

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 13.1

CAC/42 CRD08
Original Language Only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Forty-second Session

CICG, Geneva, Switzerland, 8 - 12 July 2019

DISCUSSION PAPER ON SUSTAINABLE FUNDING OF SCIENTIFIC ADVICE PROVIDED TO CODEX

Comments of Guyana, India and Thailand

GUYANA

Guyana would like to cast its support for the discussion paper CX/CAC 19/42/14 Add.1 DISCUSSION PAPER ON SUSTAINABLE FUNDING OF SCIENTIFIC ADVICE PROVIDED TO CODEX that was drafted by the United States and the EU. We agree with the contents of the paper and would like our support noted on the paper.

INDIA

Comment: It is very well recognized that carrying out full risk assessments is resource (both expertise and finance) intensive. In this context, developing countries like India have been generally utilizing the risk assessments already carried out at the international level directly or by way of utilizing Codex standards while developing their own domestic regulations. Thus the importance of scientific advice based Codex standards cannot be underestimated. In order to continued support from scientific advice bodies JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU, it is crucial that they should receive sustainable funding from the regular budgets of FAO and WHO as opposed to spending a great deal of their time trying to obtain funding. Therefore, India supports this discussion paper.

THAILAND

Thailand supports the discussion paper on sustainable funding of scientific advice provided to Codex. The scientific advices from the independent expert bodies, namely JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA and JEMNU, are crucial to Codex's work. Therefore, it should be made certain that the funding is sufficient and predictable. We support FAO and WHO to make strategic forecast taking into account the priority of the work requested scientific advice together with the budget provided by the organizations. If insufficiency is forecasted, additional budget should be sorted accordingly. Nevertheless, the sources of funding and the mechanisms to obtain funding should be fully transparent. The report should also be open for public. The budget for scientific advice can be kept as shared fund and then allocated according to the priority of the work.