCGP, CCLAC and other committees.</p> <p>CAC37 noted a preliminary analysis on the timely distribution of documents and recommended immediate and incremental action to ensure that documents are prepared in a timely manner in all languages (<i>REP14/CAC para. 118</i>)</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			for Latin America and the Caribbean, for consideration by the next session of the CCGP ( <i>ALINORM 09/32/REP, para. 194</i> )	
<p><b>Recommendation 22:</b> In order to improve the performance and ensure greater consistency among committee chairs, explicit criteria for selection of chairs should be drawn up and chairs should be confirmed by the Executive Board. More emphasis should be placed on training and assessment of chairs and the explicit role of the Codex secretariat in supporting effective chairpersonship should be fully recognized.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 29:</b> “Chairpersons of Codex Committees and Task Forces” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, paras 26-27)</p> <p>Option 29.1 - Confirmation of Chairpersons by the Executive Committee</p> <p>The Commission may wish to request the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to draft a new rule to provide for the confirmation of chairpersons by the Executive Committee.</p> <p>Option 29.2 - Status quo, but with Criteria for the appointment of Chairpersons</p> <p>The Commission may decide to maintain the status quo in regard to the appointment of chairpersons by host countries, but may wish to request the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to develop criteria for the appointment of chairpersons.</p> <p><b>Proposal No. 33:</b> “Criteria for the selection of chairpersons” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 39)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to ask the body responsible to develop draft criteria for the appointment of chairpersons of Codex Committees and Task Forces and to submit these for consideration by the Commission at its next Regular Session (2004). The criteria should recognize the right of the host country to appoint a chairperson.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 29</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to maintain the <i>status quo</i> in regard to the appointment of chairpersons by host countries, but also decided to request CCGP to develop criteria for the appointment of chairpersons. (<i>para. 176</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 33</u></p> <p>CAC26 agreed in principle to [all] of the proposals. (<i>para. 178</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 29</u></p> <p>CAC27 adopted the Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces, elaborated by CCGP. (<i>ALINORM 04/27/41 para. 14</i>)</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 33</u></p> <p>CAC27 adopted <i>Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> (<i>ALINORM 04/27/41 para. 14</i>).</p>	<p>Informal meetings of Chairs have been held regularly during the CAC and the CCGP since 2005.</p> <p>Workshops for Chairs have been organised yearly since 2009 to allow for interaction between chairs and increase capacity in negotiation and mediation techniques.</p> <p>Satisfaction surveys, which contain questions related to the Chairs performance, have been introduced since 2010 for all Committees.</p> <p>A Manual “<i>Building Common Ground: a</i></p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			Since 2003, the Codex Secretariat has provided a secretariat to informal meetings of Codex Chairs and has started to organise Codex Chair retreats.	<i>guide for Codex delegates and chairs on negotiation, mediation and facilitation methods</i> ” has been completed and is currently under FAO/WHO internal review. The Manual has been used as the basis for the Chairs’ s retreat held in connection with CCGP28 in 2014.
<p><b>Recommendation 23:</b> The present 8-step procedure should be simplified to a 5-step procedure for all standards. At Step 5, the Commission should not amend the standard but be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adopt the standard;</li> <li>• refer the standard back to the committee to explore certain changes; or</li> <li>• cancel or suspend work on the standard. The present 8-step procedure should be simplified to a 5-step procedure for all standards.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 18:</b> “Simplified procedures for standards development” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, para. 32)</p> <p>The current Uniform and Accelerated Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts should be revised to encourage Committees to submit standards to the Commission as soon as consensus on them is reached. This could be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing the qualification of two-thirds majority when deciding on an accelerated procedure or the omission of steps;</li> <li>• Re-drafting the Elaboration Procedures to provide for a normal 5-Step procedure and an extended 8-step procedure, the latter being subject to endorsement by the body responsible for standards management and subsequent approval by the Commission.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposal No. 22:</b> “Adoption of Codex Standards” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3, paras 43-46)</p> <p>Option 22.1 – Decision to adopt without amendment</p> <p>At the adoption step, the Commission should not amend the standard but shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adopt the standard;</li> <li>• refer the standard back to the Committee to explore certain changes; or</li> <li>• cancel or suspend work on the standard.</li> </ul> <p>The decision taken shall be reported clearly in a manner that focuses on decisions and not on discussion.</p> <p>Option 22.2 – Decision to adopt with amendment</p> <p>At the adoption step, the Commission may decide to amend the standard in the light of written comments but shall limit such amendments to considerations that have not previously</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>been raised in Committee and which are not of a nature affecting the technical content of the standard. Otherwise, the Commission shall either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adopt the standard;</li> <li>• refer the standard back to the Committee to consider the proposed amendment(s); or</li> <li>• cancel or suspend work on the standard.</li> </ul> <p>The decision taken shall be reported clearly in a manner that focuses on decisions and not on discussion.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 18</u></p> <p>CAC26 considered that removal of the two-thirds majority requirement for the accelerated procedure would not simplify the procedure as accelerated standards should be adopted by consensus. CAC26 did not reach a consensus on the use of a 5-Step procedure as the norm and decided to retain the 8- Step process, with the existing mechanisms to accelerate the process when necessary. (<i>para. 166</i>)</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 24:</b> Wherever possible, decisions should be made by consensus. Codex should define consensus for decision-making purposes in committees and the Commission. We propose ‘no formal objection by more than one member present at the meeting’; and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) committees should, as the norm, achieve consensus before passing on standards to the Commission for adoption;</li> <li>b) facilitators working between meetings should help to reach consensus and should be systematically used to assist in overcoming deadlock at any stage of the standard setting process);</li> <li>c) in cases of ‘near-consensus’, proposed standards should be passed on by committees to the Commission for consideration. A consultative postal-balloting system should be considered as a way of ensuring inclusiveness and legitimacy;</li> <li>d) if no better than ‘near-consensus’ could be reached in the Commission, voting should take place but should require at least a two-thirds majority of those present and voting for a standard to be adopted.</li> </ol> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 34:</b> “Determination of consensus” (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 41)</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>In view of the divergence of opinions on this matter the Commission may wish to maintain the status quo in this matter. It may wish to advise the body responsible for implementing the procedural review that resolution of the question of consensus in regard to decision-making is a matter of importance and that efforts should be made to develop appropriate guidance for Codex Committees and Task Forces. In view of the diversity of opinions currently held on this matter, the Commission may wish to request a progress report on the issue at its Regular Session in 2005.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 34</u> CAC26 agreed in principle to [all] of the proposals. (<i>para. 178</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 34</u> CAC28 had agreed to consider proposals from the Delegation of India that included the definition of consensus at its next session. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 125</i>)  CCGP21 agreed not to undertake new work on the definition of "consensus". (<i>ALINORM 05/28/33 paras 9-10</i>)  CCGP25 (2009) reviewed an extensive discussion paper prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the inputs if the chairpersons of the Codex subsidiary bodies on the matter and especially their experiences with the application of the Measures to Facilitate Consensus.  CCGP25 agreed to the following:  (a) The Secretariat would continue work on a brochure for chairs which will be in the public domain as a work in progress;  (b) Problematic cases could be addressed by the informal meeting of chairs and CCEXEC;  (c) The Secretariat would continue to convene an informal meeting of chairs in conjunction with the session of the Commission.</p>	<p>CAC33 (2010) adopted a further amendment to the <i>Guidelines to Host Governments of Codex Committees and Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> regarding sustained opposition. (<i>ALINORM 10/33/REP para. 14</i>)</p>



FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
			<p>(d) To amend the <i>Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> with a modification to the effect that the choice of the facilitator should be agreed upon by the committee concerned.</p> <p>CAC32 (2009) adopted the amendment on the use of facilitators to the <i>Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i>. (<a href="#">ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras 18-19</a>).</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 25:</b> Groups of countries with common interests should be encouraged to coordinate their positions and present these as positions of the group at committee meetings.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex Regional Committees)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 36:</b> “Conduct of meetings: Country groupings” (<a href="#">ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 45</a>)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to ask the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to consider how the opinions of groups of countries, especially smaller developing countries unable to be represented fully at Codex meetings, could best be taken into account.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 36</u></p> <p>CAC26 asked CCGP to examine this issue by 2006. (<i>para. 180</i>)</p>	<p>The European Community (later European Union) became a member organization in 2003. Since then, the EU presents before each Codex meeting a division of competence according to Rule of Procedure II paragraph 5 of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.</p> <p><u>Proposal No. 34</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed that no further revision was recommended to the Procedural Manual. (<a href="#">ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 126</a>)</p>	

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p><b>Recommendation 26:</b> Committees should be encouraged to appoint co-chairs of equal status, one of which would be from a developing country. Host countries should also hold meetings in the co-chair's country.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex/ Host Countries)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 32:</b> "Co-chairmanship" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 37)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to ask the body responsible to develop guidelines for the co-chairing of Codex Committees and Task Forces, including the cost implications.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 32</u></p> <p>CAC26 referred the work to CCGP, requesting it to develop appropriate guidelines and explore further the question of co-chairpersons. (<i>para 178</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposal No. 32</u></p> <p>CAC28 agreed that co-chairmanship should be tested on a case-by-case basis and encouraged committees to consider this practice. The Commission noted some positive outcomes of co-chairmanship experienced at the latest session of the Committee on Food Hygiene (co-hosted by the United States and Argentina) and of the Committee on Fish and Fishery products (co-hosted by Norway and South Africa). (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 124</i>)</p>	<p>CAC33 (2010) adopted an amendment to the <i>Guidelines to Host Governments of Codex Committees and Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> regarding co-hosting arrangements. (<i>ALINORM 10/33/REP, para. 13</i>)</p> <p>Guidance for Co-hosting Arrangements of Codex Sessions is included in the Codex website (<a href="http://www.codexalimentarius.org/meetings-reports/co-hosting-meetings/en/">http://www.codexalimentarius.org/meetings-reports/co-hosting-meetings/en/</a>)</p> <p>An analysis of Co-hosting arrangements was presented at CAC32. (<i>ALINORM 09/32/9B Part III</i>)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 27:</b> Codex should review its principles and procedures for observer status as required by the Procedural Manual and:</p> <p>a) should consider applying stricter criteria to ensure that observers are genuinely international. New rules should apply to existing observers as well as future 'applicants' and the credentials of Codex observers should be approved individually by the Executive Board;</p> <p>b) observers should be represented on the Executive Board and the Standards Management Committee (if established).</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex)</p> <p><u>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</u></p> <p><b>Proposal No. 28:</b> "Observer Organizations" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, paras 19-21)</p> <p>Option 28.1 - Review of the status of observer organizations by FAO and WHO</p> <p>The Commission may wish to request FAO and WHO to prepare a report on the status of the current international organizations in "Observer Status" with the Commission and submit the report to the Commission's next Regular Session.</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
<p>Option 28.2 - Revision of Rule VII.5</p> <p>The Commission may wish to invite the body responsible for the procedural review to revise Rule VII.5 so that the Executive Committee provides an opinion to the Directors-General on the status of the international organizations in "Observer Status" or requesting such status, and submit its proposals to the Commission in 2004.</p> <p>Option 28.3 - Revision of Principles governing international organizations in "Observer Status"</p> <p>The Commission may wish to invite the body responsible for the procedural review to revise the Principles Concerning the Participation of International Non-Governmental Organizations in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and to complete the guidelines on the relations between the Commission and international intergovernmental organizations in a manner that is consistent with the revised Rule VII.5. This work should be completed by 2005.</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 28</u></p> <p>CAC26 decided to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(•) request FAO and WHO to prepare a report on the status of the current international organizations in "Observer Status" with the Commission and submit the report to the Commission's next Regular Session;</li> <li>- request FAO and WHO Legal Counsels and the Secretariat to prepare a preliminary paper on Rule VII.5 for consideration by CCGP.</li> </ul> <p>CAC26 also requested the CCGP to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- revise Rule VII.5 on the basis of the paper to be presented by the Legal Counsels of FAO and WHO, and submit its proposals to the Commission in 2004, if possible; and</li> <li>- revise the Principles Concerning the Participation of International Non-Governmental Organizations in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and to</li> </ul>	<p><u>Proposal No. 28</u></p> <p>CAC28 adopted the amendment to Rule VIII.5 Observers and revised Principles concerning the Participation of International Non-Governmental Organizations in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 26 and 42</i>).</p>	<p>A review of the participation of observers in Codex work was carried out which resulted in the discontinuation of a number of observers.</p> <p>WHO has started to review the framework rules regarding its relations with non-State actors, including the granting of official relations with WHO. This will have an impact on the implementation of section 4.1 of the Principles Concerning the Participation of International Non-Governmental Organizations.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
		complete the guidelines on the relations between the Commission and international intergovernmental organizations in a manner that is consistent with the revised Rule VII.5, by 2005. ( <i>paras 174-175</i> )		
<p><b>Recommendation 28:</b> Clear criteria to be met in becoming a host country should be developed, including the resource requirements. Host countries should be required to commit to the minimum level of support including that for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• between session work; and</li> <li>• meetings being held in the co-chair's country;</li> </ul> <p>Shared hosting of committees could be explored by host countries as an option in meeting increased commitments.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: Codex/ Host Countries)</p> <p>This recommendation was dealt by the following:</p> <p><b>Proposal: No.31:</b> "Separation of advice to Host Governments and advice on the conduct of meetings" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 35)</p> <p>The Commission may wish to instruct the body responsible for implementing the procedural review to develop two separate texts dealing with these matters separately. These texts should be presented to the Commission for consideration not later than 2005, but in the case of delay the document dealing with the conduct of meetings should have priority. Within these texts, however, the criteria for the selection of chairpersons could be developed separately and as a matter of high priority (submission in 2004).</p>				
		<p><u>Proposal No. 31</u></p> <p>CAC26 agreed in principle to [all] of the proposals. (<i>para. 178</i>)</p>	<p><u>Proposals No. 31</u></p> <p>CAC27 adopted <i>Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces</i> (ALINORM 04/27/41 para. 14).</p>	<p>Guidance on co-hosting committees were developed and included in the Procedural Manual and the Codex website.</p> <p>An analysis of the effectiveness of co-hosting arrangements was done as part of the Strategic Plan implementation in 2010.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 29:</b> Resources should be put into upgrading the Codex web-site as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation 29</u></p> <p>FAO Management concurs with the Evaluation's analysis of risk communication. It draws attention to the fact that</p>				

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</a> )	CAC 25 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/25/5</a> )	CAC26 Decision ( <a href="#">ALINORM 03/41</a> ) (related to the 38 proposals)	Implementation Status by 2009 (reports of CAC27 to CAC32)	Later events after 2009
communication of risk to the public (consumers) requires further consultation between FAO and WHO and other partners concerned to formulate a common strategy on risk communication. ( <i>para. 18</i> )				
<p><b>Recommendation 30:</b> FAO and Codex review the possibilities for establishment of a database of national standards of importance in trade, including their application and methods of analysis.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				
See Rec. 29 above			<p>The International Portal for Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) was set up by FAO in 2004 to facilitate simplified access by member countries to relevant official information on plant health, animal health and food safety. The portal was widely used by FAO members until 2009.</p> <p>In 2008, CAC31 requested FAO to house a portal by which Codex members could access information on safety assessment of foods derived from recombinant-DNA plants that were assessed in accordance with the Codex "<i>Guideline for the conduct of food safety assessment of foods derived from recombinant-DNA plants</i>" (CAC/GL 45-2003). This was to facilitate implementation of annex III of the Codex Guidelines. This information was incorporated within IPSAPH.</p>	<p>The use of the IPFSAPH declined as there are many other specific initiatives and databases developed featuring trade-related information about food safety, animal and plant health. After careful evaluation, it was decided that IPFSAPH would be discontinued and that the information on safety assessment would be housed in a separate dedicated portal. This new platform (FAO GM Platform) was launched in 2013.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 31:</b> FAO and WHO should make a detailed calculation of the incremental cost increases for the Codex secretariat of implementing the agreed recommendations and provide the necessary increased core funding.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>				

### Other Recommendations of the 2002 Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation related to Risk Assessment and Expert Advice and Capacity Building

<b>RISK ASSESSMENT AND EXPERT ADVICE</b>
<p><b>Recommendation 32:</b> In light of the growing importance of microbiological hazards, JEMRA should be ratified as a permanent committee and resources allocated to increase its output.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 33:</b> There should be a clear budget and human resource allocation for scientific advice and risk assessment. The major part of this allocation should be available for prioritization by Codex. A small proportion of the budget should be retained for use by FAO and WHO to meet their own needs, particularly in relation to emerging issues. FAO and WHO should make proposals for discussion at the July 2003 session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission on how this may be achieved.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 34:</b> The increased funding of risk assessment is a top priority.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 35:</b> A high priority for WHO and FAO is to support the collection of data covering a much wider range of diets and production processes, including the essential capacity building. Furthermore, FAO and WHO should increase their role in defining data requirements for risk assessment and guaranteeing good quality data.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 36:</b> Budgetary provision should be made to pay independent experts undertaking risk assessments. At the same time, strict deadlines and quality requirements should be put in place.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 37:</b> Building on the findings of this evaluation, a consultancy study should be immediately undertaken of expert advice and risk assessment and this should be followed by an expert consultation and discussion in Codex.</p> <p>The elements to be included in the study, in line with the discussion above, should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) new methods of working, including the use of meta-analysis techniques;</li> <li>b) any requirement for redistribution of tasks in existing expert committees or for splitting the committees;</li> <li>c) definition of the form in which risk assessments can be most usefully provided to risk managers for standard setting;</li> <li>d) re-definition of basic requirements for global standards, including the minimum of essential dietary intake data for each major region and tropical performance data for GAP,GMP, GHP, etc.;</li> <li>e) funding and possibilities of payment for services when reviewing proprietary products;</li> <li>f) ways in which non-technical consumer representatives could contribute to the work of providing scientific advice and risk assessment;</li> <li>g) best practice procedures for communication between risk assessors and managers to ensure that scientific advice is given in its most useful form; and</li> <li>h) options, necessary communication expertise and resource implications of alternative risk assessment communication strategies.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 38:</b> A Scientific Committee should be established by FAO/WHO.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 39:</b> We recommend that a post of Joint Coordinator be established and located in WHO. The joint secretaries of existing scientific committees would continue to be under the current units of their two Organizations.</p>

(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)
<p><b>Recommendation 40:</b> FAO and, in particular WHO are recommended to markedly increase their contribution to health risk assessment and expert advice to feed into Codex. In addition to the immediate direct resource requirements referred to above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHO should develop data on health risks from food around the world to better determine priorities;</li> <li>• FAO should develop work on good handling and manufacturing practices for additives, packaging, processing agents, etc.; and</li> <li>• both Organizations should develop dietary data for the developing regions.</li> </ul> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<b>CAPACITY BUILDING</b>
<p><b>Recommendation 41:</b> It is recommended that the two Organizations agree on principles for coordination and delineation of responsibilities for capacity building and ensure that these principles are communicated to regional and national offices. The Codex Alimentarius Commission should be informed on progress on this agreement at its July 2003 session.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 42:</b> With a view to mobilizing funds for capacity building, it is recommended to further expand the existing FAO/WHO Codex trust fund in line with its wider objectives into a major multi-donor trust fund for capacity-building of national systems, with flexible arrangements to allow donors who wish to do so to earmark funds for a particular purpose. This will have to be done against clear delineation of capacity-building responsibilities between the two Organizations.</p> <p>(Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>

### **Other Decisions of CAC26 (related to the Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation) regarding the current Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts**

<p>Subsequent Procedure Concerning Publication and Acceptance of Codex Standards</p> <p><b>STATUS</b></p> <p>CAC28 adopted amendments to the Procedural Manual. (<i>ALINORM 05/28/41 paras 29-36</i>)</p> <p>The 33<sup>rd</sup> FAO Conference and the 59<sup>th</sup> World Health Assembly endorsed the amendment to the Statutes.</p>
<p>Guide to the Consideration of Standards at Step 8</p> <p><b>STATUS</b></p> <p>CAC29 adopted amendments to the Procedural Manual (<i>ALINORM 06/29/41 paras 22-23</i>); CCGP24 confirmed that no more action was needed. (<i>ALINORM 07/30/33 paras 7-12</i>)</p>
<p>Guide to the Procedure for the Revision and Amendment of Codex Standards</p> <p><b>STATUS</b></p> <p>CAC30 adopted amendments to the Procedural Manual. (<i>ALINORM 07/30/REP paras 24-27</i>)</p>
<p>Arrangements for the Amendment of Codex Standards Elaborated by Codex Committees which have Adjourned <i>sine die</i>.</p> <p>See above</p>

### Other Proposals not directly linked to the recommendations of the 2002 Evaluation

**Proposal No. 2:** "Implementation of the Evaluation" (ALINORM 03/26/11, paras.14-15)

Option 2.1 – Task Force

The follow up and monitoring of the implementation of the Evaluation recommendations should be entrusted to a Task Force composed of FAO, WHO representatives and the chairperson and vice-chairpersons of the Commission.

Option 2.2 – Executive Committee/Board

The follow up and monitoring of the implementation of the Evaluation recommendations should be entrusted to the Executive Committee/Board.

**STATUS**

CAC26 decided that the responsibility for following up and monitoring progress in the implementation of the recommendations from the Evaluation Report would be entrusted to the Executive Committee. Twice-yearly sessions of the Committee would be scheduled in order to absorb the additional workload, and provision had been made in the Codex budget to provide support for members from countries experiencing financial difficulties in attending. (ALINORM 03/41, para. 151)

**Proposal No. 3:** "Priorities for Implementation" (ALINORM 03/26/11, para. 17)

Taking this into account, the Secretariat proposes the following order of priorities:

- Processes for standards management;
- Functions and composition of the Executive Committee, including the participation of observers in the Executive Committee and Executive Committee procedures;
- Review of Rules and Procedures including guidelines for Codex Committees;
- Review of the Committee structures and mandates (including Regional Committees).

**STATUS**

CAC26 concluded that all four priorities were of equal importance, and that the ranking was made on the grounds of speed of potential progress. It was noted that in all cases where processes for standards management were reviewed, the standard-setting needs of developing countries should be recognized and appropriate capacity-building activities by FAO, WHO and other international organizations should be promoted (e.g. to facilitate access to Internet). The Commission decided that the priorities should be:

- a) Processes for standards management, with due regard to the special needs of developing countries.
- b) Functions and composition of the Executive Committee, including the participation of observers in the Executive Committee and Executive Committee procedures.
- c) Review of the Committee structures and mandates (including Regional Committees).
- d) Review of Rules and Procedures including guidelines for Codex Committees. (ALINORM 03/41, para. 152)

**Proposal No. 23** "Responsibility for the Procedural Review" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, paras 5-6)

Option No. 23.1 – Specialized Task Force on Procedures

In order to provide the immediate impetus for the procedural review while allowing CCGP to continue with its current work, the Commission may wish to establish a specialized Task Force under Rule IX.1(b)(i) of the Commission's Rules of Procedure to draft the required changes to the Procedural Manual, and to submit them to the Commission for consideration not later than 2005. Proposed draft Terms of Reference for the Task Force on Codex Procedures have already been presented in Annex 4 of ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.2.

Option No. 23.2 - Additional meetings of CCGP.



In order to provide the immediate impetus for the procedural review while allowing CCGP to continue with its current work, the Commission may wish to request that Committee to hold one or more special sessions to draft the required changes to the Procedural Manual, and to submit them to the Commission for consideration not later than 2005.

**STATUS**

On the basis of the views expressed by a clear majority of members and noting that only France had offered to host the meetings, CAC26 decided that the procedural review would be undertaken by CCGP, at special sessions and under a limited time-frame. The Commission agreed that the Committee would need clear instructions, terms of reference from the Commission and support from the Codex Secretariat. *(ALINORM 03/41, para. 169)*

**Proposal No. 27** "Right to address the Chair" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 16)

The Commission may wish to ask the body responsible for the procedural review to consider a new rule, based on a comparable Rule of the World Health Assembly to the effect that "In plenary meetings the chief delegate may designate another delegate who shall have the right to speak and vote in the name of his delegation on any question. Moreover, upon the request of the chief delegate or any delegate so designated by him the President [Chairperson in the case of Codex] may allow an adviser to speak on any particular point."

**STATUS**

CAC26 decided to ask CCGP to consider a new Rule, based on a comparable Rule of the World Health Assembly to the effect that "In plenary meetings of the Commission, the chief delegate may designate another delegate who shall have the right to speak and vote in the name of his or her delegation on any question. Moreover, upon the request of the chief delegate or any delegate so designated the Chairperson may allow an adviser to speak on any particular point". *(ALINORM 03/41, para. 173)*

CAC28 adopted the Amendment to current Rule V. Sessions on the right to address the Chair *(ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 27)*

**Proposal No. 30:** "Revision of Rule XI.4" (ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4, para. 29)

Rule XI.4 should be revised to allow for participation under the FAO/WHO Trust Fund for the Participation of Developing Countries and Countries in Transition in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and also to take into account the Commission's decision concerning funding of participation of Members of The Executive Committee from the Codex budget (See ALINORM 03/26/11: Add.2, Option 11.4). The body responsible for the procedural review should submit a proposal to the Commission in 2004 on this matter.

**STATUS**

CAC26 decided to ask CCGP to submit a proposal to the Commission by 2004 to revise Rule XI.4 to remove the possible impediments to the participation of recipients of funding from the FAO/WHO Trust Fund for the Participation of Developing Countries and Countries in Codex Standard Setting Procedures in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. It also requested that the revised Rule should take into account the Commission's decision concerning funding of participation of Members of the Executive Committee from the Codex budget. *(ALINORM 05/28/41, para. 177)*

CAC28 adopted the Amendments to current Rules III and IV.1 concerning the enlargement of the Executive Committee and to current Rule XII on matters related to budget and expenses. allowing the participation of the Coordinators as Members in the Executive Committee. *(ALINORM 05/28/41 para. 20).*

**Part 2 - Status of Implementation of Recommendations (32-41) related to the Evaluation on the Provision of Scientific Advice**

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <u>ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</u> )	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
<p><b>Recommendation 32:</b> JEMRA to be ratified as a permanent committee. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p><b>RISK ASSESSMENT AND EXPERT ADVICE</b></p>	
<p>FAO Management agrees that the Joint Expert Meeting on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA) be ratified as a permanent committee (Rec. 32) and is willing to implement this in consultation with WHO. Operational steps would include the definition of JEMRA's terms of reference and the creation of a post of Joint Secretary to JEMRA in FAO (para 20)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2003: After internal discussions FAO and WHO recognized the importance of having a well functioning but also flexible body which could quickly adjust and adapt to the ever evolving needs and developments in the area of microbiological food safety and risk assessment. It was considered more important that resources would be placed on enhancing the functionality and technical capacities of JEMRA, to meet the immediate needs of Codex, rather than investing in ratification of JEMRA as a permanent committee, which would involve the governing bodies of both organizations.</li> <li>• In line with the agreement to focus on the operational aspects of JEMRA, FAO, in 2002, created a new staff post to support the work of JEMRA, also at WHO one staff is dedicated to this work.</li> <li>• A joint FAO/WHO publications series was established in 2003 to disseminate the work of JEMRA, also guidelines for microbiological risk assessment were published in 2003, 2008 and 2009</li> <li>• JEMRA activities continue to be subject to the same standards of excellence, integrity, independence, transparency, objectivity, fairness and inclusiveness as those of other Joint FAO/WHO expert committees (FAO/WHO, 2007<sup>1</sup>).</li> <li>• Microbiological food safety and risk assessment has made rapid advancement since the establishment of JEMRA and the type of work has changed substantially over the last 10 years to meet the needs of Codex. FAO and WHO are currently in the process of updating the methodology used by JEMRA, to ensure it continues to produce high quality products. Not having status as a permanent body does not seem to have had any negative impact on the functioning of JEMRA. Key challenges revolve around the resources to support its work.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status: Improvement of the working mechanisms of JEMRA and all the scientific advice committees is an ongoing activity led by the Joint FAO/WHO Secretariat.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 33:</b> There should be a clear budget and human resource allocation for scientific advice and risk assessment. A small proportion of the budget should be retained for use by FAO and WHO to meet their own needs and the remainder clearly available for work on the priorities of Codex. FAO and WHO should make proposals for discussion at the July 2003 Commission session. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management agrees that there should be a clear budget and human resource allocation for scientific advice and risk assessment (Rec. 33) and agrees that prioritization is necessary, even though the situation is not the same for all three committees. FAO will examine the feasibility of making</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since 2006 FAO and WHO have been providing to CAC increasingly detailed overviews of its budget for the provision of scientific advice, as well as an overview of the requests for scientific advice and the estimated costs. This has high-lighted the overall critical financial situations within both organizations for scientific advice activities.</li> <li>• The requests for scientific advice are currently prioritized using the criteria proposed by Codex (ALINORM 05/28/3, para 75<sup>2</sup>), taking also into account requests from Member Countries and from FAO and WHO programs,</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> FAO/WHO, 2007. Framework for the Provision of Scientific Advice, <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1296e/a1296e00.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The CCEXEC5 (ALINORM 05/28/3, para. 75) agreed the following set of criteria for the prioritization of requests from Codex for scientific advice:

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB (ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1)	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
relevant proposals to the July 2003 Session of the Commission, in consultation with WHO.(para 21)	<p>and availability of resources. The requests are prioritized to ensure that regular scientific advice is provided to all requesting Codex Committees and in order to address a cross-cutting range of food safety hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within FAO the resource allocation for the Scientific Advice Programme from the Regular Programme has been protected over the last several biennia . While efforts have been made to secure more funding from external sources (e.g. GIFSA – see Rec 34), this presents a number of challenges. Many of the aspects related to FAO and WHO budgeting for scientific advice have been provided in a paper presented to the CAC in 2014<sup>3</sup>, including the issues of securing external or extra-budgetary resources for the scientific advice work.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status: FAO and WHO continue to address this in their biennial work planning. Regular reporting to Codex on the budget for scientific advice and implementation for the program will continue.</b></p>
<b>Recommendation 34:</b> The increased funding of risk assessment is a top priority. ( <i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i> )	
FAO Management agrees with Recommendation 34 that increased funding for risk assessment is a top priority. (para 22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to attract additional financial and human resources in the area of scientific advice has been an issue of discussion in both organizations.</li> <li>• Recognizing the need for extra budgetary resources to support the scientific advice work, the Global Initiative for Food-related Scientific Advice (GIFSA) was established in 2007. In 2009, FAO launched “Science for Safe Food: FAO strategy for the provision of Scientific Advice for Food Safety 2010-2013” to Support GIFSA. FAO and WHO are now in the process of working on new strategies for funding on scientific advice following the discussion on this issue in the 69<sup>th</sup> CCEXEC and 37<sup>th</sup> CAC and update on this will be provided to the 38<sup>th</sup> CAC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status: Ongoing. Resources continue to be a top priority and FAO and WHO are continuing their efforts in this area and to find new donors to support this work.</b></p>
<b>Recommendation 35:</b> FAO and WHO should support the collection of data covering a wider range of diets and production processes. ( <i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i> )	
FAO Management agrees that the quality of scientific advice is highly dependent upon the adequacy of the data (Rec. 35) and that, although generally sound, improvements in the database could be achieved through greater coverage from developing countries. This applies particularly to data on dietary intake and on production and processing practices. (para 23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of initiatives to address data availability and quality have been undertaken: i) focussed data collection efforts in specified countries on hazards and issues which are priorities for discussion within Codex ii) support to countries in the development of their capacities to undertake total diet studies and iii) development of the global databases on food consumption data. Examples of some of these initiatives are highlighted below.</li> <li>• Launch of the GEMS Food website in 2011 to allow Member States to submit data on a user-friendly interface. To date more than 2.5 million analytical results have been submitted and are regularly used by CCCF and JECFA. In parallel to the promotion of the web-platform for data submission, ongoing efforts aim to promote good practices</li> </ul>

- Relevance in relation to the strategic objectives and priorities as defined in the Strategic Plan;
- Clear definition of the scope and objective of the request as well as clear indication of the way in which the advice will be used in the work of Codex;
- Significance and urgency to the development or advancement of Codex texts taking into account public health and/or food trade relevance of the issue and the needs of developing countries;
- Availability of scientific knowledge and data required to conduct the risk assessment or to elaborate the scientific advice;
- High priority assigned by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

<sup>3</sup> [http://ftp.fao.org/codex/meetings/cac/cac37/cac37\\_12e\\_Add2.pdf](http://ftp.fao.org/codex/meetings/cac/cac37/cac37_12e_Add2.pdf)

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB (ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1)	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
	<p>for using data with a particular focus on CCCF working groups and JECFA experts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mycotoxin in sorghum – An FAO/WHO project supported by the Codex Trust Fund (with funds from the EC) implemented in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali, and Sudan will provide occurrence data on mycotoxins in sorghum together with value chain studies in each country outlining current production, processing and use patterns for sorghum. The results will be discussed by CCCF) to decide on the need for MLs.</li> <li>• Total Diet Studies – Efforts have primarily focussed on providing support at a regional or sub-regional level. Support has been provided to ASEAN countries who are working towards the harmonized use of existing individual food consumption data for risk assessment purposes. A 3-year project has just started in Benin, Cameroon, Mali and Nigeria to implement a regional Total Diet Study to assess food chemical contamination of interest (e.g. mycotoxins, heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants, pesticides residues and veterinary drugs) in their national diets. This project will enable these countries to provide reliable data for risk assessments and standard setting processes at international level. The project is funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF).</li> <li>• Global food consumption databases – Efforts focus on collection of chronic individual food consumption data to address the needs of stakeholders in the field of nutrition and food safety. The objective is to collect, harmonize and disseminate individual food consumption data available all over the world at national and sub national level.</li> <li>• Ad hoc activities: some small ad hoc studies have been undertaken in developing countries to address data gaps and to get a snapshot of the contamination situation there. Despite the limited use for the risk assessments, they provided insight into the relevance of existing data to these countries. Examples include data collection on microbiological hazards in poultry in Uganda, <i>Vibrio</i> spp in seafood in India, microbiological hazards and AMR in foods of animal origin Kenya and Cambodia.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, it should be noted that through the FAO and WHO capacity development programmes, emphasis is given to data and evidence being available and central to decision-making at country level. This includes the development of a range of tools for application at country level.</p> <p><b>Status: FAO and WHO have been very active in this area and continue to support efforts according to available resources.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 36:</b> Budgetary provision should be made to pay independent experts undertaking risk assessments. At the same time, strict deadlines and quality requirements should be put in place. (Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO)</p>	
<p>FAO Management supports the emphasis on the independence of experts (para.189). It agrees in principle with the payment of fees to experts (Rec. 36) but proposes that such fees should be paid in relation to the preparatory work done by experts and not be linked to their attendance at expert meetings, and, as experts are normally drawn from government risk assessment agencies, any payment should be cleared with the agency concerned. (para 24)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While acknowledging the intent of this recommendation, the practical implications are prohibitive. FAO and WHO have considered ways to acknowledge the in-kind contribution that institutions and experts provide to the organizations, e.g. by acknowledging individual authors. Full recognition of their contribution is made in the reports of the meetings and appreciation letters have also been sent to experts and on certain occasions their institutions. There is an increasing effort in working with experts to also publish some of the work of the expert committees in the peer reviewed literature, which contributes to the recognition of the work of experts in contributing to the scientific advice programme. This is in line with the recommendation of the FAO/WHO workshop on provision of scientific advice that was held in Geneva in 2004</li> </ul>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB (ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1)	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the interests of independence and in order to maintain the equal status of all experts FAO/WHO does not pay any experts for their time associated with participation in expert meetings. Only their expenses are covered. Resources permitting and if a very extensive amount of work is needed, experts may be contracted to undertake preparatory work in advance of a meeting. However the status of these experts in a meeting is that of a resource person rather than an expert member of the committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Status: FAO and WHO have recognised the need for reward and appreciation for the time and expertise devoted to the FAO/WHO scientific advice programme by independent experts, and continue to improve non-monetary means of achieving this.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 37:</b> Building on the findings of this evaluation, a consultancy study should be immediately undertaken of expert advice and risk assessment and this should be followed by an expert consultation and discussion in Codex. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management agrees with the proposals for improving quality, quantity and timeliness of scientific advice to Codex. With regard to Recommendation 37, it agrees that consultancy studies on expert advice and risk assessment should be undertaken. However, due to the many elements to be considered, including emerging issues, the process would require time and substantial additional resources.(para 25)</p> <p>WHO-DG</p> <p>The Director-General fully supports the recommendation to move forward expeditiously with the implementation of the agreed recommendations through the establishment of a joint task force. She will work with FAO to convene a consultation urgently to review the status and procedures of the expert bodies in order to improve the quality, quantity and timeliness of scientific advice, as requested by the Codex Alimentarius Commission at its Twenty-fourth session in July 2001. (para 20)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The “Consultative Process” began in 2003. This was in response to the 'FAO/WHO evaluation of Codex Alimentarius work and other FAO and WHO work on food standards' and an earlier request of the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission held in July 2001, which recommended that FAO and WHO carry out "a review of the status and procedures of the expert bodies in order to improve the quality, quantity and timeliness of scientific advice" (ALINORM 01/41, para 61).</li> </ul> <p>The “Consultative Process” was overseen and managed by a joint FAO/WHO Secretariat. The process, activities undertaken and results achieved were regularly reported to the Codex membership, and opportunity provided for any feedback and suggestions.</p> <p>The conclusions and recommendations of the “Consultative Process” led to three main outputs.</p> <p><b>a) FAO/WHO Framework on the Provision of Scientific Advice</b></p> <p>FAO/WHO management of the overall system for the provision of scientific advice was enhanced through the harmonization of scientific approaches and operating procedures followed by both organizations in the provision of advice requested by Codex and FAO/WHO Member Countries.</p> <p>To continue strengthening the independence, transparency and quality of FAO/WHO scientific advice, the Framework was developed to document the principles, practices and procedures currently applied by FAO and WHO for the provision of scientific advice. As science and societal needs evolve the procedures will be updated.</p> <p><b>b) Clear identification of needs (from Codex and member countries) for FAO/WHO scientific advice and criteria for the prioritization of the requests</b></p> <p>Refer to recommendation 33 for a description of the prioritization process.</p> <p><b>c) Definition of new approaches to enhance the participation of experts and the use of data from developing countries in the elaboration of international scientific advice</b></p> <p>The meeting, <i>Enhancing developing country participation in FAO/WHO scientific advice activities</i> provided a range of recommendations to FAO and WHO in three main areas: to continue for enhancing: greater inclusion of data from developing countries (Data issues are addressed under Rec 35); enhancement of the potential for experts from</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB (ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1)	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
	<p>developing countries to be selected as members and have an effective participation in these meetings; and means to enhance the enabling environment at national, regional and international levels.</p> <p>FAO and WHO now use a wide range of professional networks through which to communicate their work as well as more systematically using their regional and sub regional offices to communicate on scientific advice issues. Greater awareness and information on the expert committees and their work is also increasingly achieved through incorporation of these in to training and capacity development activities in the areas of risk analysis. However challenges in identifying expertise from developing countries remain and more work is needed in this area</p> <p><b>Status: The consultative process is complete. Appropriate follow up continues.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 38:</b> Establish a Scientific Committee to support expert advice and risk assessment (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management supports in principle the establishment of a Scientific Committee (Rec. 38). However, it considers that its rationale needs further elaboration while the composition of the Committee, its terms of reference, its interaction with the relevant Codex Committees and FAO and WHO and reporting arrangements need to be clarified. FAO Management is of the opinion that the establishment of a Scientific Committee and related issues could be addressed within the framework of activities reflected under Recommendation 37.(para 26)</p>	<p>This issue was considered as part of the consultative process which assessed the recommendation and highlighted the positive and negative implications of such an approach (ref 2004 report). Following the discussions the workshop recommended that the primary focus for FAO and WHO should be on improving the management of scientific advice, including 1) enhancing scientific approaches 2) improving coordination and prioritization and 3) facilitating communication, interaction and transparency.</p> <p>As a result, FAO and WHO each appointed a coordinator within their organization for the provision of scientific advice to Codex with the objective of working together to ensure a more streamlined management of the work. This increased the communication greatly between both organizations on scientific advice and led to regular planning meetings of the work. In addition in 2007 FAO and WHO established regular high level management meetings to address the overarching issues and direction of scientific advice programme as well as other food safety work.</p> <p><b>Status: A scientific advisory committee has not been established. Initial focus has been on enhancing internal mechanisms for coordination. This aspect will be further considered.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 39:</b> Establish a joint Coordinator for FAO and WHO scientific advisory activities. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management supports the enhancement of a coordinating function among the scientific expert committees. With regard to the creation of a post of Joint Coordinator (Rec. 39) it considers that the rationale for the proposed Coordinator would need to be further substantiated and the terms of reference discussed and carefully revised to avoid duplication and conflicts of authority. In particular, the interaction with the Joint Secretaries of the expert committees would need clarification. FAO Management is willing to discuss these issues further with WHO. The proposed posting of the Joint Coordinator at WHO is noted. Procedures to ensure effective interaction with the Codex Secretariat and modalities of joint funding would need to be</p>	<p>This recommendation has not been implemented. Rather as mentioned under Rec 38 each organization has appointed a coordinator for scientific advice to facilitate coordination between the two organizations.</p> <p>The joint coordination mechanism, overseen by regular high level FAO/WHO management meetings, is providing an effective means of coordinating the scientific advice activities, thus replacing the role of a single coordinator.</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB ( <u>ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1</u> )	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
elaborated. (para 27)	
<p><b>Recommendation 40:</b> FAO and, in particular, WHO are recommended to markedly increase their contribution to health risk assessment and expert advice to feed into Codex. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management agrees with Recommendation 40, that FAO and, in particular, WHO markedly increase their contributions to health risk assessment and expert advice to contribute to Codex. The suggested distribution of work, which would be “in addition to the immediate direct resource requirements”, needs to be carefully considered further by both agencies. (para 28)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As well as the regular meetings of JECFA, JMPR and JEMRA, FAO and WHO have implemented a number of ad hoc expert meeting to address the specific scientific advice needs of Codex since the evaluation was undertaken. Annual reports have been provided to the CAC. In addition JEMNU has been established to provide scientific advice on nutrition issues although it has not yet been activated by the CCNFSDU.</li> </ul>
<p><b>CAPACITY BUILDING</b></p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 41:</b> The two Organizations should agree on principles for coordination and delineation of responsibilities with regard to capacity building and report to the Commission in July 2003. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management welcomes the recommendation to enhance coordination between FAO and WHO at country level aimed at more effective use of FAO/WHO resources and avoiding overlaps and inconsistencies (Rec. 41). However, it is of the opinion that a formal <i>a priori</i> delineation of responsibilities and division of work is impractical as capacity building often involves joint and individual activities determined on a case-by-case basis. On the other hand, FAO agrees that FAO and WHO inform the Commission regularly of their capacity building activities. (para 30)</p>	<p>FAO and WHO work closely on many activities to improve food safety capacities at national and regional level – this includes development of global tools, training and guidance materials, implementing training courses and workshops, and joint implementation of national projects. We do this as we recognise the complementary nature of our work, and the importance of ensuring multi-disciplinary work across health, agriculture, standards, trade sectors. This does not prevent both Organizations undertaking work singularly – within their respective mandates and to meet country requests. As two sister UN agencies, information is shared regularly on our work programmes, and both Organizations report annually to the CAC on our work to strengthen food safety capacities.</p> <p><b>Status: The FAO Management response is still valid.</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 42:</b> Expand the existing FAO/WHO Codex trust fund in line with its wider objectives into a major multi-donor trust fund, with flexible arrangements.. (<i>Primary Responsibility: FAO/WHO</i>)</p>	
<p>FAO Management affirms its support to mobilizing donor funding for capacity building in food safety (Rec. 42), as well as its commitment to promote complementarities and consistency between the existing and planned trust funds and projects. (para 31)</p> <p>DG-WHO</p> <p>Capacity-building in developing countries, which should enable them to represent their interests effectively in the</p>	<p>The FAO/WHO Project and Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex (Codex Trust Fund) will end in December 2015. During its 12 years of operation the Codex Trust Fund has raised over US\$ 21million and has used these contributions to play an important catalytic role in exposing developing and transition economy countries to the international food standard-setting process and to the importance of participating effectively in Codex to realize health and economic gains for their countries. As per its second objective, the Codex Trust Fund has expanded beyond supporting only physical participation in Codex meetings from eligible countries, to supporting joint, and strategically planned FAO/WHO Codex capacity-building activities aimed at enhancing effective participation of developing and transition economy countries in Codex. These activities have been successful but need to be maintained and strengthened in the successor initiative which is under development and will become operational in 2016. In support of its third</p>

FAO Management Response / Comments by DG in WHO DG Report to EB (ALINORM 03/25/3-Add.1)	Subsequent actions taken by FAO and WHO
<p>Codex Alimentarius Commission and in WTO negotiations, should benefit from the proposed 12-year FAO/WHO trust fund supported in 2002 by the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The integration of food safety, food standards, food production and food trade considerations in relation to an agreed focus on sustainable development would represent a significant step forward for developing economies. (para 19)</p>	<p>objective, the Codex Trust Fund has supported one activity aimed at generating scientific data on mycotoxins in sorghum in 4 countries to feed into the Codex process, and further funds are expected in 2016 for a second activity. This remains an important area of concern and FAO/WHO are looking at ways to further strengthen the scientific and technical input of developing and transition economy countries in the Codex process. The mid-term review carried out in 2009 highlighted the strengths and successes of the Trust Fund and called attention to areas for improvement which lead to a strategic re-positioning of the Trust Fund which is an indicator of the dynamic nature of the Trust Fund to respond to the changing needs of countries throughout the lifespan of the Trust Fund. Results of the final project evaluation will be taken into consideration in the design and development of the successor initiative to further support countries to develop their capacity for effective participation in Codex.</p> <p><b>Status: Codex Trust Fund successfully implemented, and successor initiative under development.</b></p>