

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

**Agenda Item 7**

**CX/AFRICA 00/7  
September 2000**

## **JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**

### **CODEX COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA**

**Fourteenth Session**

**Kampala, Uganda, 27 – 30 November 2000**

#### **RISK ANALYSIS ACTIVITIES AND APPLICATION IN THE REGION**

##### **BACKGROUND**

The Codex Alimentarius Commission has been considering risk analysis matters since its 20<sup>th</sup> Session in 1993. The Commission at its 23<sup>rd</sup> Session considered principles of risk analysis and adopted a number of recommendations addressed to the Codex Alimentarius and its subsidiary bodies, governments, FAO and WHO.

During its 13<sup>th</sup> Session (Harare, 1998) this Committee noted that in order to facilitate understanding on this issue FAO in collaboration with ILSI had organized and sponsored a one day Workshop on *Risk Analysis and Food Standards*, prior to the Session of this Committee. The objectives of the Workshop were to inform participants of activities on the application of risk analysis in the Codex decision making process; and to create awareness among countries of the Region for the need to consider Risk Analysis in the development of their national food standards<sup>1</sup>.

The following recommendations made by the Workshop were endorsed by the Committee:

- The Workshop stressed and recommended the need for sound use of the principles of science in risk analysis.
- the need for training in different aspects of Risk Analysis, HACCP, GMP, GAP, and GHP at Regional, Sub-Regional or National levels for francophone and anglophone countries.
- Strengthening work in dietary/nutrition patterns, monitoring programmes and intake assessment.
- Strengthening of Codex Contact Points and National Codex Committees, with consumer and private sector representation.
- Consideration of a high level meeting on food Quality and Safety in the African Region to sensitise government officials at all tiers of government i.e. at national, state and municipal levels.
- Cooperation with the private sector in risk communication – especially in developing simple messages concerning food quality and safety.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 99/28, paras.21 & 22

- Development of ways to apply risk-based good practices in small businesses.
- Strengthening communication between Codex Contact Points and the Codex Secretariat in Rome.
- Programmes that contribute to Risk Analysis should have higher priority.

## **DISCUSSION ON PRINCIPLES OF RISK ANALYSIS AT THE 23RD SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

This paper presents the discussion on the Principles of Risk Analysis at the 23rd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission<sup>2</sup>. Special attention is drawn to paragraph 11 that contains those recommendations addressed to governments.

1. The Representative of WHO introduced the document, which presented a progress report on the work undertaken so far to implement the Action Plan approved by the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission. The Commission expressed its appreciation to FAO and WHO for the organization of expert consultations and noted that most of the recommendations included in the document had been developed by these expert consultations. The Commission noted that the recommendations in Annex 2 and 3 of the discussion paper had formed the basis of the recommendations considered and revised by the Executive Committee. The Commission considered the recommendations in the working paper as amended by the Executive Committee.
2. The Commission recalled that the proposal for possible attendance of observers at the Executive Committee had been considered under Agenda Item 6 - *Consumer's Involvement* and the Commission agreed to delete this proposal from the recommendations for adoption on risk analysis.
3. The Commission had an extensive exchange of views on the recommendation calling on governments to incorporate risk analysis in their legislation. Some delegations opposed this proposal since risk analysis was a relatively new discipline and enough time should be allowed for developing countries to integrate these principles in their legislation in view of difficulties, such as lack of resources and trained personnel. Other delegations, while recognizing the need to allow for flexibility, supported the general recommendation included in the document, especially in view of the provisions of the WTO SPS Agreement concerning risk assessment. The Commission agreed that governments should be encouraged to integrate risk analysis in their legislation, and noted that the difficulties of developing countries were addressed in other recommendations.
4. Several delegations expressed the view that many useful training programmes had been developed, especially as regards the application of HACCP, but that the differences between such programmes might create confusion, and they stressed the importance of harmonizing the training programmes on risk analysis. The Commission agreed to amend the relevant recommendation accordingly. The Representative of FAO indicated that a Training Manual on HACCP had been published and was currently used as the basis for FAO training in several regions, and that a training manual on risk analysis was under development in cooperation with WHO and ILSI.
5. As regards the report on FAO and WHO training initiatives, technical assistance and support, many delegations expressed their appreciation for the technical training and assistance provided by the parent organizations and stressed the need for continued assistance with specific focus on the risk analysis needs of developing countries. The Commission agreed to include additional recommendations to this effect.
6. The Commission agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of the Netherlands to emphasize the need for increased interaction and communication between expert bodies, such as JECFA and JMPR, and Codex Committees along the principles of risk analysis and a recommendation to this effect was introduced. The Observer from Consumers International stated that it was necessary to provide risk assessment clear and unequivocal policy to JECFA and JMPR.

---

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 99/37, paras. 47 – 58.

7. The Observer from the Global Crop Protection Federation noted the recommendation from the FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on the Application of Risk Communication to ‘identify and involve experts with a wider range of scientific perspectives in the work of international advisory bodies (such as JECFA and JMPR) and expert consultations.’ The Observer expressed concern about considering the presence of observers during the meetings of the JMPR, due to the proprietary nature of the data being discussed.

8. The Delegation of India, referring to its comments made during the Committee on General Principles, and reproduced in the document, stressed the importance of taking into account the situation prevailing in developing countries since primary production was largely through small and medium-scale enterprises, and to include data from those countries in the risk assessment process. The Delegation also proposed that the economic consequences and feasibility of risk management options should be considered in the risk management process. This position was supported by several delegations and the Commission, recognizing the need to take into account the specific situation of developing countries, introduced new recommendations to address these concerns.

9. The Delegations of Denmark and Sweden, supported by other delegations, proposed to reiterate the request of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission for the establishment of an FAO/WHO expert committee on microbiological hazards, as risk assessment and scientific advice were an essential basis for the work of the Committee on Food Hygiene. The Commission agreed to add a recommendation to this effect.

10. The Commission then adopted the following recommendations to be applied in the framework of Codex:

- a) Programmes that contribute to risk analysis should have high priority;
- b) Relevant Codex Committees should continue to develop and to apply risk analysis principles and methodologies appropriate to their specific mandates within the framework of the Action Plan and report their progress to the Commission on a regular basis;
- c) Proposals for new or amended definitions for use within the framework of risk analysis, as appropriate, should be considered by the Codex Committee on General Principles;
- d) To overcome confusion about the usage of the terms “risk analysis” and “hazard analysis”, the Commission should reiterate its definitions for these concepts and explain how they apply in practice;
- e) The Commission should continue and expand its efforts to increase the participation of those national governments and NGOs that are members or observers but that are not presently active participants in Codex matters;
- f) Relevant Codex committees should appoint a co-author from a developing country for position papers, where the main author(s) is from a developed country;
- g) Relevant Codex committees should consider developing quality criteria for data used for risk assessment. To the extent possible such criteria should be consistent with one another, taking into account the technical differences in the disciplines covered;
- h) Relevant Codex committees should consider the acute aspects of dietary exposure to chemicals in food;
- i) Recognizing that primary production in developing countries is largely through small and medium enterprises, risk assessment should be based on global data, including that from developing countries. This data should particularly include epidemiological surveillance data and exposure studies;
- j) Risk management should take into account the economic consequences and the feasibility of risk management options in developing countries. Risk Management should also recognize the need for flexibility in the establishment of standards, guidelines and other recommendations, consistent with the protection of consumers’ health.

11. *The Commission also endorsed the following recommendations addressed to governments:*<sup>3</sup>
- a) *Member governments should participate actively in Codex work. Governments should also consider, to the extent possible, the views of all interested parties when formulating the national position on a Codex matter. Further, governments are encouraged to communicate and explain the basis of the decisions of Codex to those same interested parties and to the public at large;*
  - b) *Governments should adopt organizational structures and procedures that assure transparency and that allow National Codex Committees to consider consumer and private sector opinions. Cooperation should be developed with the consumer and private sectors in risk communication - especially in developing simple messages concerning food quality and safety;*
  - c) *Governments are encouraged to incorporate principles of risk analysis when establishing or updating national legislation on food safety matters;*
12. The Commission endorsed the following recommendations addressed to FAO and WHO:
- a) FAO and WHO should develop harmonized training or other programmes designed to increase the understanding of the risk analysis process and the role of risk communication, both for member countries and for international organizations active in Codex work;
  - b) FAO and WHO should continue to assist, on a priority basis, developing countries by providing training at regional, sub-regional or national levels in introducing and applying different aspects of risk analysis, HACCP and good manufacturing, agricultural and hygienic practices and development of ways to apply risk-based good practices in small businesses;
  - c) FAO and WHO should take greater steps to strengthen their work in assisting developing countries to undertake dietary/nutrition studies, monitoring programmes and intake/exposure assessment;
  - d) FAO and WHO should strengthen transparency in scientific risk assessment. This includes transparency in the choice of experts and the advice being given including how uncertainties are addressed;
  - e) FAO and WHO, as parent organizations, should emphasize the need for increased interaction and communication between expert bodies, such as JECFA and JMPR, and the Codex Committees, such as CCFAC, CCRVDF and CCPR, and should request the expert advisory bodies and the subsidiary committees to cooperate along the principles of risk analysis;
  - f) The Commission reiterated its request to FAO and WHO to convene an international expert advisory body similar to JECFA and JMPR on the microbiological aspects of food safety to address particularly microbiological risk assessment.

## **ACTION REQUESTED**

Delegations are therefore invited to report on the situation and experiences in implementing risk analysis in their own countries.

---

<sup>3</sup> Italicized by the Codex Secretariat.