CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION





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

Agenda item 10.1

CRD5

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD IMPORT AND EXPORT INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Twenty-fourth Session

Brisbane, Australia, 22 - 26 October 2018

DISCUSSION PAPER PROPOSING TO CONSOLIDATE AND MODERNIZE GUIDANCE ON THE USE OF EQUIVALENCE

Comments from Philippines and African Union

Philippines

Position

We would like to thank the United States of America for coming up with the discussion paper on achieving alignment of existing CCFICS guidance in light of the work of developing guidance document on systems equivalence. The diagram as provided, which logically explains the CCFICS texts, is indeed very helpful.

We are amenable in revisiting existing guidelines to remove areas of duplication and to ensure consistency in the language use and understanding. We further believe that the current proposed draft guidelines can be considered as a 'mother document' that can provide the overall framework on the judgment of equivalence (i.e. systems), with existing Codex texts particularly to CAC/GL 53-2003 and its Appendix providing specific guidelines for equivalence of set of sanitary measures making up a food control system associated with a certain type of food or group of foods.

African Union

Issue

The current draft Systems Equivalence paper includes a significant number of concepts that overlap or duplicate existing Codex Guidelines, especially the Guidelines on the Judgment of Equivalence of Sanitary Measures Associated with Food Inspection and Certification Systems (CAC/GL 53-2003) and the Guidelines for the Development of Equivalence Agreements Regarding Food Imports and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CAC/GL 34-1999).

Position

African Union supports merging the existing documents and the draft Systems Equivalence paper.

Rationale

Referring to different overlapping documents on equivalence may be confusing to countries when determining which text is applicable for each specific circumstance.