



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
75th Session
FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy, 26-29 June 2018
CRITICAL REVIEW

Comments of Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Colombia, El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Perú, Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Tobago

The importance of the scientific basis and the Procedural Manual for the Codex Alimentarius

1. CCLAC expresses its concern and its firm rejection of what happened at the 24th meeting of the CCRVDF, so that it does not mark or establish a precedent in which the transparency and scientific integrity of the Codex System are challenged and the bias, beyond the scientific perspective, can be introduced in the final guidelines. Decision that would compromise the role of Codex Alimentarius before the WTO, becoming a disadvantage for countries that depend on such harmonization for their respective regulatory legislation and constitutes an action that violates the principles on which the Codex Alimentarius is based.
2. It is well known that the CCRVDF has devoted significant time to discussing this type of issues and has different tools, so that the concerns that Members may have regarding a particular situation of food safety, and the process of establishing MRLs, may also use the specific concern form, which allows Members that have a concern about a compound and that is based on science, to be manifested in the corresponding instances.
3. It should be noted that it is of great concern that the reference body on food safety for the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization and whose measures favor industry, consumers and government, does not have its decisions based on scientific evidence and what is established in the Procedures Manual. Opposing actions can lead to the loss of credibility, making the Codex Alimentarius an irrelevant body.
4. In this context, it is imperative to recognize, support and strengthen the scientific basis of the Codex system that comes from the corresponding advisory bodies, JECFA, JMPR and JEMRA, which as we know are conformed and supported by renowned scientists who are commissioned for the evaluation of risks, fundamental stage in the Codex normative process. This is the transparent mechanism to obtain an impartial and complete scientific perspective that allows us as managers to make the best decisions that minimize food risks, especially in those cases where members do not have the experience or funds to carry out their own evaluations about a large number of dangers.
5. And as we mentioned in the 24th CCRVDF when the standards that received scientific support are delayed for reasons beyond the mandate of Codex, this may discourage participation in the Codex Alimentarius of Members and Observers, especially from developing countries, both in the preparation and presentation of data, such as attendance at Codex meetings, as it could be considered a misuse of government resources.
6. We deeply believe, as a Region, in multilateralism as an engine for the primary development of the states and we invite those Members in which their concerns are beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius, to use the other multilateral instances where their concerns can be accommodated, and

in this way recognize and respect scientific recommendations as a fundamental pillar of the Codex Alimentarius system.

7. Finally, we strongly request the Executive Committee to take steps so that this situation does not continue to occur in this Joint FAO / WHO Food Standards Program and to recommend to the CAC, a decision that mandates the Codex Committees, to adhere to the guidelines established in the Codex Procedural Manual.