CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION E

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 3.1 **CX/EXEC 18/75/2 Add.1**

June 2018

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

CRITICAL REVIEW – PART II

1 January 2018 to 31 May 2018

1. Procedural background

1.1 The Codex Procedural Manual states that: "*An on-going critical review shall ensure that proposals for new work and draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption continue to meet the strategic priorities of the Commission and can be developed within a reasonable period of time, taking into account the requirements and availability of scientific expert advice*".

1.2 CCEXEC is invited to critically review the work of the committees in accordance with the Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Part 2 and for each Committee, taking into account the recommendations of the Secretariat and the comments of the chairs to:

- Examine standards and related texts submitted to the Commission for adoption (2.);
- Review the status of development of standards against the timeframe agreed by the Commission (3.); and
- Review proposals for development/revision of standards (4.)

2. Comments by the Secretariat

This document is a continuation of CX/EXEC 18/75/2, Critical Review – Part I.
Work of the committees under review is progressing according to schedule. The following specific observations and recommendations are made:

2.1 CCPR50

CCEXEC should recommend the CCPR/EWG on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed to work closely with the CCRVDF/EWG on the definition of animal tissues in order to have a harmonized definition that will facilitate establishment of MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs.

2.2 CCRVDF24

CCEXEC should recommend the CCRVDF/EWG on the definition of animal tissues to work closely with the CCPR/EWG on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed in order to have a harmonized definition that will facilitate establishment of MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs.

2.3 CCS

CCEXEC may recommend options on how to proceed with the standard development for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice, e.g. discontinuation of work or convening a physical meeting of the Committee to address the critical issues for finalization of the Standard[1].

2.4 CCCPL

CCEXEC may recommend that countries be encouraged to identify a method of analysis for determination of saponins to CCMAS so that the standard, if adopted, can be fully implemented.

[1] The explanatory notes and the draft standard provided by Colombia (Host country of CCS) are included in CX/CAC 18/41/11 Add.1.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF), 12th session (12-16 March 2018)
Appendix 2: Committee on Food Additives, 50th session (CCFA) (26-30 March 2018)
Appendix 3: Committee on Pesticide Residues, 50th session (CCPR) (9-14 April 2018)
Appendix 4: Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF), 24th session (23-27 April 2018)
Appendix 5: Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS), 39th session (7-11 May 2018)
Appendix 6: Committee on Sugar (CCS) (working by correspondence only)
Appendix 7: Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes (CCCPL) (working by correspondence only)
Appendix 8: Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV) (working by correspondence only)

Structure of the appendices for each committee:

- Adoption (Step 5, 5/8, 8)
- Ongoing work
- New work
- Discussion papers/others
- Overall workload

For each of the items, the tables in the appendix contain as relevant:

- Job Identification Number": or the year when new work was approved, or the year when work actually started, as applicable.
- "Target Year": the year by which the text is to be adopted at Step 8, as agreed by the Commission on the basis of the project document (from 2004 onwards), or the date specified by the Committee, where applicable.
- "Output Codes": the following codes are used:
    - 1.1: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food safety;
    - 1.2: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality;
    - 1.3: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food labelling and nutrition;
    - 1.4: Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food inspection and certification, and methods of sampling and analysis.
- Secretariat notes including as relevant: status of endorsement, brief description of the scope of new work; responses of the Committee to the recommendation of CCEXEC to consider the need to develop an approach for the management of their work and other comments.
- Chairperson's comments

APPENDIX 1: Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) (12th Session, 12-16 March 2018)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/CF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MLs for lead in grape juice, mango chutney, canned brassica vegetables, fresh farmed mushrooms, food grade salt (excluding salt from marshes), fat spreads and blended spreads, edible fats and oils (revision of existing MLs in the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995)	N04-2014	2015	5/8	1.1	73rd JECFA	Ref. para 45 and Appendix II **Note 1:** The ML for lead in canned brassica vegetables is an amendment to the ML for canned vegetables which has now been extended to cover this vegetable group. **Note 2**: Revised MLs will supersede corresponding existing MLs in the GSCTFF.
Proposed draft MLs for cadmium in (i) chocolate containing or declaring ≥ 50% to < 70% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis; and (ii) chocolate containing or declaring ≥ 70% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	N15-2014	2017	5/8	1.1	77th JECFA	Ref. para. 67 (i) and (ii) and Appendix III
Proposed draft MLs for methylmercury in tuna, alfonsino, marlin and shark	N21-2017	2020	5/8	1.1	Expert scientific advice has been already provided by JECFA and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on the Risks and Benefits of Fish Consumption	Ref. para. 91 (i), (iii) and (iv) and Appendix IV **Note 1**: Sampling plans not endorsed by CCMAS39, but will not impact on the adoption of the MLs. Method performance criteria endorsed by CCMAS39 which will support enforcement of the MLs. **Note 2**: These MLs will supersede GLs for methylmercury in predatory and non-predatory fish. **Note 3**: Discontinuation of work on MLs (i) amberjack (not necessary) (ii) swordfish (not possible to reach consensus)
Proposed draft revision of COP for the prevention and reduction of dioxins, dioxin-like PCBs and non-dioxin-like PCBs in food and feed (CXC 62-2006)	N22-2017	2019	5/8	1.1	A risk assessment was completed by the 80th JECFA	Ref. para. 98 and Appendix V
Proposed draft COP for the reduction of 3-monochloropropane-1-2-diol esters (3-MCPDE) and glycidyl esters (GE) in refined oils and food products made with refined oils	N23-2017	2020	5	1.1	A risk assessment was completed by the 83rd JECFA	Ref. para. 102 (i) and (ii) and Appendix VI

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/CF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft guidelines for risk analysis of instances of contaminants in food where there is no regulatory level or risk management framework established	N24-2017	-	5	1.1	-	Ref. para. 124 (i) and Appendix IX
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments						

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/CF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MLs for total aflatoxins (AFT) in ready-to-eat (RTE) peanuts and associated sampling plans	N14-2014	2017	4	1.1	69th and 83rd JECFA	Ref. para. 115 (i)-(iii) and Appendix VII CAC37 (2014) agreed to start new work on MLs for AFT in RTE peanuts based on the JECFA69 assessment. CCCF10 (2015) could not agree on the proposed ML of 10 µg/kg and requested JECFA to perform an impact assessment using different hypothetical levels within the range of 4 – 15 µg/kg including violation rates. The ML was retained at Step 4 pending the outcome of the JECFA exposure assessment for health impact. JECFA83 (2016) concluded that enforcing an ML of 4, 8 or 10 µg/kg for RTE peanuts would have little further impact on dietary exposure to AFT for the general population, compared with setting an ML of 15 µg/kg. At an ML of 4 µg/kg, the proportion of the world market of RTE peanuts rejected would be approximately double the proportion rejected at an ML of 15 µg/kg (about 20% versus 10%). Based on the outcome of JECFA83, CCCF11 (2017) considered two MLs (10ug/kg retained at Step 4 by CCCF10 and 15ug/kg proposed at Step 4 based on the outcome of JECFA83). CCCF could not reach consensus on any of the two figures nor on figures below 10 µg/kg or between the range of 10-15ug/kg.

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/CF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				In view of the lack of consensus and the need for further consideration of the JECFA83 report, CCCF11 agreed to request comments on the MLs of 10 (original proposal) and 15 µg/kg (new proposal) in order to present a revised proposal CCCF12 (2018). CCCF12 (2018) noted that comments in reply to the CL supported an ML of 10 µg/kg and agreed to consider this ML. Delegations expressed the same divergent views as in 2017. CCCF12 thus agreed to hold the ML of 10 µg/kg at Step 4 to ensure implementation of the *Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of aflatoxin contamination in peanuts* (CXC 55-2004); JECFA will issue a call for data after three years' time; data generated through this call will be analysed by an EWG lead by India to prepare a proposal for consideration by CCCF. **Note 1**: The COP was adopted in 2004 and the ML for AFT in RTE peanuts was proposed in 2014, 10 years following the adoption of the COP. It was noted that data analysed from 2004 onwards would have followed the implementation of the COP and work should be delayed for only one year to request additional data for consideration by CCCF13 (2019). **Note 2**: CCEXEC should consider establish a new deadline for completion of work taking into account the information given above
Proposed draft MLs for total aflatoxins (AFT) and ochratoxin A (OTA) in nutmeg, dried chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and turmeric and associated sampling plans	N20-2017	-	4	1.1	JECFA would issue a call for data in three years' time	Ref. para. 119 (i) and Appendix VIII CAC40 (2017) agreed to start new work on MLs for AFT and OTA in the aforesaid spices. CCCF12 considered the proposed MLs and could not reach consensus on any of them. CCCF12 therefore agreed to hold the ML of 20/30 µg/kg for AFT and 20 µg/kg for OTA in nutmeg, chili and paprika, ginger, pepper and

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/CF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
						turmeric, respectively, at Step 4 to give time for the implementation of the *Code of Practice for the prevention and reduction of mycotoxins in spices* (CXC 78-2017). Following this timeline JECFA will issue a call for data and the data generated will be analysed by an EWG lead by India to prepare proposals for consideration by CCCF. **Note**: CCEXEC should consider to establish a new deadline for completion of work taking into account the need for data collection following the adoption of the COP by CAC40 in 2017.
MLs for lead in selected commodities in the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995)	N04-2014	2015	2/3	1.1	73rd JECFA	Ref. para. 46 CCCF12 agreed to continue work on MLs for regular and fortified wines made from grapes harvested after the date of the establishment of the ML and on MLs for edible offals. **Note 1**: This work will complete the revision of the MLs for lead in the GSCTFF. The work is expected to be concluded at CCCF13 (2019). **Note 2**: CCEXEC should establish a new deadline for completion of this work.
MLs for cadmium in (i) chocolates containing or declaring < 30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis (ii) Chocolate and chocolate products containing or declaring ≥ 30% to < 50% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis and (iii) cocoa powder (100% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis)	N15-2014	2017 2019 (revised timeframe for completion of work)	2/3	1.1	77th JECFA	Ref. para. 67 (iii) and (v) **Note**: CCCF12 (2018) discontinued work on dry mixtures of cocoa and sugars sold for final consumption in light of data limitation. Work on cocoa powder would enable in future to set MLs for mixtures of cocoa and sugars by deriving values from data on cocoa powder.
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments						

Discussion papers/others

Documents (discussion papers)	**Explanatory Notes** **(The reference is REP18/CF)**
Lead and cadmium in quinoa	Ref. para. 14 Following a request from CCCPL working by correspondence on the standard for quinoa as to whether the MLs for lead and cadmium in cereals (currently excluding quinoa) in the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995) (GSCTFF) can be extended to cover quinoa, CCCF12 (2018) agreed that the Codex and JECFA Secretariats would explore this matter in a discussion paper for consideration by CCCF13.
MLs for methylmercury in additional fish species	Ref. para. 93 Following completion of work on MLs for methylmercury in various fish species, CCCF12 agreed to consider establishment of MLs for methylmercury for additional fish species.
MLs for hydrocyanic acid and mycotoxin contamination in cassava and cassava-based products	Ref. para. 125 Following a request from CCAFRICA on the development of a regional standard for fermented cooked cassava-based products as to whether the ML for HCN in gari in the GSCTFF was applicable to fermented cooked cassava-based products and the feasibility and appropriateness to establish MLs for mycotoxins to this product, CCCF12 agreed to further gather relevant data to facilitate consideration of this matter at its next session..
MLs for lead in new commodities	Ref. para. 131 Following the completion of work on the revision of MLs for lead in the GSCTFF in 2019, CCCF12 (2018) agreed to consider the establishment of MLs for lead in new commodities.
MLs for Aflatoxins (AFT) in cereals and cereal-based foods including foods for infants and young children	Ref. para. 138 CCCF12 (2018) agreed to consider the establishment of MLs for AFT in wheat, maize, sorghum and rice grains for human consumption including MLs for flour and cereal-based foods for infants and young children.
Discussion paper on the development of a Code of practice for the prevention and reduction of cadmium contamination in cocoa	Ref. para. 144 and 145 CCCF12 (2018) agreed to consider the development of a COP to prevent and reduce cadmium contamination in cocoa grains. This work will support compliance with the MLs for cadmium for chocolates and cocoa-based products.
Forward workplan for CCCF	Ref. para. 154 CCCF12 (2018) agreed to further develop the forward workplan in order to operate strategically by prioritizing items within its workload and to systematically identify areas for food contamination of concern for public health and with trade implications.
General guidance on data analysis for MLs development	Ref. para. 156 CCCF12 agreed to develop guidance to provide a harmonized approach on data analysis for the development and establishment of MLs.

Revision of the *Code of Practice for the Prevention and Reduction of Lead Contamination in Foods* (CXC 56-2004)	Ref. para. 160 CCCF12 agreed to consider the revision of the COP in light of new management measures available to reduce lead contamination during agricultural production and food processing. This work will support compliance with the revised MLs for lead in the GSCTFF.
Priority list of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants proposed for evaluation by JECFA	Ref. para. 148 and Appendix X
Comments by the Chairperson: The discussion papers follow from work in other Codex Committees, the JECFA evaluation, and identified gaps in the current standards for contaminants, and thus are relevant to elaborate. Depending on the available information identified in the papers, and the discussion on the forward workplan, CCCF13 (2019) will decide on the (feasibility of) start of new work on these subjects.	

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCCF12	4	2	1	4	-	9	6
Explanatory Notes: Certain items includes several MLs for adoption or under consideration e.g. MLs for cadmium in chocolates comprising 2 MLs for adoption and 3 MLs under discussion; MLs for lead is one item comprising 7 MLs for adoption, etc. CCCF current workload is manageable within the length of the meeting (5 days meeting). The workplan should allow prioritization of proposals of new work arising from the discussion papers and the outcome of the discussion on the finalization of the ongoing work.							
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments							

APPENDIX 2: Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) (50th Session, 26-30 March 2018)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft *Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives*	Ongoing	-	5/8	1.1/1.2	84th JECFA (June 2017)	Ref. para. 30(i) and App. III CCFA50 agreed to forward the full specifications for food additives (new and revised) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8. **Note:** The specifications, adopted by reference, will be included in the *List of Codex Specifications for Food Additives* (CXM 6).
Draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives* (GSFA)	Ongoing	-	5/8 and 8	1.1/1.2	JECFA	Ref. para. 111(i) and App. V, part A CCFA50 agreed to forward to CAC41 the draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA, for adoption at Step 8 and Step 5/8 Costa Rica expressed its general reservation regarding the use of food additives with functional class other than antioxidant in fluid milks fortified with vitamins and minerals since it viewed such use as not technologically justified.
	-	-	-	1.1/1.2	-	Ref. paras. 30(ii) and 121(iii) CCFA50 agreed to: • amend and forward to CAC41 for adoption the food-additive provisions in the GSFA by replacing the name "sodium aluminosilicate (INS 554)" with "sodium aluminium silicate (INS 554)" • Make consequential amendments to the GSFA in respect of the listing of steviol glycosides (INS 960) as a group food additive with steviol glycosides from *Stevia rebaudiana Bertoni* (Steviol glycosides from Stevia) (INS 960a) and Rebaudioside A from multiple gene donors expressed in *Yarrowia lipolytica* (INS 960b(i))
Proposed draft revision of the *Class Names and the International Numbering System for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989)	ongoing	-	5/8	1.1/1.2	-	Ref. para 121(i) and App. IX, part A2 CCFA50 agreed to forward the proposed draft revision to the INS to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8.

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
	-	-	-	1.1/1.2	-	Ref. paras 30(ii), 149 and App. IX, part A1 CCFA50 agreed to • replace the name "sodium aluminosilicate (INS 554)" with "sodium aluminium silicate (INS 554)" in the CXG 36-1989 and forward to CAC41 for adoption • add some texts to the Background section of the INS in order to clarify the relationship between the INS and the GSFA
Revised food-additive provisions of the GSFA in relation to the alignment of the annexes on canned mangoes, canned pears and canned pineapples of the *Standard for Certain Canned Fruits* (CXS 319-2015) and 14 standards for fish and fish products	-	-	-	1.1/1.2	-	Ref. para. 48(i) points c and d and App.V, part B CCFA50 agreed to forward to CAC41 for adoption a number of food additives provisions of the GSFA related to its work on alignment.
Revised food-additive sections of the *Standard for Certain Canned Fruits* (CXS 319-2015) and the Standards for *Canned Salmon* (CXS 3-1981); *Canned Shrimps or Prawns* (CXS 37-1991); *Canned Tuna and Bonito* (CXS 70-1981); *Canned Crab Meat* (CXS 90-1981); *Canned Sardines and Sardine-Type Products* (CXS 94-1981); *Canned Finfish* (CXS 119-1981); *Salted Fish and Dried Salted Fish of the Gadidae Family of Fishes* (CXS 167-1989); *Dried Shark Fins* (CXS 189-1993); *Crackers from Marine and Freshwater Fish, Crustacean and Molluscan Shellfish* (CXS 222- 2001); *Boiled Dried Salted Anchovies* (CXS 236- 2003); *Salted Atlantic Herring and Salted Sprat* (CXS 244-2004); *Sturgeon Caviar* (CXS 291- 2010); *Fish Sauce* (CXS 302-2011) and *Smoked Fish, Smoke-Flavoured Fish and Smoke-Dried Fish* (CXS 311-2013)	-	-	-	1.1/1.2	-	Ref. paras. 48(i) points a and b, 30(ii) and App.IV CCFA50 agreed to forward to CAC41 for adoption the revised food additives section of a number of commodity standards related to its work on alignment.
Revised food-additive sections of Standards for *Milk Powders and Cream Powder* (CXS 207- 1999), *a Blend of Skimmed Milk and Vegetable Fat in Powdered Form* (CXS 251-						Ref. para. 30(ii) CCFA50 agreed to forward to CAC41 for adoption the revised food additives section of a number of commodity standards related to the change of the food additive name with INS 554.

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
2006); and *Edible Casein Products* (CXS 290-1995						
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments						

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Draft and proposed draft food additive provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives* (GSFA)	Ongoing	-	Various steps	1.1/1.2		Ref. REP18/FA, para. 112 CCFA51 (2019) will continue working on the GSFA and in particular will address: (i) Draft and proposed draft provisions for colours in the Step process in food categories 05.2 (Confectionery including hard and soft candy, nougats, etc. other than food categories 05.1, 05.3 and 05.4), 05.3 (Chewing gum), 5.4 (Decorations (e.g. for fine bakery wares), toppings (non-fruit) and sweet sauces); (ii) All remaining draft and proposed draft provisions in Table 1 and 2 of the GSFA in food categories 01.0 through 16.0, with the exception of those additives with technological functions of colour (excluding those provisions discussed in point (i)) or sweetener, adipates, nitrites and nitrates, the provisions in food category 14.2.3 and its subcategories, and provisions awaiting a reply from CCSCH, CCPFV or CCFO; (iii) Proposed draft provisions in Table 3 for Gum ghatti (INS 419) and, pending assignment of an INS number, tamarind seed polysaccharide (see Appendix IX, parts A.2); (iv) The technological justification for the use of preservatives and anticaking agents for surface treatment of mozzarella with high moisture

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				content covered by the Standard for Mozzarella (CXS 262-2006); and (v) Request for and compile information on available relevant dietary exposure data for dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate (INS 480), polyglycerol esters of fatty acids (INS 475), sodium stearoyl lactylate (INS 481(i)), calcium oleyl lactylate (INS 482(ii)) and the actual use level and technological justification in Food Category 14.1.4 for dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate (INS 480), polyglycerol esters of fatty acids (INS 475), sodium stearoyl lactylate (INS 481(i)), calcium oleyl lactylate (INS 482(ii)) and in food category 14.1.5 for polyglycerol esters of fatty acids (INS 475), sodium stearoyl lactylate (INS 481(i)) and calcium oleyl lactylate (INS 482(ii)) for consideration by the electronic working group to formulate recommendations on the provisions for these additives in those food categories.
Revision of the *Class Names and the International Numbering System (INS) for Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989)	Ongoing	-	1,2,3	1.1/1.2		Ref. REP18/FA, para. 123(ii) CCFA50 agreed to establish an EWG to consider: (i) replies to the CL on addition and changes to INS (CL 2018/26-FA); and (ii) assign an INS number to β-Carotene-rich extract from *Dunaliella salina*.
Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives (86th JECFA)	Ongoing	-	1,2,3	1.1/1.2		CCFA51 (2019) will consider for adoption the Specifications for the Identity and Purity of Food Additives prepared by the 86th meeting of JECFA (June 2018).
Alignment of the food additive provisions of commodity standards and relevant provisions of the GSFA	Ongoing	-	-	1.1/1.2		Ref. REP17/FA, para. 49 CCFA50 agreed to establish an EWG to consider: (i) the alignment of the following commodity Standards listed in the forward workplan for which there was no active commodity committee: CXS 12-1987, CXS 212-1999 (CCS), CXS 152-1985, CXS 202-1995, CXS 249-2006 (CCCPL), CXS 108-1981, CXS 227-

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/FA)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				2001 (CCNMW), CXS 163-1987, CXS 174-1989, CXS 175-1989 (CCVP); (ii) the alignment, with the assistance of IDF, of the following ripened-cheese commodity Standards: CXS 263-2007, CXS 264-2007, CXS 265-2007, CXS 266-2007, CXS 267-2007, CXS 268-2007, CXS 269-2007, CXS 270-2007, CXS 271-2007, CXS 272-2007, CXS 274-2007, CXS 276-2007 and CXS 277-2007; (iii) the addition of a footnote to the Table entitled "References to Commodity Standard for GSFA Table 3 Additives" to read: "This Section only lists Commodity Standards where the corresponding GSFA Food Category is not listed in the Annex to Table 3. Provisions for the use of specific Table 3 additives in Commodity Standards where the corresponding GSFA Food Category is listed in the Annex to Table 3 can be found in the corresponding Food Categories in Tables 1 and 2."; and (iv) the proposed revisions to the adopted provisions contained in CCFA50/CRD 2 Annex 4 Part C i.e. the deletion of Note 15 in Food Categories 13.1.1, 13.1.2 and 13.1.3 for ascorbyl palmitate (INS 304) and ascorbyl stearate (INS 305).
Proposal for additions and changes to the Priority List of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA	Ongoing	-	-	1.1/1.2		CCFA51 (2019) will consider replies to the CL on the Priority List of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA (CL 2018/28-FA).
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments						

Discussion papers/others

Documents	**Explanatory Notes** **(The reference is REP18/FA)**
Discussion paper on the use of nitrates (INS 251, 252) and nitrites (INS 249, 250)	Ref. para. 103 CCFA50 agreed to establish an EWG to develop an inventory of data available on nitrates and nitrites, and in particular to collect general information on: i) risk-management approaches on nitrates and nitrites used as food additives by regulatory agencies of Codex members; ii) the GSFA subcategories for which provisions on nitrates and nitrites existed (whether adopted or in the Codex Step procedure), and when available, provide accompanying data and studies demonstrating the effectiveness of the levels in performing the desired technological function; iii) natural occurrence data on nitrates and nitrites; and (v) collecting available information on other various questions to further consider feasibility and the need for risk assessment.
Discussion paper on the use of the terms “fresh”, “plain”, “unprocessed” and “untreated”	Ref. REP18/FA, para. 110 CCFA50 agreed to request that the Russian Federation prepare a discussion paper on how the terms “fresh”, “plain”, “unprocessed” and “untreated” were used in existing Codex texts to determine whether definitions could be developed for the purposes of allocating food-additive provisions..
Discussion paper on the development of wording for an alternative to Note 161 relating to the use of sweeteners	Ref. para. 142 CCFA50 agreed to establish an EWG to develop wording for an alternative to Note 161 relating to the use of sweeteners consistent with Section 3.2 of the Preamble to the GSFA and the Statement of Principles in the Procedural Manual to address concerns of those Codex Members requiring significant energy reduction or food with no added sugars when sweeteners were used and those Codex Members requiring flexibility in the use of sweeteners; and, subject to agreement on the wording of an alternative, review CXFA 15/47/13, in particular recommendations 1 to 6, in the context of pending and adopted provisions.

Discontinued/completed	
Revocation and discontinuation of food additive provisions of the GSFA	Ref. para. 111(ii),(iv), 134(iv), and App. VI and VIII CCFA50 agreed to: (i) forward to CAC41 the food additive provisions of the GSFA recommended for revocation; and (ii) discontinue work on a number of food additive provisions of the GSFA.
Relevant food-additive provisions (Malates and Tartrates) from the Standards for *Mozzarella* (CXS 262-2006), *Cottage Cheese* (CXS 273-1968), *Cream Cheese* (CXS 275-1973), *Fermented Milks* (CXS 243- 2003), and *Dairy Fat Spreads* (CXS 253-2006). The food-additive provision for sodium sorbate (INS 201) from the Standards for *Instant Noodles* (CXS 249-2006), *Fermented Milks* (CXS 243- 2003), *Dairy Fat Spreads* (CXS 253-2006), *Mozzarella* (CXS 262-2006), *Cheddar* (CXS 263- 196), *Danbo* (CXS 264-1966), *Edam* (CXS 265- 1966), *Gouda* (CXS 266-1966), *Havarti* (CXS 267- 1966), *Samsø* (CXS 268-1966), *Emmental* (CXS 269-1967), *Tilsiter* (CXS 270-1968), *Saint-Paulin* (CXS 271-1968), *Provolone* (CXS 272-1968), *Cottage Cheese* (CXS 273-1968), *Cream Cheese* (CXS 275-1973) and *Cheese* (CXS 283-197)	Ref. para. 48(ii) and 134(iv) CCFA50 agreed to forward to CAC41 the food additive provisions of various commodity standards recommended for revocation.
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments	

Overall workload

Committee sessions	**Step 8 and 5/8**	**Step 5**	**Other texts for adoption**	**Ongoing work**	**New work**	**Discussion paper**	**Revoked standards, discontinued work or discussion paper**
CCFA50	3	-	3	5	-	3	3

Explanatory Notes:

CCFA50 considered the paper on future strategies of the CCFA which included eleven recommendations after analysing the major challenges. A number of decisions relating the GSFA, alignment, INS, JECFA evaluation, processing aids and prioritization of work with the aims of improving the advancement of CCFA work were made. Regarding Note 161, it was decided to establish an EWG to develop wording for an alternative to Note 161 relating to the use of sweeteners. CCFA50 also developed a workplan for future alignment of the food additive provisions of commodity standards.

The main focus of the CCFA work continues to be the GSFA, in particular the completion of consideration of the outstanding draft provisions (approximately 1,700) and the alignment of the food additive provisions of commodity standards with those in the GSFA. Other work related to the GSFA includes: i) preparation of the priority list of substances to be evaluated by JECFA, ii) the adoption of the specifications for quality and purity prepared by JECFA, and iii) the update (amendments) of the *Class Names and the International Numbering Systems of Food Additives* (CXG 36-1989). The discussion paper on nitrate and nitrites will assist CCFA in considering specific issues of the GSFA. The paper on the use of certain terms ("fresh", "plain", "unprocessed" and "untreated") in Codex might assist in the harmonization of terms used in the GSFA.

CCFA current work is manageable.

Comments by the Chairperson:

No additional comments

APPENDIX 3: Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR), 50th Session (9-14 April 2018)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/PR)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies)	Ongoing	-	5/8	1.1	JMPR (2017)	Ref. para. 112 and Appendices II
Proposed draft and draft revision to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CX/M 4-1989): Type 04: Nuts, seeds and saps Type 05: Herbs and spices	N11-2004 N09-2006	-	5/8, 8	1.1	-	Ref. paras 118 and 120, Appendices VII-Part A and VIII-Part A
Proposed draft Tables on examples of representative commodities for Type 04 and Type 05 (for inclusion in the *Principles and guidance for the selection of representative commodities for the extrapolation of MRLs for pesticides to commodities groups* (CX/G 84-2012)	-	-	5/8	1.1		Ref. para. 127, Appendices VII and VIII

Comments by the Chairperson:

Thanks being ready to take compromise by all the parties involved during the elaboration process. CCPR has successfully forwarded its decision through adopting recommendations of MRLs made by JMPR, using the accelerated process of step 5/8. That means the most MRLs are positively decided as CXLs within a year. However, the gap between Codex's work and the practical demands, which is the international and domestic food trade demand for food safety, is expanding, especially for developing countries. Member countries/ organizations and sponsors try their best to expand the capacity of MRL elaboration, as the scientific consultation delivered by FAO/WHO refines and upgrades its tools for effective and more reliable outputs. We should find an innovative way to reduce the gap, for example, a specific project to deal with the long waiting list of dossiers transforming into more CXLs.

With the adoption of Type04/05, the main part of Codex classification of food and feed, namely food commodity of plant origin(class A), is finalized. This is a big step of the work. The commodity list is more inclusive now. Fewer commodities in the real international trade in food left outside the list of revised Codex classification. Some rare related commodities in international level of trade even included in the new version of Codex classification, which helps more members to adopt CXLs into their own MRL systems in an easier way. With more members adopt Codex classification of food and feed and applying CXL as their own food safety standards at the same time, a quick finalization of the work is expected. Codex could try in the following works 2 WGs simultaneously: one for feed and processed food of plant origin; another for all other commodities of animal origin.

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/PR)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies)	Ongoing	-	4, 7	1.1	JMPR	Ref. para. 112 (ii), Appendix IV and V Finalization of these MRLs depends on consideration of re-evaluation (new/additional uses, periodic review, etc.) by JMPR according to the Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides agreed to by CCPR.
Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed for feed commodities Tables on examples of representative commodities for feed commodities	N11-2004 N09-2006	2020	2/3	1.1	-	Ref. para. 124 and 129, Appendix X
Comments by the Chairperson: Proposed draft MRLs retained at step 4,7 have different reasons. In general, lack on required basic data or an alternative solution for a concern about dietary exposure assessment what for the certain pesticide/commodity combination an dietary health risk is not excluded. Final decision will be taken, once this situation comes clear before the time point regulated by CCPR risk assessment principles. It seems necessary that the risk assessment policy applied by JMPR should be refined and updated in a timely manner and in the correct direction, including updating of the definition of “Appropriate Level of Protection” and assumption and suitability of the risk analysis principles applied by CCPR. With the adoption of Type04/05, the main part of Codex classification of food and feed, namely food commodity of plant origin(class A), is finalized. This is a big step of the work. The commodity list is more inclusive now. Fewer commodities in the real international trade in food left outside the list of revised Codex classification. Some rare related commodities in international level of trade even included in the new version of Codex classification, which helps more members to adopt CXLs into their own MRL systems in an easier way. With more members adopt Codex classification of food and feed and applying CXL as their own food safety standards at the same time, a quick finalization of the work is expected. Codex could try in the following works 2 WGs simultaneously: one for feed and processed food of plant origin; another for all other commodities of animal origin.						

New work

Documents	Timeframe		Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/PR)
	Reference and project document	Target Year			
JMPR 2019 Schedule for evaluation of pesticides			1.1	JMPR 2019	Ref. para. 153 and Appendix XIII **Note:** Proposals for new work on establishment of MRLs for pesticides are not subject to the Critical Review.
Comments by the Chairperson: This is the new work of number one for CCPR/JMPR. It is worthy to mention that under the supporting of members and sponsors, JMPR will organize an extraneous meeting to evaluate more pesticides for more MRL recommendations. This is a substantive progress in expanding the outputs of scientific consultation. New experience and ways to solve the capacity issue is expected.					

Discussion papers/others

Documents	**Explanatory Notes** **(The reference is REP18/PR)**
Review of the IESTI equations	Ref. para 137, Appendices XI and XII
Establishment of a Codex database of national registration of pesticides	Ref. para. 157 **Note**: Ongoing work to facilitate the establishment of CCPR schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR (periodic review)
Management of unsupported compounds	Ref. para. 153 (ii)
Biopesticides	Ref. para. 160
Revision of the Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of residues (CXG 56-2005)	Ref. para. 166
Opportunities and challenges related to the participation of JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound	Ref. para. 168
Revocation/ discontinuation	
Codex MRLs (CXLs) (revocation)	Ref. para. 112(i), Appendix III **Note**: Revocation of CXLs is dependent on the outcome of JMPR evaluations and the availably / commitment of the Member / Observer to provide relevant data for JMPR to carry out the assessment or further refine the assessment.
Proposed draft and draft MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) (withdrawn)	Ref. para. 112(ii), Appendix VI **Note**: Withdrawal of MRLs in the Step Procedure is dependent on the outcome of JMPR evaluations and the availably / commitment of the Member / Observer to provide relevant data for JMPR to further refine the assessment.
Comments by the Chairperson: It is a good beginning for members and observers to understand the risk assessment in detail with Review of the IESTI Equations. It seems necessary that the risk assessment policy applied by JMPR should be refined and updated in a timely manner and in the correct direction, including updating of the definition of “Appropriate Level of Protection” and assumption and suitability of the risk assessment policy applied by CCPR. Revocation of CXLs and withdrawn of recommended MRLs during the step procedures are now routine works of CCPR. The occasional appearance of the discussion about the scientific fitness of periodic review is cautionary to members and observers to thinking and to act.	

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCPR50	3	-	-	2	1	6	2
Explanatory Notes: The numbers are given by items. One item e.g. MRLs for pesticides going for final adoption may contain several combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) MRLs. CCPR current work is well balanced and manageable within the length of the meeting (6 days meeting).							
Comments by the Chairperson: "Born out of consensus and founded on sound science". Holding the two main principles, CCPR makes progress as planned by the Commission. The main constraints limiting more output of CCPR should be the unbalanced development of the different resources. The key restrictions count capacity building of members from developing countries, resources of scientific consultation, harmonization of the risk analysis principles applied by members and CCPR, which CAC should pay attention to.							

APPENDIX 4: Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF), 24th session (23-27 April 2018)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MRLs for: amoxicillin (finfish fillet, muscle); ampicillin (finfish fillet, muscle); lufenuron (salmon and trout fillet); monepantel (cattle fat, kidney, liver, muscle) (JECFA85)	-	-	5/8	1.1	85th JECFA (2017)	Ref. paras 60, 64, 77, 79 and Appendix IV
Draft RMR for gentian violet	-	-	8	1.1	78th JECFA (2013)	Ref. para. 37 and Appendix II CCRVDF24 noted that the current RMR text would allow member countries to choose appropriate risk management approaches to prevent residues of Gentian Violet in food. CCRVDF24 noted reservations (while not opposing to the progress of the RMC in the Step Procedure) on the text as proposed for adoption (Appendix II) without the clarification provided by CCRVDF in the report that the current RMR text would allow member countries to choose appropriate risk management approaches to prevent residues of Gentian Violet in food (paragraph 30). .
Proposed amendment to the Procedural Manual: Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCRVDF	-	-	-		-	Ref. paras 83, 84(i) and Appendix V CCRVDF24 noted that the current Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCRVDF (Procedural Manual, Section IV) required that extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species, could only be recommended where JECFA had identified that it is scientifically justifiable and the uncertainties have been clearly defined. In order to provide more autonomy to CCRVDF, this section of the Risk Analysis Principles should be amended. **Note**: This amendment will facilitate and speed up ongoing discussion on the extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species (see also priority list and work on extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species and the reference to Part D (including a pilot on

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
						extrapolation of MRLs identified in Part D of the Priority List)

Comments by the Chairperson:

There was a good sense of consensus in the 24th CCRVDF considering the draft MRLS for advancement (other than for zilpaterol HCl, discussed separately). Discussions were uniformly positive and supportive for these MRLs.

The 24th CCRVDF considered the proposed MRLs for 3 veterinary drugs intended for use in aquaculture – two for use in finfish (amoxicillin and ampicillin) and one for use in salmon and trout (lufenuron) and advanced all of them to step 5/8 for CAC41.

Similarly, monepantel for cattle was advanced to step 5/8 for CAC41 with minimal discussion.

The risk management language for gentian violet is good example of a robust discussion within the Codex process. The CCRVDF has struggled with appropriate risk management recommendation language for drugs for which JECFA could establish neither an ADI nor recommend MRLs due to concerns for human health since the 2004 Joint FAO/WHO Technical Workshop on Residues of Veterinary Drugs without ADI/MRL (Bangkok, Thailand, 24-26 August 2004) and the subsequent 15th CCRVDF. The Committee has been able to come to consensus on language for risk management recommendations for 12 veterinary drugs that meet these criteria despite prolonged and sometime loud discussions. The 24th CCRVDF continued this debate, centred not on whether such risk management language is appropriate, but rather the language itself. In the end, it became clear that there was a consensus in the Committee to accept the proposed language, and four of the members (United States of America, Ecuador, Honduras, and Nicaragua) opposed to that language expressed their dissenting opinions through reservations. The Committee agreed to forward the risk management recommendation on gentian violet to CAC41 for adoption at Step 8. This is exactly how the Codex process should work and the discussions and resolution reflected the passion those involved brought to the appropriate risk management for a public health concern and to the Codex procedures.

Similarly, the proposed amendment to the risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF provides breadth within CCVDF procedures to consider alternative approaches allowing development of standards (MRLs) across a broader range of animal species and to maximize the applicability of available data.

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MRL for flumethrin (honey) (JECFA85)	-	-	5	1.1	85th JECFA (2017)	Ref. para 73 and Appendix IV

Comments by the Chairperson:

Adoption of MRLs for flumethrin in honey was a challenging risk management question for the committee, not because of the inherent toxicity of the veterinary drug, but because the residues resulting from good practice of veterinary drugs would be so low as to strain the analytical capabilities of many member countries. After a robust discussion, the 24th CCRVDF agreed to advance flumethrin for honey to step 5 as MRL “unnecessary” (considering residues resulting from the use of flumethrin in honey as a result of good veterinary practice are unlikely to pose a hazard to human health). This was an excellent example of problem solving by the Committee and of cooperation across a broad range of members, achieved with clear consensus across the Committee.

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Proposed draft MRLs for zilpaterol hydrochloride (cattle fat, kidney, liver, muscle)	-	-	4	1.1	78th, 81st and 85th JECFA (2013, 2015 and 2017)	Ref. paras. 40, 52 and Appendix III CCRVDF23 (2016) agreed to hold the MRLs at Step 4 for consideration at its next session in light of the JECFA evaluation of additional studies (REP17/RVDF, para. 74). The JECFA Secretariat confirmed the previous JECFA risk assessment and affirmed the proposed MRLs as presented to CCRVDF23 (REP18/RVDF para. 40). CCRVDF24 expressed strong support for the robust scientific evaluation carried out by JECFA and further emphasized that there were no public health or scientific concerns regarding the proposed MRLs. Delegations expressed divergent views in support of or against the progress of the MRLs in the Step Procedure. The Codex Secretary noted that: • CCRVDF appeared unable to achieve consensus for reasons beyond the mandate of the Committee and the mandate of Codex itself. • No voice had been heard from members rejecting the scientific basis of this work and there was agreement on the appropriateness of the level of protection established by the JECFA evaluation. However, other considerations expressed by delegations remained preventing the advancement of the proposed MRLs. • the Statements of principle concerning the role of science in the Codex decision-making process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account in the Procedural Manual states: "*When the situation arises that members of Codex agree on the necessary level of protection of public health but hold different views*

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				*about other considerations, members may abstain from acceptance of the relevant standard without necessarily preventing decision by Codex*". CCRVDF24 was unable to reach consensus and therefore did not advance the proposed MRLs in the Step procedure at this session and consequently retained the proposed MRLs at Step 4. CCRVDF24 noted reservation from countries to this decision for the following reasons: • CCRVDF had previously acknowledged that the compound had met those criteria for prioritization of the assessment as recommended by CCRVDF and endorsed by the CAC; • There was explicit consensus within CCRVDF concerning JECFA's conclusion that any residues that may be present associated with GVP in the use of this compound did not constitute a risk to consumers; • Furthermore, no other legitimate factors consistent with the Procedural Manual had been raised by members. • Accordingly, the decision not to advance the MRLs is not consistent with both the Procedural Manual and the rules or procedures adopted by CCRVDF. • The decision to not progress MRLs important for trade, especially for developing economies, solely based on philosophical objections outside the mandate of CCRVDF by several countries was unacceptable. • The application of *ad hoc* criteria in this case that were in contravention to the decisions explicitly taken by CAC. •The Codex Secretary

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				• noted that the decision of CCRVDF would send a strong message to CCEXEC and CAC to take action and discuss this issue. • expressed concern that CCRVDF was prevented from acting on this standard due to factors beyond science and expressed the hope that discussions could take place in the appropriate bodies to avoid potential damage to Codex in the future.

Comments by the Chairperson:

Zilpaterol HCl is a beta receptor agonist drug, and used to improve cattle production in a number of member countries (affecting rate of weight gain, feed efficiency and carcass leanness). Zilpaterol was proposed for evaluation by JECFA at the 21st CCRVDF meeting. The Committee was extraordinarily divided over that proposal and unable to reach consensus. The CCRVDF Chair, Steven Vaughn, brought the issue to the 35th Commission, noting that the veterinary drug met all of the Committee's criteria for such an evaluation. The 35th Commission agreed, and the veterinary drug was forwarded to the 78th JECFA. Zilpaterol HCl has been evaluated by the 78th, 81st and 85th JECFA; an ADI and ARfD have been established and MRLs for muscle, liver, and kidney of cattle have been recommended. CCRVF expressed strong support for the robust evaluation carried out by JEDFA and further emphasized that there were no public health or scientific concerns regarding the proposed draft MRLs. Two members voiced concern for public health issues, but no references were provided to the committee, nor was a concern form provided to support further evaluation by JECFA.

The concerns expressed by those who opposed progressing the standard for residues of zilpaterol HCl in food are listed in paragraphs 42 and 43 of REP18RVDF; the concerns expressed by those who favored progressing the standard either to Step 5, or to Step 5/8 are provided in paragraph 44.

The arguments against progressing the standard centered on an objection to the use of veterinary drugs for non-therapeutic purposes in food producing animals, and because zilpaterol HCl is not approved for use, or belongs to a class of drugs explicitly prohibited from approval in their countries. As noted in by the arguments in favor of progressing the standard, none of the arguments against a standard meet the criteria in the *Appendix, General decisions, Statements of Principle Concerning The Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making Process and the Extent To Which Other Factors Are Taken Into Account (Codex Procedural Manual, 26th Ed)*, i.e., legitimate factors relevant for health protect and fair trade practices. It is notable that the Observer from OIE provided an intervention noting the role of OIE in animal health and animal welfare. The Chair of the 24th CCRVDF (Kevin Greenlees) and the Codex Secretary attempted unsuccessfully to urge members objecting to advancement of the standard to consider factor 4 and abstain from acceptance of the zilpaterol standard without preventing a decision by Codex.

The Chair determined that consensus had not been reached, that CCRVDF was divided as a committee, and the reasons against advancing the proposed MRLs were not due to concerns regarding science, public health, or fair trade practices. Debate was closed and the draft MRL for zilpaterol was retained at Step 4. In response to not advancing the draft MRLs, 28 of the 69 countries in attendance expressed reservations articulated in paragraph 54 of REP18RVDF. It is notable that, even with this large number of reservations, there were still additional members who provided interventions in favor of advancing the MRLs during the plenary discussion, exceeding the number of interventions against advancement. The Committee was clearly heavily divided on this issue, and not in consensus.

The debate regarding the MRLs for zilpaterol HCl are not new; they echo the debates that have raged for years through CCRVDF and the Commission for veterinary drugs like estradiol, melengestrol acetate, recombinant bovine somatotropin and ractopamine. The latter led to an extremely contentions vote at the Commission, passing the standard by a slim margin. Recombinant bovine somatotropin has remained for years at the Commission at Step 8, with no prospect of advancing. The debate regarding the MRLs for zilpaterol HCl is notable in that, for the first time, the rationale for those favoring and objecting to setting Codex standards was clearly articulated on all sides and captured in the Committee report.

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
As noted in the Comments by the Chairperson for gentian violet, in the discussions regarding the other proposed MRLs advanced during the 24th CCRVDF, and the fruitful discussions for the development of data for veterinary drugs for JECFA evaluations, CCRVDF is a dynamic and engaged Committee, whose member passionately argue to develop and improve Codex standards to protect public health. But the inability of some members to stay within the bounds of Codex procedures when considering the basis for advancement for proposed MRLs for residues of veterinary drugs with non-therapeutic uses (whether classified as hormones or not) threatens the fabric of Codex. There is no question that all sides are bringing real concerns to the table; nor is there question that many of these concerns driven by political, social, and economic forces. That the concerns against advancing the MRLs clearly fall outside of Codex procedures, and in doing so can adversely impact human public health and fair trade practice, and that those expressing those concerns are unwilling to abstain from acceptance of the zilpaterol standard without preventing a decision by the Committee, threatens the future of Codex as standard setting body.						

New work

Documents	Timeframe		Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/RVDF)
	Reference and project document	Target Year			
Priority list of veterinary drugs requiring approval by CAC as new work for CCRVDF	-	-	1.1	The next meeting of JECFA	Ref. paras 84(i)(ii), 108, 109, 112, 115, 116 and Appendix VI (Parts A and D) Part A - List of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA Part D - List of veterinary drugs for which CCRVDF would consider extrapolation of Codex MRLs to additional species.
Comments by the Chairperson: One of the significant differences between CCRVDF and CCPR, despite the similarity of the MRLs that these committees develop in the Codex standard process, is the limited number of veterinary drugs for which data are available for a robust JECFA evaluation compared to similar evaluations of pesticides by JMPR. The 24th CCRVDF continues to work to address this issue, and has developed a Part D of the priority list, in an attempt to develop criteria and data that would allow extrapolation (or extension) of data from species for which MRLs have been established for a veterinary drug residue to additional species. This effort is reflected in the activities described below as “Discussion papers and others” and reflects the dedication of the members of CCRVDF to find additional paths to allow setting of Codex standards that are protective of public health and fair practice in the food trade.					

Discussion papers/others

Documents (discussion papers)	**Explanatory Notes** **(The reference is REP18/RVDF)**
Extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species (including a pilot on extrapolation of MRLs identified in Part D of the Priority List)	Ref. paras 84(ii), 108 **Note**: This work is linked to the amendment of the Risk Analysis Principles and the approval of Part D of the Priority List (see above).
Coordination with the CCPR/EWG on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed (CXM 4-1989) for the development of a harmonized definition for edible offal / animal tissues for the establishment of MRLs	Ref. para. 95 **Note**: This work follows the recommendation of CCEXEC73 to encourage close collaboration between CCRVDF and CCPR on cross-cutting issues (REP17/EXEC2, para. 19)
Advantages and disadvantages of a parallel approach to compound evaluation	Ref. para. 103 **Note**: This work aims at facilitating the establishment of MRLs for veterinary drugs through a pilot project along the same lines on a pilot project on the opportunities and challenges related to the participation of JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound (see CCPR Critical Review).
Database on countries' needs for MRLs	Ref. para. 110 **Note**: No further work is expected in terms of requests for inclusion of additional compounds but the DB would be maintained and made available to members prior to CCRVDF25 to support work on identification of countries' needs for MRLs.
Discontinued/completed	
Discussion paper on MRLs for groups of fish species	Ref. para. 84 **Note**: This work has been overtaken by the work on extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species (including a pilot on extrapolation of MRLs identified in Part D of the Priority List (see above).
Discussion paper on the revision of the criteria for the use of multi-residue analytical methods for the determination and identification of veterinary drugs in foods in the *Guidelines for the design and implementation of national regulatory food safety assurance programs associated with the use of veterinary drugs in food producing animals* (CXG 71-2009)	Ref. para. 97 **Note:** CCRVDF agreed to discontinue this Agenda Item for the time being.
Comments by the Chairperson: As previously discussed, these efforts are driven by a recognition that the priority list of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by the JECFA is extremely limited, despite a long list of veterinary drugs and species identified by members a needing Codex MRLs. The work is directed towards finding ways to develop approaches to allow development of MRLs for additional veterinary drugs and additional species.	

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCRVDF24	2	1	1	1	1	4	2

Explanatory Notes: The overall workload includes agenda items which may have several MRLs e.g. MRLs at Step 5/8 is 1 item comprising of 10 MRLs for 4 compounds. CCRVDF current work is manageable within the length of the meeting (5 days meeting).

Comments by the Chairperson:

As noted above, CCRVDF continues to struggle to find access to the underlying data that will allow a robust, scientifically based risk assessment by JECFA leading to appropriate ADIs and recommended MRLs for veterinary drugs. Many factors impact this difficulty, including the relative size of the veterinary drug industry compared to human medicine – or to the agricultural pesticide industry. The Committee has developed a number of alternate pathways to develop these data, and for the first time, at the 24th CCRVDF, members of the generic animal drug industry began to engage in the conversation. These activities provide a basis for optimism in the availability of continuing work for the Committee.

This optimism, unfortunately, is somewhat counterbalanced by the inability of the Committee to advance standards for non-therapeutic veterinary drugs, despite the development of clear and robust risk assessments supporting these standards. This inability clearly increases the risk to the pharmaceutical industry for submission of data to support these standards, raising questions about the safety of national registrations by implication, if not by science and discourages participation in the Codex process. It increases the risk to the human consumer as international standards for the residues of these veterinary drugs cannot be established, despite an increased focus on the development of such products to increase agricultural efficiency meet the increased food needs most recently articulated by 69 nations in January 2018 Global Forum for Food and Agriculture.

APPENDIX 5: Committee on Methods and Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS), 29th session (7-11 May 2018)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/MAS)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Methods of analysis / performance criteria for provisions in Codex standards (for inclusion in CXS 234-1999)	Ongoing work	-	-	1.4		Ref. paras 22 and Appendix II The methods of analysis and performance criteria include those submitted by CCCF, CCNFSDU, and CCCPL for endorsement, and methods of analysis identified through the review/update of current methods of analysis (dairy workable package) (see item below)
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments						

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/MAS)
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Revision of the *Recommended Methods of Analysis and Sampling* (CXS 234-1999) -Preamble and structure of CXS 234 -Workable packages	ongoing	2020	2/3	1.4	-	Ref. paras 34(ii) and 47, Appendix III CCMAS agreed to return the introduction, preamble, and structure to Step 2/3 for redrafting. Work will continue on three workable packages: dairy, cereals, pulses and legumes, and fats and oils . **Note:** The target year of 2020 is for the completion of the preamble, scope, other relevant information to the use of the standard, and structure of the Standard. The review and update of the methods of analysis will be ongoing work.

New work

Documents	Timeframe		Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/MAS)
	Reference and project document	Target Year			
Revision of the *Guidelines on measurement uncertainty* (CXG 54-2004)	61, Appendix IV	2020		None	• The project document provides the necessary information and rationale to support the new work by CCMAS
Revision of the *Guidelines on Sampling* (CXG 50-2004)	71, Appendices V and VI	2021		None	• The project document provides the necessary information and rationale to support the new work **Note:** Work on the revision of the *Guidelines on measurement uncertainty* (CXG 54-2004) will run concurrently with the revision of. the *Guidelines on Sampling* (CXG 50-2004). Upon completion of the two sets of work, CCMAS will address the interrelationship between MU and sampling.
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments					

Discussion papers/others

Documents	Explanatory Notes (The reference is REP18/MAS)
Criteria for endorsement of biological methods used to detect chemicals of concern	Ref. para. 54 CCMAS39 agreed that no further work was necessary and to use the General Criteria for the Selection of Methods of Analysis in the Procedural Manual, but may consider other criteria referenced in other internationally recognized organizations' documents on a case-by-case basis for evaluation of biological methods.
Guidance for endorsement	Ref. para. 34(i) CCMAS39 agreed that a paper would be prepared which would address and recommend guidance for endorsement. This will ensure a consistent approach to the endorsement process and will inform the CCMAS endorsement work and the ongoing review and update of methods of analysis in CXS 234.
Comments by the Chairperson: No additional comments	

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCMAS 39	1	-	-	1	2	1	-

Explanatory Notes:

The Committee has a manageable workload and the work on CXS234 is receiving priority to ensure that it remains the single source of methods of analysis in Codex. The work on the preamble and structure is on track and should be finalised by the target year. The ongoing work to review and update the methods of analysis in CXS 234 will take place over the next few years (will be ongoing). Already work on a package on methods of analysis for milk and milk products has started and two new work packages have been identified, i.e. cereals, pulses and legumes, and fats and oils, respectively. The cooperation of Standards development organisations (SDOs) in the review work is appreciated.

Comments by the Chairperson:

No additional comments

APPENDIX 6: Committee on Sugar (CCS) (working by correspondence only)

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Secretariat notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Draft Standard for Non-Centrifuged Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice	N13-2011	2018 (initially 2013)	6/7	1.2	-	Ref. CL 2017/84-CS and CX/CAC 18/41/11 Add.1 The timeline for completion of work has been extended several times. CAC34 (2011) reactivated CCS working by correspondence to develop a Standard for "Panela" (renamed as Dehydrated Non-Centrifuged Sugar Cane Juice by CAC36). CAC36 (2013) adopted the proposed draft standard at Step 5. CAC37 (2014), CAC38 (2015), CAC39 (2016) and CAC40 (2016) considered the draft standard but no substantial progress was made. CAC37 (2014) held the draft standard at Step 6 due to the unresolved issues related to the identity (product name / scope) and quality (chemical characteristics, etc.); while CAC38 (2015) noted that if no consensus could be reached on final adoption by CAC39, consideration should be given either to convening a physical meeting of CCS or to discontinuing work on the draft standard. CAC39 (2016) requested CCS to clarify the scope of the draft standard only and to provide evidence of the international support for the defined scope. CCEXEC73 (2017) noted that the timeframe for completion of the work had been extended for four consecutive years and that agreement on the scope of the standard could not be reached and recommended to discontinue work on the development of the standard. CAC40 (2017) extended the work by another year to enable CCS to continue developing the standard and to report on progress to CAC41. Based on the conclusion of CAC40, Colombia, as host country of CCS, reviewed the comments submitted to CAC40, and prepared a revised version of the draft standard with a scope that was originally contained in CL 2015/19-CS. The analysis of comments together with the revised texts were circulated for comments under CL 2017/84-CS. The comments in response to CL 2017/84-CS are almost identical to the comments received before, which indicated that a number of issues, including name and scope of the product have not been resolved. After reviewing these comments, Colombia prepared explanatory notes and the draft standard (Appendices I and II of CX/CAC 18/41/11 Add.1) and titled the draft standard Panela (common or vernacular name known in each country). In addition to the title of the draft standard, the main revisions are related to: (i) the scope and product definition; (ii) parameters for saccharose, reducing sugars, proteins; and (iii) methods of analysis. Due to the time constraints, the latest proposal provided by Colombia cannot be distributed for comments for consideration by CAC41. However, with reference to the previous discussions, since no substantial progress has not been made on those core issues, it might be difficult to further proceed with the development of the draft standard.

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Secretariat notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Comments by the Chairperson (Translated from Spanish): CCS is grateful for the extension that has been granted to present advances. According to the comments received in response to CL 2017/84-CS, Colombia as host country of the CCS, with the purpose of harmonizing with the comments, has been working on aspects such as: renaming the product "Non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice" as "Panela" following the common name, as it is known and marketed in different regions and countries of the world. This adjustment is due to the observations presented by Brazil, the United States, Kenya, Sudan and countries of the region such as Ecuador and Mexico. The purpose is to differentiate this product from other sugar derivatives, and to recognize it by its distinctive organoleptic characteristics. Particularly, the term "concentration" has been added to the definition of the product, and it is clarified that the product does not contemplate purification or centrifugation stages in its manufacturing process. Likewise, in this section other characteristic elements are specified such as: phenols, flavonoids and vitamins to give precision and identity to the product. Regarding the scope of application, the response to a comment received from Japan in response to CL 2017/84-CS and CL 2017/45-CS is reiterated, where the purpose of the standard is also to prevent the product from being elaborated from the recomposition of the components of sugarcane juice or derivatives thereof, as is the case of the use of sugar or molasses, among others. Therefore, the purposes are to avoid irregular practices, guaranteeing that the marketed product is natural and a direct result of sugarcane milling, and not to induce to error to the consumer when offering a product originating from already processed ones. Finally, by addressing the last observations received, by the work done to respond to the observations from members through CL 2017/45-CS, CL 2016/45-CS, CL2016 / 15-CS, CL 2015/19-CS, CL 2015/16-CS, CL 2014/35-CS and CL 2013/9-CS, and following the procedures defined by Codex, it can be seen that the draft standard has evolved. It is now heading towards achieving a standard that guarantees the safety of the product, differentiates its quality in relation to other similar products, and shows the product as a healthy alternative for the consumer throughout the world.						

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCS	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Comments by the Chairperson: Colombia, as host country of CCS, appreciates and considers relevant to advance to the next step in the development of the Draft Codex standard on "Non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice", which is of special interest to countries. Colombia also appreciates the comments and international support received from several member countries in response to the circular letters. Since the product contains nutritive elements of sugarcane juice, such as some minerals, traces of proteins and vitamins which are not eliminated in the process of production, the new proposal includes fundamental aspects in the draft standard, regarding the name, scope and definition of the product. As Chairperson of CCS, we believe that we are taking a broader approach with the new proposal, and we are differentiating and giving identity to this product as compared to other sugar products already standardized.							
Explanatory Notes In view of the difficulties to continue the work and reach consensus for those fundamental provisions, taking into account the decisions made in CCEXEC73 and CAC40, CCEXEC should consider options on how to further proceed – see recommendations from secretariat in Section 2.3.							

APPENDIX 7: Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes (CCCPL) (working by correspondence only)

Adoption

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Draft Standard for Quinoa	N17-2015	2019	8	1.2	-	Ref. CL 2018/25-CPL Annex II The work has been completed ahead of the schedule. CAC38 (2015) reactivated CCCPL working by correspondence to develop the standard for quinoa and established an EWG, chaired by Plurinational State of Bolivia and co-chaired by the United States of America. CAC40 (2017) adopted the draft Standard at Step 5 and agreed to address the outstanding issues (e.g. moisture content, protein content, saponin content and methods of analysis and sampling). After CAC40, two rounds of EWG consultation were conducted. The EWG made the conclusions on all the outstanding issues. For saponin, the EWG identified this parameter as a quality requirement and agreed to a saponin content of 0.12%. The EWG noted that there was no internationally validated method for the determination of saponins in quinoa and requested advice on suitable testing methods from CCMAS. In the draft standard, the testing method for saponin is listed as "to be determined". Endorsement: Food Additives: Not permitted, for endorsement by CCFA51 (2019) Methods of Analysis and Sampling: CCMAS39 (May 2018) endorsed methods of analysis for moisture content (with the addition of AACCI 44-15.02) and protein content (as Type IV) in quinoa. For saponins, CCMAS was not in a position to recommend a suitable method for determination of saponins, and noted the interest

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
						of AACCI to undertake collaborative studies using an appropriate method. Note: Lack of a suitable internationally validated method for determination of saponins may raise questions on the provision itself and the enforcement of the standard. Contaminants and Hygiene: Standardized text as in the Procedural Manual Food labelling: For endorsement by CCFL45 (2019)
Comments by the Chairperson: After the two rounds of EWG consultation were conducted, CL 2018/25-CPL was issued on April 6, 2018 requesting comments on the draft Standard for Quinoa at Step 8 with a comment deadline of May 31, 2018. The CL specifically requested comments on whether the proposed 0.12% maximum limit for saponin content in Section 3.2.6 of the draft standard can be supported for adoption at Step 8. The Chairperson anticipates receiving comments in response to this specific requests and in support for adoption of the draft standard at Step 8 by May 31, 2018 deadline. The Chairperson also anticipates receiving comments on the proposed methods for determining moisture and protein contents. If comments provide additional methods for determining moisture and protein contents, they should be considered for adoption at Step 8 by CAC41 and for endorsement by CCMAS40.						

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCCPL (working by correspondence)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comments by the Chairperson: During the past year, the majority of the EWG members actively participated by providing valuable comments in further development of the draft standard. The Chairperson is encouraged that some of the contentious issues, such as the moisture and saponin content, will be resolved and that the draft standard could be adopted at Step 8, ahead of schedule.							
Explanatory Notes: The work is ahead of schedule. If there are some contentious issues such as the moisture content and saponin content (taking into account the need for a validated method of analysis to ensure compliance with the proposed saponin level), an EWG may be established to continue addressing them. Any further proposals for methods of analysis for protein content and moisture content should be referred to CCMAS and should not hold up discussion on the standard nor adoption of the standard.							

APPENDIX 8: Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV) (working by correspondence only)

Ongoing work

Documents	Timeframe		Current Status	Output Codes	Scientific Advice	Explanatory Notes
	Job ID or year	Target Year				
Standard for Cashew Kernels	N13-2017	2019		1.2	-	Ref. CL 2018/22-PFV CAC40 (2017) approved the seven proposals for new work. CAC40 agreed that CCPFV would work by correspondence until CAC41 t(2018) to: (i) prioritize its work on the proposals for new work and pending work on the review of the existing standards; (ii) prepare a work plan to address its overall work; and (iii) prepare recommendations for CAC41 on the establishment of EWGs to carry out standard-development work, as prioritized in the work plan, for consideration by a physical meeting of CCPFV to be held in 2019. A CCPFV electronic forum was set up in February 2018. CL 2018/22-PFV "Request for comments on prioritization of work for the codex committee on processed fruits and vegetables (CCPFV)" was distributed in March 2018 with a deadline of 10 April 2018. Comments in response to CL 2018/22-PFV are being analyzed by the host country of CCPFV and the follow-up discussion is currently taking place on the electronic forum. The work plan is expected to be available in June 2018.
Conversion of the Regional Standard for Chili Sauce (CODEX STAN 306R-2011) into a worldwide standard	N14-2017	2019		1.2	-	
Revision of the Standard for Mango Chutney (CODEX STAN 160-1987)	N15-2017	2019		1.2	-	
Standard for dried sweet potato	N16-2017	2021		1.2	-	
Conversion of the Regional Standard for Gochujang (CODEX STAN 294R-2009) into a worldwide standard	N17-2017	2021		1.2	-	
Standard for dried fruits (including dried persimmons)	N18-2017	2021		1.2	-	
Standard for canned mixed fruits (Revision of the Standard for Canned Tropical Fruit Salad (CODEX STAN 99-1981))	N19-2017	2022		1.2	-	

Comments by the Chairperson:

The ongoing work for CCPFV will be determined by the recommendations from CCPFV-online as modified/approved by CAC41. As a result, the listing above of documents may be adjusted. In addition, work is contemplated by CCPFV to respond to matters referred from CCFA49 & CCFA50 and CCMAS.

The target dates in the above table appear to be based on the new work proposals contained in CX/CAC 17/40/8 Add1. However, based on developments since CX/CAC 17/40/8 Add1 was distributed, it is appropriate to adjust the dates for the target years to 2022. The timeline for this is as follows, assuming 2-year interval between CCPFV plenary sessions:

July 2018 – CAC41 reviews/modifies/approves Work Plan and EWGs.

August 2018 thru August 2019 – CCPFV EWGs develop draft standards.

Sept 2019 – CCPFV meets. Planned progress would be for draft documents go to CCEXEC (in 2020) at step 5.

Sept 2021 – CCPFV meets. Planned progress would be final drafts go to CCEXEC (2022) and CAC (2022) at 5/8 for adoption.

July 2022 – CCEXEC recommends and CAC adopts final drafts.

Overall workload

Committee sessions	Step 8 and 5/8	Step 5	Other texts for adoption	Ongoing work	New Work	Discussion paper	Revoked Standards, Discontinued work or discussion paper
CCPFV	-	-	-	7	-	-	-

Explanatory Notes:

CCPFV was re-established by CAC in 1997 to review all existing standards for processed fruits and vegetables. The resulting work concentrated on updating and simplifying the standards and grouping similar products (when feasible and appropriate) into group standards to facilitate their application. The review of all standards that existed prior to 1997 is the program of work given to CCPFV by CAC and as such is not subject to submission of project documents and approval of new work. In the interest of transparency, the CCPFV has followed the practice of identifying a country interested in undertaking the review to facilitate work in plenary and to submit a project document to facilitate the progress monitoring by CCEXEC under the Critical Review. While the focus of CCPFV work has been on reviewing the existing standards, CCPFV has also agreed on proposals for development of new standards when necessary.

At CCPFV28 (2016), the Chair proposed to consider adjourning *sine die* since its top priority work had been completed at the session and that the pending issues would not warrant holding a physical meeting. In recognition of the interest of many delegations on the revision of existing/development of new standards, CCPFV 28 agreed to request proposals for new work through a circular letter to CCEXEC for consideration under the Critical Review and CAC decision on the approval of new work. CAC40 (2017) approved seven proposals for new work which include revision of standards (pending work on the review) and new standards. CAC40 agreed that CCPFV would work by correspondence until CAC41 (2018) to prepare recommendations on its work plan for considerations by CAC41.

CL 2018/22-PFV was distributed with the purpose of collecting comments and preparing recommendations as requested by CAC40.

As summarized in CL 2018/22-PFV, the ongoing work in CCPFV includes:

- approved new work on Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables: 7 standards
- pending work on the review of Codex standards for processed fruits and vegetables: 12 standards
- matters on food additives and methods of analysis arising from CCFA and CCMAS

CCPFV is currently analyzing the comments received in response to the CL and the USA as chair of CCPFV will provide a report for considerations by CAC41. Preliminary reviews are provided in the comments by the chair below.

Comments by the Chairperson:

CCPFV is currently working by correspondence as “CCPFV-online” through the Codex electronic forum. Twenty-two countries and seven observer organizations are members of CCPFV-online. We have draft responses for the following three tasks CCPFV received from CAC40:

(i) Prioritize work on proposals for new work and pending work on the review of the existing standards;
(ii) Prepare a work plan to address overall work; and
(iii) Prepare recommendations for CAC41 on the establishment of electronic working groups (EWG) to carry out standard development work, as prioritized in the work plan, for consideration by a physical meeting of CCPFV to be held in 2019.

We expect to finalize the draft recommendations for submittal as a report to CCEXEC/CAC by June 15. It will include some analysis of the results from CL 2018/22-PFV. The recommendations are based on the results of the online survey, other responses to CL 2018/22-PFV, synthesis by the Chair, and review by CCPFV-online members. In short, the recommendations call for EWGs for the standards work that received the highest priority, and EWGs for the matters referred from CCFA and CCMAS. Work receiving lower priority ranking will be considered after progress is made on the higher priority work.

One ongoing factor that merits noting with respect to CCPFV is the relatively low level of participation in meetings and standards elaboration. For example, during five of its last six meetings, CCPFV did not have enough participating members for a quorum, i.e., did not have at least 20% of the members of the commission attending[1/]. In the last four meetings (since 2010), 26 to 29 members participated (approximately 14% to 16% of the Commission at the time).

Related to this, there is currently uncertainty as to the level of likely country participation in the new work approved by CAC40. For example, the survey response by eight countries to CL 2018/22-PFV (which sought work priorities) was a limited showing, and as such, was not conclusive as to country support for the new work. In addition, because the proposals for new work were submitted directly by countries to CCEXEC73 (in response to CL 2017/07-PFV) without CCPFV discussion and endorsement, the level of support among Committee members for the new work submitted was not clearly gauged.

As a result of this situation, the draft recommended work plan includes EWG work by correspondence after CAC41, with a mid-year progress review to assess activity and provide a basis for determining appropriate next steps. These steps include a physical meeting in 2019, or continuing to meet by correspondence until the level of progress on standards is sufficient for a physical meeting, or possible submission to a standards advancement committee (if such an entity is agreed to by CAC).

As noted above, the report for CCEXEC/CAC with recommendations from CCPFV on the Committee's priorities, work plan, and EWGs is being finalized for expected submittal to CCEXEC by June 15.

1/ See Codex Procedural Manual, Rule VI, Paragraph 7.