



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

38th Session, CICG

Geneva, Switzerland, 6-11 July 2015

CODEX WORK MANAGEMENT AND FUNCTIONING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

Governments and international organizations in Observer status with the Codex Alimentarius Commission are invited to submit comments on each of the 18 proposals in Section 4 Table 1. A template for the submission of comments is presented in Annex 1.

Comments should be submitted no later than **31 May 2015** as follows: Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme (E-mail: Codex@fao.org).

Governments and international organisations who have submitted comments on this matter at CCGP29 are invited to resubmit their comments (either the same or revised) using the template in Annex 1 to this document.

Comments submitted will be compiled in original language only; therefore, Governments and international organizations may provide the translation of their comments in other Codex official languages.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1. CCEXEC69 discussed a proposal of CCGP28 to (i) develop an inclusive and clearly scoped process to review the work management systems and practices of Codex according to strategic goal 4 of the Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019; and (ii) envisage a review, under the auspices of FAO and WHO, of the status of implementation of the recommendations and associated proposals arising from the 2002 Codex Evaluation.

2. CCEXEC69 noted that the key concerns needed to be identified and analysed first, before concrete decisions could be made on the way forward and that this could be best addressed through a discussion paper prepared by the Secretariat in cooperation with FAO and WHO.

3. CCEXEC69:

- Agreed that a two stage process, first internal and Secretariat-led and then external could be undertaken in order to evaluate the work management of Codex
- Requested the Secretariat to prepare, in collaboration with FAO and WHO, a paper identifying scope and processes to evaluate the work management of Codex for consideration by CCGP in May 2015. The background to this paper should also include an analysis of the implementation of the 2002 Codex evaluation. Taking into account comments expressed at CCGP, the Secretariat-led internal review will be initiated in a form to be decided and approved by the Commission at its 38th Session. The case and process for an external review will also be examined by the Commission.

4. CCEXEC69 also considered the issue raised by the Delegation of Cameroon during CCGP28 regarding the effectiveness and representativeness of CCEXEC and noted that this matter was closely linked to the discussion on the Codex work management and that it could be dealt within the discussion paper agreed upon.¹

5. CAC37 endorsed the recommendation of CCEXEC69 concerning the preparation of a paper identifying scope and process to evaluate the work management of Codex (i.e. that the Secretariat prepare, in collaboration with FAO and WHO, a paper identifying scope and processes to evaluate the work management of Codex) for consideration by CCGP in 2015. CAC37 noted that the paper would also address the issues related to the effectiveness and representativeness of the Executive Committee and that the

¹ REP14/EXEC paras 69-75

Codex Evaluation in 2002 ([ALINORM 03/25/3](#)) and its follow-up in 2005 were appropriate starting points for this work².

6. As indicated by CAC37 and CCEXEC69, this document uses as a starting point the implementation of the recommendations of the Codex Evaluation in 2002 ("the Evaluation").

7. The Evaluation contains forty-two recommendations, which address: (i) Codex (Rec. 1-31); (ii) Scientific Advice (Rec. 32-40); and (iii) Capacity Building (Rec. 41-42).

8. For the purpose of part 2, 3 and 4 of this document only recommendations 1-31 are considered. The status of implementation of the 41 recommendations including those related to Scientific Advice and Capacity Building is presented in a separate document (CX/CAC 15/38/9 Add.1).

9. At its 25th (Extraordinary) Session (Geneva 13-15 February 2003), the Commission had a general discussion on the main aspects of the recommendations identified by the Executive Committee, namely: the mandate; the priorities; the establishment of an Executive Board, in place of the current Executive Committee and a Standards Management Committee; the definition of consensus; expert scientific advice; and capacity building.

10. CAC25 requested the Secretariat to obtain comments from governments and interested international organizations on the report of the Evaluation, and to prepare options and strategies for consideration by CAC26. Based on the replies received, the Codex Secretariat prepared thirty-eight proposals, addressing the following areas:

- Review of the Codex committee structure and mandates of Codex committees and task forces, including regional committees ([ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.1](#)) (related to Recommendations 16, 17);
- Review of the functions of the Executive Committee ([ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.2](#)) (Recommendations 9, 10);
- Improved processes for standards management ([ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.3](#)) (Recommendations 18, 20, 23, 24);
- Review of the Rules of Procedure and other procedural matters ([ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.4](#)) (Recommendations 8, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28); and
- Implementation of other Recommendations ([ALINORM 03/26/11 Add.5](#)).

11. From CAC27 (2004) until considered completed in 2009, the Codex Secretariat presented a document (to both CCEXEC and CAC) on the status of implementation of the 38 proposals. It should be noted that there is no always a clear correspondence between the recommendations of the Evaluation and the proposals that were monitored.

12. In the Appendix, for each recommendations, information is provided on:

- Correspondence with proposals
- FAO/WHO Management Response;
- Relevant decision of CAC25, which discussed the recommendations;
- Relevant decision of CAC26; which discussed the proposals;
- Implementation status by 2009 of the proposals; and
- Events after 2009.

1.2 Overview

13. Section 2 contains a review of the implementation status of recommendations 1-31. Section 3 contains proposals made to improve Codex work management and functioning of the Executive Committee. Section 4 will examine possible ways and resources required for further evaluation and implementation of the proposals.

2. FINDINGS

14. When reviewing the implementation status of recommendations 1-31, 5 main areas for re-evaluation /improvements which are discussed below were identified (Sections 2.1-2.5) as well as recommendations for which presently no further action is recommended (2.6). Each section contains the original short version of each recommendation from 2003 followed by comments by FAO/WHO/Codex Secretariat from 2015.

² REP14/CAC para. 103

2.1 Mandate and priorities

Recommendation #1:

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 :

- strengthen work on foods for special dietary uses, health claims and nutrient addition; and
- undertake new work on packaging materials; and on industrial processing agents and bioagents in foods.

15. The work of Codex continues both on health (food safety and nutrition) and non-health standards; the exact ratio in the use of Codex resources for these different categories has never been examined.

16. Work on foods for special dietary uses, health claims and nutrient addition has continued and even been strengthened in several specific areas such as special dietary uses, health claims, nutrition labelling, nutrient addition. Codex worked intensively in these areas also in relation to the implementation of the WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, adopted by the World Health Assembly.

17. It is not clear why in the recommendation new work on packaging materials and industrial processing agents in foods was stressed.

18. What seems to be lacking in some areas are effective mechanisms to strategically conduct horizon scanning and identify and include emerging issues in the programme of work (this would be consistent with the Codex Strategic Plan Strategic Goal 1). Ongoing discussions on the “revitalisation of FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee meetings” are also partly addressing this question. The proposal (related to Recommendation #11) to submit a “strategic plan for standards development” at two-yearly intervals on a rolling basis could address this issue as the Codex strategic plan may be too high level for this purpose.

Recommendation #2: It is recommended that Codex should not take on additional work in non-health related areas.

19. This recommendation appears to be partly in contradiction with Recommendation #3.

20. Commodity standards continue to be an important part of Codex work. Many countries consider work on commodity standards useful to improve their market access and in preventing food trade impediments.

21. The establishment of the CCSC was not without controversy and has also led to the present review. With the decision to establish a new commodity committee Codex went against recommendation #16 (i.e. use of time bound task forces).

Recommendation #3: In determining its standard-setting work programme, Codex should prioritize as follows:

- 1) standards having an impact on consumer health and safety;
- 2) commodity standards responding to the expressed needs of developing countries;
- 3) commodity standards responding to the expressed needs of developed countries; and
- 4) informational labelling relating to non-health and non-safety issues.

22. Consumer health and safety continue to be the first priority for Codex; new work is decided on the basis of the Critical Review.

23. For deciding on new commodity standards, guidance in the Procedural Manual does not address/recognise the importance of a commodity for developing countries.

24. Informational labelling relating to non-health and non-safety issues is not a priority for Codex, however, it remains a fundamental part of commodity work, contributing to the mandate of Codex to ensure fair trade practices.

25. These four priorities overall reflect current Codex work that is presently driven mainly by Members requests rather than by the Critical Review or an overall strategy.

Recommendation #4 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:

"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."

26. The Codex mandate has not been changed. No proposals for amendment were submitted to FAO/WHO governing bodies. There is an explicit recognition of Codex food safety work in the WTO/SPS Agreement and an implicit recognition in the WTO/TBT Agreement.

2.2 Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO

Recommendation #5: 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).

27. Codex standards are mainly used by its membership. FAO and WHO also promote use of Codex standards and guidelines through food and nutrition policy development and capacity development programmes (as well as supporting enhanced participation in Codex).

28. There seems to be sufficient interaction between the Codex Secretariat and FAO and WHO to create synergies and enhance each other's work. On a more general level in accordance with Article 5 of the statutes of Codex, CAC "*shall make recommendations to the FAO Conference and the appropriate body of WHO through their respective Directors-General*" however this does not seem to be the case regularly. Despite this provision, Codex matters are not a standing item in the FAO Conference or in the World Health Assembly.

29. Codex related matters are not regularly reported to WHO Governing bodies. Amongst Codex-related bodies, only JECFA outcomes are regularly reported to the World Health Assembly through the WHO Executive Board.

30. FAO Governing Bodies regularly state their support for Codex and related activities of FAO.

31. In the other direction there exist different interpretations on the extent to which Codex can/should support FAO and WHO policies and strategies and how much these should/could guide or direct the work of Codex (e.g. alcoholic beverages; follow-up formula; WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health; ICN2 follow-up etc.).

Recommendation #7: 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.

32. Codex as an Article VI body of the FAO constitution enjoys a certain degree of autonomy, but not as much independence as Article XIV bodies (such as IPPC).

33. There is a need for a more rigorous work planning and budgetary process for Codex work to justify the financial support from FAO and WHO. The new planning process should be pro-active and facilitate integrating the Codex budget planning with the relevant FAO and WHO processes. Senior officials of FAO and WHO discuss Codex management matters at least once a year (and as often as needed) with the Codex Secretary. These meetings can be the mechanisms to facilitate streamlining of the budgetary planning. The change in the schedule of the FAO Conference (from December to June) facilitates coordination with WHO whose World Health Assembly is in May.

Recommendation #13: 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.

34. In the secretariat the D-1 mainly fulfils executive functions of the Secretariat with the support of 2 P-5 officers who also assist in committee work but have other functions (work planning, communication etc.) in addition. Thus the bulk of the Committee work needs to be ensured by the two P-4 and 2 P-3 food standard officers.

35. Experience has shown that four fully proficient food standards officers are needed to efficiently provide the Secretariat to Codex subsidiary bodies. If only one is missing or not yet fully proficient (an average of

three years is needed to work independently), then senior officers need to take on substantively more committee work at the detriment of their other functions.

36. In the past, recruitment of officers to fill vacated positions, including internal promotion, has led to extended periods of vacancies within the Codex Secretariat. As of December 2014, for the first time since 2009, the Secretariat (P level) is fully staffed with a mix of longstanding staff members and relatively new ones.

37. Experience should be gained with this situation and a review of the professional structure of the Secretariat could be considered in two or three years time.

38. Apart from the human resources of the Codex Secretariat, effective operation of the Codex programme heavily depends on the staff resources of FAO and WHO, in technical and scientific advice and managerial oversight (food safety, nutrition, environmental health), in the administration of the Codex Trust Fund, in Codex-related capacity development and in legal services. The salaries of and travel costs for attendance of Codex meetings by the staff involved are usually not covered or reimbursed by the Codex budget, and the manpower in FAO and WHO is very much limited.

Recommendation #15: 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.

39. The Codex budget has been “protected” during this period while other programmes of FAO and WHO have suffered important reductions.

40. While the current budget allows meeting regular activities of Codex, demand for additional resources should be justified by specific needs and detailed plan of activities. As mentioned in the comments to recommendation #7 there is a need for a more transparent budgeting and work-planning process to better allow FAO and WHO to ensure adequate funding.

41. It is important to recall the importance of sustained and adequate funding to other programmes (e.g. Scientific advice) for the functioning of the “Codex standard setting machinery. The issue of funding should be seen holistically.

2.3 Strategic governance within Codex - “Executive Board”

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.

Recommendation #10: The Executive Board should be small and include:

- 2-3 observer representatives for consumers, industry and perhaps primary producers;
- formal participation of the Secretary of Codex and FAO and WHO.

42. An Executive Board was never established. Instead 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. A few delegations preferred retaining it as a strategic Management Body only, expressing a concern not to overburden the Executive Committee. (ALINORM 93/41, para 156); and
- Enlarge the Executive Committee 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. (ALINORM 93/41, para 158).

43. The size and working modalities (agenda, working documents etc) of the CCEXEC rather resemble those of a restricted CAC (a mini CAC). As both Members elected and Coordinators come from specific regions there is continuous confusion between their distinct roles. This was already feared by a number of countries in CAC26 and subsequently the CCGP clarified that the members elected should act in the interest of the Commission as a whole and the coordinators bring in regional aspects however in practice the role confusion continued.

44. The possibility of Members to be accompanied by up to two advisors who are chosen by the member further increased the number of participants and confusion about roles and regional position taking. The possibility to invite observers was never studied seriously and implemented.

45. The new tasks given to the Executive Committee after the evaluation are the critical review and the review of observer applications. Specific tasks such as the development of the draft strategic plans was delegated to sub-committees.

46. The standards management function (critical review) is further discussed under recommendation #11. The discussion of observer applications which in any case need to be cleared by the legal services of FAO and WHO did not add value.

47. The decision of CAC regarding the revised functions and composition of the CCEXEC has not shown a significant positive impact. Rather than giving directions there is often repetition of discussions between CCEXEC and CAC and especially the CCEXEC discussions on critical / controversial issues often show the same split of opinions as in CAC without proposing creative solutions.

48. Even if the CCEXEC sacrifices the representativeness of CAC, it is still big enough to be split into different positions and therefore is not able to function as a strategic advisory body to CAC.

49. After the Evaluation the CCEXEC started to meet every six months but ceased to do so in 2012. Since then it is meeting every 12 months, during the week preceding a CAC session. This means that after the renewal of the CCEXEC membership, it will not meet for almost one year later.

50. The CCEXEC's generally recognised role, to prepare a ground and advice for the CAC, is somehow linked to the timing of its pre-CAC meeting as prescribed in Rule V.6 of the Rules of Procedure. This timing does not give much room for CCEXEC to assist in the timely follow-up to the decisions taken by a CAC session.

51. Sub-committees of the CCEXEC and informal meetings between the Chair and the Vice-Chairs of the Commission and the Secretariat have proven useful to identify and address specific issues and advice the CCEXEC and the CAC.

Recommendation #11: 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.

52. A standards management committee was never created and CCEXEC started its Critical Review function in 2006, which consists of looking at new work, adoption of standards and monitoring of standard development, based on documents prepared by the Codex Secretariat in cooperation with the Codex Committee chairs.

53. Only very few recommendations were made by CCEXEC to speed up work, to discontinue work, not to approve new work or not adopt standards.

54. The CCEXEC performed this task looking at individual pieces of work rather than from strategic point of view which would look at the overall work and strategy of the committee and CAC as a whole.

55. The proposed biennial strategic plan for standard setting which could have assisted the CCEXEC in its advisory role on standard development was never implemented though it is included in the Procedural Manual in the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and related Texts, Part1. Strategic Planning Process*. This could have included guidance to committees on how to identify emerging issues (Objective 1.2 of the overall Codex Strategic Plan).

56. Any improvement in the speed of standard setting seems to be more related to the annual meetings of the CAC and better management of the committees themselves rather than to the strategic management function of CCEXEC.

57. Possible reasons for this situation are:

- The current composition of CCEXEC may not allow its members to consider tough decisions in the overall interest of the membership (as outlined also in the comments under Recommendations #9 and #10).
- Decisions coming out of the critical review need to be supported by a thorough analysis of proposals for new work and ongoing work. The present format of the pre-session documentation and the discussion during the CCEXEC may not have been fulfilling this need.

- The meeting frequency, timing, format of discussion and duration offered by the CCEXEC may not support the conduct of a thorough critical review and standards management.

Recommendation #12: 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.

58. Annual meetings of CAC:

- Have significantly increased the workload of the secretariat, leaving less time for to stop and think and process the outcome of the commission and properly communicate about it.
- May have improved the efficiency of the work of certain Committees at certain times but overall effects are not apparent.
- Have contributed to timely and prompt start of new work
- Have contributed to raise awareness on the work of Codex and related issues;
- Have reduced the need for meetings of the CCEXEC in its current form which repeats to a large extent the agenda of the CAC; and
- Have narrowed the time window for scheduling committee meetings as no committee meetings should be scheduled two months before and after a CAC.

59. While the increase of the meeting frequency for the Commission seems to have had overall positive effects on Codex productivity, the recent reduction of the frequency of the meetings of CCEXEC did not have a noticeable effect. The possibility of different agendas for different commission years (one full and one reduced commission is examined under a different recommendation).

60. The format, frequency, timing and length of meetings of an executive body that would assist the Commission should be commensurate to its strategic role.

Recommendation #18: 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.

61. A study conducted by the Codex Secretariat showed that the average overall speed for Codex work was 4.2 years and for food safety matters was 3.5 years.³ The limit of five years has not been enforced and is not realistic for those committees meeting only every two years.

62. Projects that go beyond the 5 year limit are rare and the reasons for the delays are diverse. Rather than a strict time limit it would be preferable if an effective management process can address issues affecting the progress of a particular project before delays become unreasonable. The critical review has until now not noticeably influenced the speed of the standard setting.

Recommendation #27: Codex should review its principles and procedures for observer status as required by the Procedural Manual and:

- 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;
- b) observers should be represented on the Executive Board and the Standards Management Committee (if established).

63. The process for applications was already commented on under the Executive Board Proposal 3. Stricter criteria were developed but it is not clear if this has led to more representative observers.

64. There are many inactive observers some of which genuinely may not have any work to comment on for some years and others who may not have any further interest in participating in Codex but who maintain the link to raise their own profile. The Codex Secretariat should review the participation of observers in line with the guidance given in the Procedural Manual depending on available resources.

65. The regular participation of observers in the Executive Board is not recommended as due to the diversity of observers there would have to be several delegates. It could be imagined to invite observers on a case by case basis to address specific technical questions.

³ [CX/EXEC 09/63/8](#)

2.4 Structure of Codex Subsidiary Bodies

Recommendation #16: 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:

- the existing committee mandates with a view to rationalization;
- any need for redistribution of tasks and responsibilities between committees; and
- any need to split committees.

Also:

- a) commodity work should be handled through time bound task-forces;
- 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;
- 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.

66. Not all recommendations of the review of Codex committees (carried out in 2005) and in particular those related to commodity committees have been implemented. There was no major restructuring of Codex work on commodities.

67. A new Committee on Spices and Culinary Herbs (CCSCH) was established in 2012.

68. A number of commodity committees was adjourned *sine die*, e.g. CCNMW, CCCP, CCMMP.

69. Commodity committees are generally adjourned when they have completed their work. They can be reactivated to address specific requests, e.g. CCMMP and CCS.

70. Most of the work on commodity committees focuses on quality provisions of standards. Safety provisions of commodity standards make reference to texts developed by general subject committees, e.g. CCFH, CCPR, CCRVDF, CCFA. Work of commodity committees is now generally on group standards rather than on individual commodities.

71. A number of Task Forces have been established and dissolved after successful completion of their work.

72. Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC) was split into CCFA and CCCF; the CCMH was adjourned *sine die* and some of its tasks assigned to CCFH.

2.5 Efficiency of Committee Work

Recommendation #21: 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.

73. The main purpose of meetings reports, especially those of subsidiary bodies, is to inform CCEXEC and CAC the outcome of their work. They also provide critical information to member countries, whether they were present or not in the meeting, and the Secretariat on the decisions taken and follow up actions to take.

74. The Secretariat strives to work towards outcome oriented reports with clear conclusions. Audio recording has been introduced in CAC and CCEXEC to address the need of Member to have discussions to be recorded in detail.

75. The Procedural Manual and CAC decisions provide guidance on the meeting report.

Recommendation #23: 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:

- adopt the standard;
- refer the standard back to the committee to explore certain changes; or
- cancel or suspend work on the standard.

76. The Commission adopts the majority of standards at Steps 5/8, thus omitting Steps 6 and 7. This may be partly due to the increased use of working groups, which allow members to comment extensively and thus

reduce the need for a second round of comments and discussions. The success of Working groups however has led to their proliferation caused a heavy workload for members/FAO/WHO and Codex Secretariat which could be further evaluated.

77. The accelerated procedure is rarely used and even when used has not always resulted in a faster standards setting.

78. The possibility to hold a draft standard at step 8 is not mentioned in the recommendation/proposals.

Recommendation #24: 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:

- a) committees should, as the norm, achieve consensus before passing on standards to the Commission for adoption;
- 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);
- 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;
- 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.

79. Codex never defined "consensus" in order not to limit the consensus building process of the chairperson.

80. Codex also never changed the voting mechanism for adoption of standards to a qualified majority rather than simple majority as at present because of the fear that this may lead to more votes.

81. In the last 10 years there have been two situations, which led to a vote for a standard adoption and on one occasion the decision was taken by one vote.

82. This result has been divisive for the Commission and impacted negatively on the work in other areas.

Recommendation #26: 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.

Recommendation #28: 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:

- between session work; and
- meetings being held in the co-chair's country;

Shared hosting of committees could be explored by host countries as an option in meeting increased commitments.

83. Co-hosting has proven particularly effective in increasing awareness and high-level policy commitment at country level.

84. This process does not usually lead to a sharing of costs and the continued interest of host countries to enter into co-hosting arrangements shows their commitment to promote Codex work and increase commitment in emerging countries.

85. Criteria for host countries do not seem necessary as the change of host countries is rare in particular because of the important financial implications.

86. However the current distribution of host countries is not even and co-hosting can address this issue only partially

87. Assistance to new hosts has been provided by the Codex Secretariat and previous hosts where applicable.

88. Co-chairing is often done in combination with co-hosting and has resulted in increased exposure of developing countries to the work of Codex.

89. The issue of co-chairing on a more stable basis could be considered. Such an arrangement has been used as a mechanism to facilitate the smooth rotation of hosting responsibility to other countries (Example: CCFAC ->CCFA and CCPR to China).

Recommendation #20: 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:

- written comments should be fully taken into account;
- where between-session working groups are used they should be electronic, not generally physical meetings which are not inclusive in possible participation;
- greater use should be made of knowledgeable NGOs in preliminary standard development.

90. The experience with electronic and physical working groups has been overall positive.

91. There is a trend to reduce the number of physical working groups meeting between sessions to reduce financial implications for members.

92. The impact of working groups and the workload that these groups cause for members and FAO/WHO Codex Secretariat could be evaluated in the future.

93. Electronic platforms and other tools may further increase the efficiency of electronic working groups in the future.

94. There is a growing number of emerging countries leading working groups which can benefit from a mentoring approach.

Recommendation #19: 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.

95. Principles of risk analysis of Codex and Codex committees highlight the functional separation of risk management and risk assessment while strengthening the need for clear communication.

96. Adequate funds should be allocated to risk assessment bodies to ensure timely advice to Codex and avoid delays.

97. There is an on-going process of exchanging experiences of “good practice” among committees, which has led to some improvement, however there still seem to be differences in application of risk analysis principles by different Committees.

98. The process led by CCGP to review procedures applied by the various committees is expected to further provide further information about the situation. In addition FAO and WHO may wish to review how different Committees use risk analysis frameworks in practice and report areas for improvements.

2.6 No further action recommended at this moment

Recommendation #6: 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.

99. It should be noted that a definition of ALOP, consistent with the definition of the WTO/SPS, is included in a number of Codex texts, such as: *Guidelines for Food Import Control Systems* (CAC/GL 47-2003); *Guidelines on the Judgement of Equivalence of Sanitary Measures associated with Food Inspection and Certifications Systems* (CAC/GL 53-2003); *Guidelines for Risk Analysis of Foodborne Antimicrobial Resistance* (CAC/GL 77-2011).

Recommendation #8: Codex and OIE should intensify their collaboration to minimize overlaps and avoid gaps in standard setting with:

- 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;
- b) where work is in both Organizations' interest it should be pursued through joint task forces.

Continued close collaboration between Codex and IPPC should also be maintained.

100. Collaboration with OIE is continuously strengthened through secretariat exchanges and participation in meetings. Recent CCGP Guidance has been approved.

101. The proposal for formalizing a procedure for Joint OIE/Codex standards was discussed but not supported by the Codex membership.

102. MOUs with OIE were established/revised by FAO and WHO to address their collaboration with OIE. There are also regular tripartite meetings dealing with issues of strategic interest to the three organisations.

103. Collaboration with IPPC at this moment is limited to a number of subjects, e.g. electronic certification, as well as at the level of facilitating communication with respective membership (joint development of tools and systems).

Recommendation #14: 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.

104. Previously located within the FAO Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division, the Codex Unit (Codex Secretariat) is now located in the office of the Assistant Director General of the FAO Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department. The Codex Secretary participates together with the other Unit Chiefs and Division Directors in departmental management meetings. Other secretariats such as IPPC have been moved in the same context which has created synergies.

105. However, while the integration into a big organization such as FAO brings advantages in many areas, some administrative rules may make less sense for Codex than for other units because of the specific nature of work. This could be further examined. The decision on the institutional location of the Codex Secretariat within FAO should be left to FAO Senior management on condition that the institutional arrangement should facilitate and in no way hamper the functioning of the Codex Secretariat in relation to its ability to propose and execute its work programme and budget.

106. The practice mentioned in the FAO management Response “whereby all job descriptions are prepared jointly, and Secretariat staff selected jointly, by FAO and WHO” needs to be consistently adhered to for all Secretariat staff recruitment.

107. There is no consultation with the Commission regarding any appointment in the Secretariat and this does not seem necessary. CAC and CCEXEC are annually informed of the staffing situation.

Recommendation #17: Codex should undertake a review of the mandate and work of regional committees within the next two years.

108. A formal review of the mandate and role of regional committees was not done.

109. The issues related to their work (e.g. development of regional standards), their effectiveness and their geographical distribution remain unsolved.

110. The Secretariat jointly with FAO and WHO, have recently launched an initiative to revitalise RCCs with a view to strengthen their contribution to Codex, FAO and WHO activities and to respond to the needs of food safety professionals in the regions, thus optimising the considerable resources and time invested in their activities.

111. A more thorough review of the RCCs might still be needed but is not recommended at this moment as it may benefit on the discussions and outcome of the revitalisation process.

Recommendation #22: 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 chair-personship should be fully recognized..

112. Criteria for selection of Chairs are included in the Procedural Manual. The activities organised by the Secretariat as well as the informal meetings of chairs have been useful to Codex chairs to discuss issues of common interest e.g. how to facilitate consensus building.

113. These activities should continue with support from Codex chairs and host governments.

114. The responsibility for naming the Chair rests with the host governments.

Recommendation #25: Groups of countries with common interests should be encouraged to coordinate their positions and present these as positions of the group at committee meetings.

115. CCGP25 confirmed that coordinating committees might define regional positions, however, there is confusion as to how these positions should be considered by other bodies.⁴

116. While the views and needs of as many countries as possible should be brought to the attention of Codex committees or the CAC, countries who cannot attend these sessions can still have their voice heard by sending written comments. The setting of strict positions by a group of countries may lead to building of blocks and reducing room for negotiation and consensus building.

117. Members have successfully cooperated on writing joint documents and proposals or working together in working groups, which seems more appropriate than setting positions.

Recommendation #29: Resources should be put into upgrading the Codex web-site as a matter of urgency.

118. The Codex website is being upgraded on an ongoing basis and is becoming more interactive.

Recommendation #30: 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.

119. Online databases have been developed for GFSA, pesticide residues and veterinary drugs. Further work could be undertaken with regards to contaminants and methods of analysis.

120. FAO continues to promote regular updating and use of the GM-Platform and to report on this to the CAC. No action is required.

3 PROPOSALS

121. As reported at CAC32 (2009) most of the proposals addressing the recommendations of the 2002 Evaluation have been implemented. However, when examining the outcomes of the implementation of the proposals, several areas for improving the management of Codex have been identified on which proposals are made in the following sub-sections. Some of these are practical and could be implemented quickly if there is agreement others will require further evaluations, development of further options and in-depth discussions.

3.1 Mandate and priorities

3.1.1 *Examine the amount of Codex resources spent on health-related vs. other work*

122. It is likely that health-related Codex work represents far over 50% of the Codex resources spent, however this was never explicitly checked and the Codex Secretariat could examine this more in detail.

3.1.2 *Evaluate the use made of Codex standards and their impact in protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in the food trade*

123. In order to assess what are the issues that should be strategically addressed by Codex it may be necessary to know whether Codex standards are used, and by whom (countries, private sector, bilateral or multi lateral trade agreements etc.), and if so, what the impact of current Codex work is and what is the main contributor to this impact. It is main impact through the standards developed or through the process of developing them and the resulting joint learning and building of international networks.

124. Uptake of Codex standards by governments and other parties is also related to the institutional or legislative mechanisms the governments have in place to link the Codex standards with enforceable texts. It is also related to the capacity of members to implement standards. The ongoing development of a Codex communication strategy could help this evaluation.

125. The scope of this work could also be limited to look in particular at the impact of Codex commodity standards and their format.

3.1.3 *Develop effective mechanisms to strategically identify and include emerging issues in the programme of work*

126. This would be in line with the Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019 (Strategic Goal 1). It would also address in a more generic manner some of the issues mentioned explicitly in the 2002 Evaluation, e.g. is it necessary that Codex increases work on nutrition related aspects, packaging material or processing agents.

⁴ ALINORM 09/32/33, para. 103

The question of the biennial strategic plan for standards development that was proposed but never implemented is related to this (see recommendation #11).

127. Codex works as a member-driven organization; however, more strategic guidance based on international strategies and policies, which could be established by FAO and WHO, could be useful (as has happened in the case of the Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health and is expected for the follow up of ICN2). This issue will also be touched on under 3.2.

128. The results from the evaluation under 3.1.2 should ideally be taken into account in developing these mechanisms.

3.2 Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO

3.2.1 Examine what processes could be used so that the Codex Alimentarius Commission can give appropriate input to FAO/WHO governing bodies and how FAO/WHO can best give strategic and policy guidance/direction/input to Codex

129. CAC (through the Secretariat) should report to FAO/WHO governing bodies about its work through appropriate mechanisms and also get input into its work while maintaining adequate autonomy. This will increase the visibility of Codex and foster better cooperation between national delegations to Codex and to the FAO/WHO governing bodies. On the other hand the roles of FAO/WHO in the strategic guidance of Codex should be clarified.

3.2.2 Develop a clear, transparent budget planning process for Codex that will continue to give security to the Secretariat to organize and implement the relevant Codex meetings and FAO and WHO to justify and provide adequate funding

130. The Codex budget contains fixed items that can and should be planned years in advance (e.g. costs for Commission, Executive Committee; Coordinating Committees; core staff and travel costs). Beyond this there are costs for secretariat projects such as publications; promotion and outreach and assistance to Codex contact points; communication; systems etc. as well as special ad hoc projects such as Codex evaluation, and digitization of archives.

131. The Codex budget could be dynamically linked to the Strategic Plan with annual reporting and request for allocation of funds every two years. The Strategic Plan could be aligned with the strategic planning and budget years of FAO and WHO.

3.2.3 Explore the best modalities to incorporate FAO and WHO input to Codex work at different levels (Commission, Committee and working groups)

132. It could be reviewed what could be done to ensure that FAO and WHO can support Codex meetings in the most effective way and if such support should be included in the Codex budget for transparency.

3.2.4 Review process followed for observer applications

133. Presently at least six months pass before observers that were recommended by the CCEXEC get accredited by the DGs of FAO and WHO even though the screening of the Legal offices has usually already taken place before the application is submitted to the CCEXEC. Under 3.3 it is already proposed that this process only be handled by the Codex Secretariat in cooperation with the Legal offices of FAO and WHO but the process to be followed after legal clearance should in addition be reviewed so the most applications would ideally not take longer than 6 months from first contact to conclusion.

3.3 Strategic governance within Codex - "Executive Board"

3.3.1 Consider replacing the Executive Committee with a Codex Executive Board (CX-EB)

134. It is the opinion of the Codex Secretariat that the following observations support the consideration to replace the CCEXEC with a smaller CX-EB:

- (i) It is essential that the Commission is supported strategically by a smaller body that acts in the interest of the Commission as a whole. This body does not need to take decisions on behalf of the Commission (if the Commission continues to meet annually) but prepares draft strategies, manages the standard setting process, discusses and recommends actions and ways forward in "stuck" situations to the Commission and may discuss financial and budgetary matters. CX-EB is expected to work in a transparent way and fully communicate with Members and other Codex subsidiary bodies to obtain the best information.

- (ii) The present Executive Committee has not shown itself fully capable to fulfil the functions described under (i) above in a satisfactory way. The reasons for this seem to lie in its structure and ways of working which replicate the Commission rather than creating an out-of-the box mechanism that is able to give strategic advice.
- (iii) The 2002 Evaluation was correct in principle in proposing a smaller strategic body rather than a Committee, however it is likely that the recommendation seemed too radical to the eyes of Codex Members at the time. This recommendation thus merits reconsideration today, especially in the light of the experience gained with annual sessions of the Commission and with the practical application of the critical review.
- (iv) In the follow-up to the 2002 Evaluation the CCGP tried to amend some of the issues in the enlarged CCEXEC. However, even though new rules for clarifying the distinctive roles of member vs. coordinators were written, their roles continued to be confusing. In addition, advisors to a geographically elected member are nominated at the will of the member without any transparent process and their role has also not been clear. The issue of different interpretations of Rule V.1 (not more than one delegate from one country can be member of the CCEXEC) was settled by the Commission in 2014, but the general issue of representativity may remain in the current, enlarged Executive Committee.

3.3.2 *Examine what could be elements of the mandate for a Codex Executive Board (CX-EB)*

135. The CX-EB mandate could include:

- *Standards management/ critical review:* The process could be maintained as it is and monitored by the CX-EB itself.
- *Urgent strategic issues:* CX-EB could discuss urgent, strategic issues and recommend actions to the Commission.
- *Standards development plan:* Already mentioned in the Procedural Manual such a plan could cover six years as the Codex Strategic Plan and be developed and renewed by CX-EB on a rolling basis every 2 years in cooperation with the relevant Codex Committees and provide a link between the Codex Strategic Plan and the Critical Review. This item is related to the outcome of the evaluation under Proposal 3.1.2 and the process under 3.1.3.
- *Codex Strategic Plan:* The plan could be aligned to cover 3 budget periods. Similar to what has so far been done by the sub-committee of CCEXEC, CX-EB would prepare a draft plan that would then go through different consultations and be adopted by the Commission.
- *Budget planning:* CX-EB could support the Commission in the use of a more efficient and transparent budget planning process as mentioned in Proposal 3.2.
- *Observer applications:* CX-EB should not handle observer applications. These could be handled by FAO/WHO legal offices in cooperation with the Codex Secretariat. The process followed by FAO and WHO could be reviewed to ensure timeliness of *processing* of application (presently at least 6 months after the CCEXEC recommendation). The Commission will be invited to comment on the decisions taken.

3.3.3 *Develop and evaluate different proposals for the composition of CX-EB*

136. The board should be a small team with members from different regions who would be expected to act in the interest of the Commission as a whole – not constrained by country or regional positions. While there should be some representation from all regions, ideally the total number of members, including the chair, participating in a CX-EB meeting should be less than 10.

137. Ideas for the composition of the CX-EB could be for example (in addition to the institutional presence of the Codex Secretariat, FAO and WHO):

- a. A regionally representative, enlarged group of Chair and Vice-Chairs in which case the members of the CX-EB could be individuals and could all be called Vice-Chairs of the Commission (thus the number of Vice-Chair positions would increase).
- b. A regionally representative group of countries elected by the Commission, which will designate a person sit in a given meeting of CX-EB (comparable to FAO council or WHO EB).

138. Election modalities, terms, re-eligibility etc. would have to be developed taking into account the new roles in the CX-EB.

139. The CX-EB would be serviced by the Codex Secretariat and receive guidance from FAO and WHO.

140. The Chairperson of the CX-EB could also be Chairperson of the Commission (present model) or the roles could be given to different persons. The Chairperson of the Commission could continue to be elected by the Commission, or from within the CX-EB. The same options exist for the CX-EB chair in case it is a different person.

141. All options may have pros and cons which need to be examined in more detail:

Option a. would address in addition the issue that the present group of one Chairperson and three Vice-Chairpersons is not regionally representative which has led to the fact that some regions have not been represented in the bureau for many years. The fact that each of the elected members would also be an officer of the Commission could help guarantee that all members act in the board in the interest of the Commission as a whole.

Option b. would avoid the issue that seats in the CX-EB remain vacant due to the fact that members are not available and avoid re-elections in case the person moves to a different position in- or outside their government.

142. The CX-EB could be given the right to invite non-members such as chairpersons of committees and representatives of observers to give technical advice.

3.3.4 *Develop a modus operandi for CX-EB*

143. The agenda of meetings of the CX-EB should be simple and flexible, thus allowing meetings as frequent as necessary and allowing sufficient time for discussion. If possible there should be no need for lengthy reports, translation or interpretation. The meeting schedule could be directly before and after the Commission and once in between sessions of the Commission.

3.4 **Structure of Codex Subsidiary Bodies**

3.4.1 *Review the recommendations of the 2002 and 2005 evaluations with regards to the Codex committee structure*

144. This paper does not go into the detail of this issue but it seems that the way Codex works through subsidiary bodies, especially with commodities committees, could be improved and some of the proposals made at the time e.g. super-commodity committee that coordinates all commodity work could be revisited.

145. In 2013 the Commission created a new committee (spices) for the first time since CCFICS and CCNEA in the 1990s. This was in direct contradiction to Recommendation #16 on the use of time-bound task forces, however it was the wish of Codex members.

146. Commodity committees could be abolished as they finish their tasks and for any specific requests in their area a task force could be created or a working group of the super-commodity committee as the case may be.

147. This area is closely related to decisions taken with regards to Codex standards management and should be considered in the light of decisions taken on this topic in particular with regards to the work on quality standards.

3.5 **Efficiency of Committee Work**

3.5.1 *Review the way Codex reports are drafted and the use made of current audio recordings*

148. Reports should ideally be short and outcome oriented – this reduces translation costs and frees up secretariat time. However short reports may not fulfil the need of the readers to fully understand the debate. It could be considered to supplement short outcome oriented reports with the audio recordings of the full session.

149. This would achieve the goal to have concise reports while also allowing members and observers to review the whole proceeding whenever needed. It would also allow those who could not attend the meeting to get a better impression of the discussions held and serve for training purposes.

150. The review should find out what the needs of members, FAO, WHO are with regards to Codex reports and make recommendations based on these findings.

151. Presently the Codex Secretariat posts of audio recordings of the Commission and CCEXEC sessions on the Codex website. The use made by visitors to the website could also be reviewed. At the same time it could be reviewed if there is an interest in the audio recordings of Codex committee sessions and if these could be seen as a complement to shorter reports.

3.5.2 *Simplify the present 8-Step procedure to have only 5 steps*

152. Nothing will be lost if the present procedure is simplified. New work is approved at step 1, initially drafted at step 2 then go for a first round of comments and discussion at steps 3 and 4. If redrafting is needed they can be sent back to step 2 and if not the standard can be presented for adoption.

153. Present Codex procedures are complex and difficult to understand for outsiders and new participants. More clarity can simplify and speed up discussions.

3.5.3 *Continue striving for consensus and examine to what extent voting could assist Codex in case of blockages without being divisive*

154. Consensus should be the main way of taking decisions in Codex using all possible tools such as facilitation, mediation etc. A definition of consensus is not proposed. However, it is necessary to continue working with the group of Codex Chairs to ensure that equivalent approaches are followed across different committees including the use of different means to reach consensus, while allowing some flexibility for chairs.

155. Votes could be part of the democratic Codex process rather than be seen as divisive as at the moment. As the evaluation recommended they could be based on a 2/3 majority and only happen in the Commission. However, they should be used with caution as Codex is attempting to create global public goods, which need to have the vast support of members to be of value.

156. If attempts to find consensus fail the Executive Board may recommend a vote to be taken in the Commission at a qualified majority.

3.5.4 *Explore ways to ensure a more equal geographical distribution of countries chairing committees while not obstructing the standard setting process*

157. A rotation system would give giving more countries the opportunity to host and chair a Codex committee. However, it takes resources and experience to become an efficient host country to Codex committees, to ensure proper functioning and reduce the burden of the Codex secretariat. Imposing a strict limit on the number of years or sessions a country can host and chair the same committee could thus be counter-productive if not at the same time a new host country is already trained and has mobilised resources. In theory host countries are designated every year by the Commission however practically there is very little change. It could be considered to set a time period (e.g. 6-8 years) after which a Committee would be coming up for rotation but the present host could also apply to continue hosting. Stable co-hosting/ co-chairing of two countries for one committee could be explored.

158. The effectiveness of the guidance given to host countries on how to select the Chairperson of a Codex Committee or Task forces could be reviewed.

3.5.5 *Review the effectiveness of working groups*

159. Without doubt working groups are a very well used tool by Codex committees; often over 50 groups are working in parallel. What is the workload of developing countries as well as on FAO, WHO, and Codex Secretariat to cope with WGs? Is there a need to revise the current guidelines?

3.5.6 *Consider to review how different Committees use risk analysis frameworks in practice and report areas for improvements*

160. In addition to the on-going process of exchanging experiences of “good practice” among committees and the process led by CCGP to review procedures applied by the various committees is expected to further provide further information about the situation, FAO and WHO may wish to review how different Committees use risk analysis frameworks in practice and report areas for improvements.

Section 4 – Suggested steps forward

161. Capturing the overall theme to the issues and possible proposals developed under section 3 in a simple question could read: “Is Codex setting the right standards to achieve its mandate (proposal 3.1.2) and is it doing it in the most efficient way? (all other proposals)”.

162. Implementation of proposal 3.1.2 would lead to an external evaluation about Codex impact and use made of Codex standards.

163. The information gained from this evaluation would be a strategic driver for the future of Codex work in general or related to commodities should the Commission decide to limit the scope of this evaluation to this part of Codex work.

164. For all other areas in the table below an attempt was made to assign responsibilities and the way forward for the internal further evaluation or direct implementation.

165. The costs would be expected high for the external evaluation and for the other proposals relatively low and depending on if consultants are used to assist the work. It was also attempted to estimate the staff resources input needed from the Codex Secretariat, FAO and WHO. At this moment no attempt was made to prioritise the proposals as this should be done in light of the discussions in CCGP and CCEXEC and the decisions of the Commission.

TABLE 1: Overview of proposals

Proposal	Responsible	Recommended action	External cost	FAO/WHO/Codex staff resources
3.1 Mandate and Priorities				
3.1.1 Examine the amount of Codex resources spent on health-related vs. other work.	Codex Secretariat	Report to CAC	none	minor
3.1.2 Evaluate the use made of Codex standards and their impact in protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in the food trade.	FAO/WHO evaluation offices, Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Members	Develop discussion paper for CAC - External Evaluation decided by CAC	major	major
3.1.3 Develop effective mechanisms to strategically identify and include emerging issues in the programme of work.	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Members	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.2 Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO				
3.2.1 Examine what processes could be used so that Codex can give appropriate input to FAO/WHO governing bodies and how FAO/WHO can best give strategic and policy guidance/direction/input to Codex	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO	FAO/WHO continue consultations and report progress to CAC	none	minor
3.2.2 Develop a clear, transparent budget planning process for Codex that will continue to give the security to the Secretariat to organize and implement the relevant Codex meetings and FAO and WHO to justify and provide adequate funding.	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO	FAO/WHO continue consultations and report progress to CAC	none	minor
3.2.3 Explore the best modalities to incorporate FAO and WHO input to Codex work at different levels (Commission, Committee and working groups)	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO	FAO/WHO continue consultations and report progress to CAC	none	minor
3.2.4 Review process followed for observer applications	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO Legal	Report to CAC	none	minor
3.3 Strategic governance within Codex - "Executive Board" (CX-EB)				
3.3.1 Consider replacing the Executive Committee with a Codex Executive Board(CX-EB)	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Legal	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	major
3.3.2 Examine what could be elements of the mandate for a Codex Executive Board (CX-EB)	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Legal, consultant	See 3.3.1		
3.3.3 Develop and evaluate different proposals for the composition of CX-EB	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO,	See 3.3.1		

Proposal	Responsible	Recommended action	External cost	FAO/WHO/Codex staff resources
	Legal, consultant			
3.3.4 Develop a modus operandi for CX-EB	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Legal, consultant		See 3.3.1	
3.4 Structure of Codex Subsidiary Bodies				
3.4.1 Review the recommendations of the 2002 and 2005 evaluations with regards to the Codex committee structure	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Members, consultant	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.5 Efficiency of Committee Work				
3.5.1 Review the way Codex reports are drafted and the use made of current audio recordings	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, Members, Consultant	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.5.2 Propose to simplify the present 8-Step procedure to have only 5 steps.	Codex Secretariat, Legal	Prepare proposal for CAC	minor	minor
3.5.3 Continue striving for consensus and examine to what extent voting could assist Codex in case of blockages without being divisive	Codex Secretariat, Legal; consultant	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.5.4 Explore ways to ensure a more equal geographical distribution of committees while not obstructing the standard setting process.	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO, members, consultant	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.5.5 Review the effectiveness of working groups	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor
3.5.6 Consider to review how different Committees use risk analysis frameworks in practice and report areas for improvements.	Codex Secretariat, FAO/WHO	Discussion paper for CAC	minor	minor

Template for the submission of comments on the 18 proposals (Section 4 Table 1)

Comments of

3.1 Mandate and Priorities
Proposal 3.1.1 Examine the amount of Codex resources spent on health-related vs. other work.
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.1.2 Evaluate the use made of Codex standards and their impact in protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in the food trade.
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.1.3 Develop effective mechanisms to strategically identify and include emerging issues in the programme of work.
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
<i>Do you have any additional proposal with regard to Mandate and Priorities (3.1)</i>

3.2 Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO
3.2.1 Examine what processes could be used so that Codex can give appropriate input to FAO/WHO governing bodies and how FAO/WHO can best give strategic and policy guidance/direction/input to Codex.
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.2.2 Develop a clear, transparent budget planning process for Codex that will continue to give the security to the Secretariat to organize and implement the relevant Codex meetings and FAO and WHO to justify and provide adequate funding.
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.2.3 Explore the best modalities to incorporate FAO and WHO input to Codex work at different levels (Commission, Committee and working groups)
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.2.4 Review process followed for observer applications
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?

<i>Do you have any additional proposal with regard to Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO (3.2)</i>
3.3 Strategic governance within Codex - "Executive Board" (CX-EB)
3.3.1 Consider replacing the Executive Committee with a Codex Executive Board(CX-EB)
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.3.2 Examine what could be elements of the mandate for a Codex Executive Board (CX-EB)
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.3.3 Develop and evaluate different proposals for the composition of CX-EB
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.3.4 Develop a modus operandi for CX-EB
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>

<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
<i>Do you have any additional proposals with regard to Management of the Codex Programme and links to FAO/WHO (3.3)</i>
3.4 Structure of Codex Subsidiary Bodies
3.4.1 Review the recommendations of the 2002 and 2005 evaluations with regards to the Codex committee structure
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
<i>Do you have any additional proposals with regard to Structure of Codex Subsidiary Bodies (3.4)</i>
3.5 Efficiency of Committee Work
3.5.1 Review the way Codex reports are drafted and the use made of current audio recordings
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>
3.5.2 Propose to simplify the present 8-Step procedure to have only 5 steps.
<i>Comment on the proposal:</i>
<i>What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :</i>
<i>Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?</i>

3.5.3 Continue striving for consensus and examine to what extent voting could assist Codex in case of blockages without being divisive
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.5.4 Explore ways to ensure a more equal geographical distribution of committees while not obstructing the standard setting process.
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.5.5 Review the effectiveness of working groups
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?
3.5.6 Consider to review how different Committees use risk analysis frameworks in practice and report areas for improvements.
Comment on the proposal:
What further action do you recommend with regard to this proposal :
Which priority do you assign to this proposal (high, medium, low)?

<i>Do you have any additional proposals with regard to Efficiency of Committee Work (3.5)</i>