

# codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: +39(06)5701 Telex: 625825-625853 FAO I Email: Codex@fao.org Facsimile: +39(06)5705.4593

Agenda Item 3

ALINORM 99/4  
June 99

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

*23<sup>rd</sup> Session, FAO Headquarters, Rome, 28 June-3 July 1999*

### REPORT OF THE FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

*FAO Headquarters, Rome, 24-25 June 1999*

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission met at FAO Headquarters, Rome, from 24 to 25 June 1999. The Session was chaired by the Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Prof. Dr. Pakdee Pothisiri (Thailand). A complete list of participants is given in Appendix I.

## ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 1)<sup>1</sup>

2. The Executive Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as the Agenda for the Session. It also agreed to discuss, under Item 7, a paper concerning the language and documentation policies of the Commission (CX/EXEC 99/46/3 - Addendum). Under Item 8 Other Business, it agreed to discuss a proposal to include in the Procedural Manual a reference to the special and differential treatment of developing countries, and the response of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to the Communiqué of the 25<sup>th</sup> Economic Summit (G8 Summit) held in Cologne, Germany, on 20 June 1999, concerning biotechnology and other aspects of food safety.

## FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS (AGENDA ITEM 2)

### A. REPORT ON THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME FOR 1998/99 AND 2000/2001<sup>2</sup>

3. The Executive Committee noted the Secretariat's report on the outcome of the 1996/97 biennium and the status of the operating budget for the current (1998/99) biennium. It expressed its satisfaction at the overall budget level for the biennium 2000/01, noting the financial constraints under which the parent Organizations were operating. It also expressed its appreciation of the generous voluntary support provided by Host Governments for Codex Committees. The Executive Committee noted with some concern the increased documentation costs foreseen for 2000/01.

4. The Executive Committee noted that the presentation of the budgetary information for the biennia 1998/99 and 2000/01 was different and was therefore not easy to compare. It was noted, however, that the new presentation of information should lead to easier comparisons if used in future years and made it easier to understand the total level of budget allocated to different items of expenditure.

<sup>1</sup> CX/EXEC 99/46/1

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 99/5

5. It was noted that while the Codex budget provided for the funding of a limited number of *ad hoc* Expert Consultations under the FAO-only contribution, funding for the important scientific advisory committees JECFA, JMPR and consultations, was provided by the programmes of FAO and WHO other than the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. The Executive Committee was concerned that inadequate resources for these bodies could seriously impede the work of the Commission and the relevant subsidiary bodies responsible for developing science-based food safety standards. It expressed the view that the independence and the scientific integrity of these bodies should continue to be strengthened. The Executive Committee noted that FAO and WHO were considering issues related to the transparency of the selection process for experts; resolution or avoidance of conflicts of interest; expression of minority opinions by experts; and enlarging the basis of expert advice in the scientific committees. The Executive Committee agreed to recommend to the Commission that a draft Resolution addressed to FAO and WHO be considered, embodying the concerns expressed above. The Text of the Draft Resolution is contained in Appendix II to this report.

6. On a related matter that had been discussed by the 45<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee (ALINORM 99/3, para.22), it was noted that FAO and WHO had convened an *ad hoc* Expert Consultation on Microbiological Risk Assessment in March 1999 and that report of this Consultation would be available well in advance of the next Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

#### **B. SUPPORT TO DEVELOPING MEMBER COUNTRIES<sup>3</sup>**

7. The Forty-fifth Session of the Executive Committee had welcomed initiatives to support the work of Codex Contact Points in developing countries through workshops and seminars, and for the technical assistance provided by FAO and WHO to support developing countries in food control in general. It had requested the Secretariat to provide an estimate of this support. The document submitted to the Executive Committee presented information on workshops and seminars for Codex Contact Points; the FAO Technical Cooperation and other field Programmes; WHO activities, especially at the regional level; and a special report on training activities in the area of fisheries.

8. The Executive Committee expressed its appreciation of the report and noted that these expenditures represented a significant and worthwhile contribution to the aims of the Joint Food Standards Programme. It noted that as a result there had been significant positive developments in several regions, particularly Africa, and expressed its full appreciation to FAO and WHO and their partners for this work.

#### **PRINCIPLES OF RISK ANALYSIS (Agenda item 3)<sup>4</sup>**

9. The Committee took note of the action taken so far to implement the Action Plan approved by the 22nd Session of the Commission for the integration of risk analysis in Codex work. It expressed its appreciation to FAO and WHO for the organization of expert consultations as important elements contributing to the achievement of the Action Plan and noted that most of the recommendations contained in the working document (paras. 25 to 27) had been developed by these expert consultations. The Executive Committee expressed its support for most of the recommendations included in paras. 25 to 27, and discussed more specifically the following points.

10. As regards the recommendation in para. 25e) concerning the participation of observers in the Executive Committee, some members pointed out that it may have been preferable to address this question in the Commission as part of the discussion on consumer participation (Agenda Item 6). However, the Executive Committee noted that this recommendation, which originated from the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Risk Communication, was intended to address NGO participation in general, in order to improve the transparency of the process and was not limited to consumers NGO involvement in Codex.

11. The Representative of Asia expressed the view that the composition of the Executive Committee should remain unchanged as its intergovernmental nature should be retained. This position was supported by the Representative of Europe who pointed out that the admission of NGOs would also create significant practical problems, especially to determine which organizations would be allowed to participate. Other

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 99/5-Addendum.

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 99/9

members proposed to consider the possibility of admitting selected NGOs as observers in the Executive Committee since this appeared to be a significant concern, especially for consumers. The Committee noted a proposal to increase the number of advisers to the Regional Representatives in order to permit the attendance of NGOs while maintaining the current structure of the Executive Committee. After an exchange of views on this question, the Committee agreed that the current proposal in para. 25 e) would be retained for further consideration by the Commission.

12. The Representative of Latin America and the Caribbean proposed to add a reference to the special needs of developing countries in the area of risk analysis and drew attention to the comments of India reproduced in the working paper. The Representative of Europe proposed to add recommendations concerning the interactive nature of the risk analysis process and transparency in the selection of experts and the proceedings of the expert committees.

13. As regards the recommendations addressed to governments (para. 26), some members stressed that the text should not make recommendations concerning the formulation of national position on Codex matters since this was the responsibility of governments and would differ from one country to another (point a). Some members pointed out that this was also applicable to the composition and operation of the National Codex Committees, and recalled that the CCGP had recognized this when developing the *Draft Core Functions of Codex Contact Points*; the text of points a) and b) was therefore amended to make it more general.

14. Some Members pointed out that the recommendations concerning the updating of national legislation should be more flexible and that governments should rather "be encouraged" to do so, in order to take into account national differences in the regulatory processes and the difficulties of developing countries.

15. The Committee amended the recommendations of the working document in view of the above proposals and agreed to propose following text for endorsement by the Commission:

**para 26:**

- a) Member governments should participate actively in Codex work. Governments should also consider, to the extent possible, the views of all interested parties when formulating the national position on a Codex matter. Further, governments are encouraged to communicate and explain the basis of the decisions of Codex to those same interested parties and to the public at large.
- b) Governments should adopt organizational structures and procedures that assure transparency and that allow National Codex Committees to consider consumers' and private sector opinions. Cooperation should be developed with the consumer and private sectors in risk communication - especially in developing simple messages concerning food quality and safety.
- c) Governments are encouraged to incorporate principles of risk analysis when establishing or updating national legislation on food safety matters

**para. 27**

- d) FAO and WHO should strengthen transparency in scientific risk assessment. This includes transparency in the choice of experts and the advice being given including how uncertainties are addressed.

16. The Executive Committee agreed that the other recommendations included in the document would remain unchanged and be presented to the Commission for endorsement.

## MATTERS ARISING FROM REPORTS OF CODEX COMMITTEES (AGENDA ITEM 4)<sup>5</sup>

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS

#### *Use of Hydrogen Peroxide for the Preservation of Raw Milk<sup>6</sup>*

17. The Executive Committee noted that the Commission had approved the use of substances that generate hydrogen peroxide as part of the Lactoperoxidase System for the Preservation of Raw Milk and had adopted Guidelines to cover this practice (CAC/GL 13-1991). The Executive Committee therefore endorsed the Recommendation of the Committee on Milk and Milk Products and invited the Commission to make a clear statement that the use of hydrogen peroxide in a manner not consistent with the above Guidelines was no longer acceptable.

### CODEX REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR ASIA

#### *Levels of Sulphur Dioxide in Plantation or Mill White Sugar<sup>7</sup>*

18. As the issue regarding the level of sulphur dioxide in these commodities had already been taken into account by the Committee on Sugars while revising the relevant standard the Executive Committee took no action on this matter.

#### *Duplication of Work between UNECE and the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables<sup>8</sup>*

19. The Executive Committee noted that matter of duplication of work between UN/ECE Working Party and the Committee on Fresh Fruit and Vegetables had been a matter for discussion for some time and should be resolved through exchanges of information between the parties concerned. Although the matter specifically at hand had been resolved since the meeting of the Coordinating Committee for Asia, it concurred in general with the views of this Committee. The Executive Committee noted that the matter of harmonization of standards for these commodities was important and that the broadest possible consensus on all international standards needed to be achieved.

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

#### *Amendments to the Procedural Manual<sup>9</sup>*

20. The Executive Committee was informed that the Committee was initiating a revision of the section of the Procedural Manual dealing with the selection of methods of analysis and sampling and that this “new work” might lead to the development of a Codex Standard, Guidelines or related text. The Executive Committee felt that it was primarily technical matter and not a procedural matter. It also noted the recommendations of the Committee on General Principles on the above subject. It recommended that the Commission endorse the proposal to revise the criteria for the selection of methods of analysis and sampling but indicated that final text should be included in the relevant volume of the Codex Alimentarius as advice to governments and not in the Procedural Manual.

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 99/21 Part III and Part III-Add.1.

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 99/11, para. 96.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 99/15, paras 76-78.

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 99/15, para. 8.

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 99/23, para. 28 and Appendix II.

**CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES/CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS**

***Harmonization of MRLs for Compounds Used as Pesticides and as Veterinary Drugs<sup>10</sup>***

21. The Executive Committee noted that residue definitions may be applied differently when some substances were used as pesticides or as veterinary drugs. This led to situations where two different MRLs for the same compound had been proposed depending on the use of the drug. It also noted that a joint meeting of experts from both JECFA and JMPR had been held in February 1999 to resolve this issue and therefore suggested that the Commission hold proposed MRLs for such compounds at Step 8 until harmonized residue limits could be developed by both relevant Committees.

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR NORTH AMERICA AND SOUTH WEST PACIFIC**

***Analysis of the Status of the Use or Acceptability of Codex Standards<sup>11</sup>***

22. The Executive Committee endorsed the proposal of the Co-ordinating Committee that the Commission, through its Secretariat, request the WTO Secretariat to indicate the availability of information that could help in analysing the use or acceptance of Codex Standards.

**CODEX REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA**

***Risk Communication Needs in Developing Countries<sup>12</sup>***

23. The Executive Committee noted that there might be implications for developing countries in implementing risk communication as part of risk analysis. It agreed to the proposal of the Coordinator for Africa that the matter be included on the Provisional Agendas of all Regional Coordinating Committees when risk analysis issues were discussed and that a combined report be presented on these issues at the next Session of the Commission.

**CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD IMPORT AND EXPORT INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS**

***Judgement of Equivalence: Technical Regulations<sup>13</sup>***

24. The Executive Committee noted that the equivalence of technical regulations was a recognized concept under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade. It also noted that the Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems had been requested to develop concepts for equivalence in food control for import and export (ALINORM 99/3, paras. 35-36). The Executive Committee recommended that the Committee proceed to develop guidance on the judgement of equivalence of systems for inspection and certification in relation to technical regulations other than sanitary measures. The question of determination of equivalence of measures, however, should be dealt with by specific technical (general subject or commodity) committees as required.

25. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that priority should be given to the development of judgement of equivalence regarding matters of food safety, but recommended that the Committee should decide whether the work of technical regulations relating to matters other than safety should be integrated or developed in parallel with food safety issues. It was noted that in some food control administrations there was no major difference between the systems in place that controlled these two elements.

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 99/24, paras 70, 80, 92-93.

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 99/32, para. 19.

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 99/28, para. 78.

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 99/30A, paras 69-84.

26. The Executive Committee proposed that the Secretariat prepare a paper for the next Session of the Committee on the matter of judgement of equivalence systems for controlling of safety and quality outlining the issues involved.

## **CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

### **REVISION OF THE ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE**

27. Despite general agreement that the current Acceptance Procedure was out-dated and no longer functioning, the Executive Committee noted that the Committee on General Principles had considered this matter over three sessions. Due to a diversity of opinions, that Committee was unable to make progress on the matter and had agreed to return to it a future date and not to include it in its next session. The Executive Committee decided not to pursue the matter, but to refer it to the Commission for consideration.

## **DESIGNATION OF HOST GOVERNMENTS FOR CODEX COMMITTEES AND AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCES (AGENDA ITEM 5)<sup>14</sup>**

28. The Executive Committee noted that it had special authority under Rule III.2 to advise the Commission on the matters covered by this Agenda Item. It was informed that the establishment and operation of subsidiary bodies and *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Forces was subject to the approval by the Commission of the revised Criteria for the Establishment of Subsidiary Bodies. The Executive Committee welcomed this move to a more flexible structure, using *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Forces to handle specific issues.

### **ABOLITION OF CODEX COMMITTEES**

29. In considering Annex 2 of document ALINORM 99/16 containing information provided by Host Governments on the status of the work of those Committees adjourned *sine die*, the Committee recommended the abolition of the Codex Committee on Processed Meat and Poultry Products as suggested by the Host Government of Denmark.

30. The Committee noted the recommendation of the Government of Canada that the Codex Committee on Vegetable Protein could be abolished after completion of the revision of the Codex Standard for Wheat Gluten.

### **AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON FRUIT JUICES**

31. With regard to the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit Juices, the Committee endorsed the proposal to establish such a body with the Terms of Reference set out in Annex 1 of ALINORM 99/16. It welcomed the offer of the Government of Brazil to host such a body. It was noted that the *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force would consider standards for fruit and vegetable juices for human consumption, and that issues relating to by-products of this process used as components of animal feeds would be considered in the context of the question of animal feeding in general.

32. The Committee recalled that the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had approved the elaboration of a Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding and had assigned this work to the Codex Committees on Food Hygiene, Food Additives and Contaminants, Pesticide Residues, and Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods, with the co-ordinating role to be taken by the Executive Committee<sup>15</sup>. However, progress on the draft Code had been slow because of the split responsibilities. Moreover, the technical need for the Code had evolved and greater emphasis needed to be placed on the appropriate use and control of antimicrobial substances.

### **AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANIMAL FEEDING**

33. The Executive Committee had an exchange of views on how to proceed with the elaboration of the Code. It was felt that the current draft was too general to and that there was a need for a more complete text

---

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 99/16 and ALINORM 99/16-Add.1

<sup>15</sup> ALINORM 97/37, para. 129

which addressed all the issues relating to animal feed. The Executive Committee was of the opinion that the Commission should proceed urgently with the development of international guidelines or recommendations on animal feeding that would provide more explicit advice than was contained in the present Draft Code. It proposed that the new mechanism of an *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force would be an appropriate means of achieving this goal. It was noted that the establishment of such a task force would depend on the identification of a Host Government consistent with the Rules of Procedure.

#### **ELABORATION OF A GENERAL STANDARD FOR FOODS DERIVED FROM BIOTECHNOLOGY<sup>16</sup>**

34. The Executive Committee noted that the draft Medium-Term Plan for 1998 to 2002 prepared by the Forty-fifth Session of the Executive Committee foresaw, *inter alia*, the consideration of a general standard for foods derived from biotechnology or traits introduced into foods by biotechnology.

35. The Executive Committee unanimously agreed to recommend to the Commission that an *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology be established to deal with this subject. It also agreed that the work should cover “safety and nutritional aspects” of foods derived from biotechnology and should be conducted in a totally transparent manner. Some Members were of the opinion that it should also cover aspects of consumer information and labelling. The Executive Committee noted that the Government of Japan had offered to host the *ad hoc* Task Force and appreciated the generous offer of that Government.

36. In regard to the timeframe of the Task Force to be included into the Terms of Reference, the Executive Committee unanimously agreed that the Task Force should first submit a preliminary report to the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission in 2001, and a full report in 2003. The Executive Committee also noted with satisfaction that a Joint Expert Consultation would be convened in 2000 by FAO and WHO to draft an initial text, whether a general standard, general guidelines or guidelines on specific issues, that should be scientific in nature and would be used as basis for the work of the Task Force.

37. As for the rest of the Terms of Reference the Executive Committee, having failed to reach an agreement, decided that Commission should consider the basis of the Japanese proposal in CAC/LIM 8 (1999). During the discussion the Executive Committee noted the following comments:

- the Terms of Reference should be within the mandate of the Commission;
- Item 2) Objectives should include the necessity of responding to consumers' concerns regarding any risks associated with the production and processing of foods derived from biotechnology; the same should be included under item 4) Terms of reference; some Members noted, however, that the notion of consumers' concern may be outside the mandate of the Commission;
- co-ordination with the other Codex bodies would be essential, in particular with the Codex Committee on Food Labelling working currently on the recommendations for the labelling of foods obtained through biotechnology;
- it would be appropriate to link this work with that of the OECD which had been requested by the 45<sup>th</sup> Economic (G-8) Summit to study the implications of biotechnology and other aspects of food safety;
- existing regulatory instruments elaborated on this matter by national food safety authorities and principles and procedures recommended by FAO, WHO and other international organizations should be taken into account in the work of the Task Force;
- the Commission should consider which type of Codex guidance would be most appropriate.

#### **REVIEW OF CRITERIA FOR NEW WORK AND GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF “INCLUSIVE” STANDARDS (AGENDA ITEM 6)<sup>17</sup>**

38. The Executive Committee noted that the referenced paper had been prepared by the Secretariat in response to the request of the last Session of the Commission in relation to the consideration of new work

<sup>16</sup> CAC/LIM 8 (1999); Submitted by Japan.

<sup>17</sup> CX/EXEC 99/46/2.

and the preference of “inclusive” standards over highly specific standards<sup>18</sup>. The Committee focused its discussion on the recommendations set forth in paragraphs 7-10 of the paper.

39. The Executive Committee:

***Review of the Criteria for New Work***

- recommended that the Commission adopt the proposals of the Codex Committee on General Principles for “Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities”<sup>19</sup>, including amendments to the existing criteria to establish an effective basis for deciding on proposals for new work at future sessions. It proposed that criteria should be reviewed by the Executive Committee in years between Commission sessions as part of its review of the achievement of the Medium-Term Objectives.
- referred the decision-tree approach for elaborating or revoking standards used by the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products<sup>20</sup> to the Codex Committee on General Principles with a view to establishing a set of criteria more generally applicable by Codex Commodity Committees.

***Guidelines for the Development of “Inclusive” Standards***

- agreed that where it appeared that enough common provisions exist between individual standards, Commodity Committees should give preference to the development of "inclusive" standards for related commodities. This question should be examined on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the different situations in the various Committees.
- requested the Codex Committee on General Principles to consider incorporating a statement in the above mentioned criteria emphasizing that Codex standards should be no more trade restrictive than necessary to meet the legitimate objectives of protection of consumers' health and assurance of fair practices in the food trade in order to address potential exclusion of similar products moving in international food trade from proposed standards.
- agreed that there was no need to develop detailed guidelines on this issue.

**PROVISION OF DOCUMENTATION, TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION SERVICES FOR CODEX COMMITTEES (AGENDA ITEM 7)<sup>21</sup>**

40. The Executive Committee was unable, due to lack of time, to consider in detail the issues presented in document CX/EXEC 99/46/3. It agreed that the matters raised in the document should continue to be pursued by the Secretariat in consultation with Host Governments.

**LANGUAGE AND DOCUMENT POLICIES OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

41. The Executive Committee noted the discussions that had taken place at the 116th Session of FAO Council concerning the principle of equality of FAO languages and its importance in providing widest possible access to information and the fullest participation of Members. It also noted that the language and documentation policies of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies were governed by Rule XII of the Commission's Rules of Procedure. This Rule provided for the use of not less than three working languages which are working languages of both FAO and Health Assembly of WHO. Other languages that were working languages of either FAO or the Health Assembly of WHO could be added provided that the administrative and financial implications were clear and the use of the additional language(s) had the approval of the Directors- General of FAO and WHO. It was noted that Arabic, Chinese English, French and Spanish were working (official) languages of both Organizations and that Russian was a working (official) language of WHO.

<sup>18</sup> ALINORM 99/3, para. 27.

<sup>19</sup> ALINORM 99/10 Part 1, Annex 2.

<sup>20</sup> ALINORM 99/11, paras. 80-83; CX/MMP 98/6, CX/MMP 98/6 Corrigendum.

<sup>21</sup> CX/EXEC 99/46/3; CX/EXEC 99/46/3-Addendum.

42. The Executive Committee stressed the importance of providing all documentation and interpretation in the three current languages of the Commission for all subsidiary bodies dealing with world-wide subjects and for the timely availability of the all language versions of these documents.

43. In regard to the extension of language services to include Arabic and Chinese, the Executive Committee considered the options presented in the Secretariat paper and was of the view that translation of the *Codex Alimentarius* Standards, Guidelines and recommendations could be undertaken in the biennium 2000/01, possibly with external resources and assistance. It proposed that efforts should be made for the provision of the Limited services for Arabic and Chinese as described in the document<sup>22</sup> by the time of the next (24<sup>th</sup>) Session of the Commission in 2001, resources permitting. Institution of Full, Major or Main services would take a longer time but could be envisaged by 2005, resources permitting. Because it would not be acceptable for the use of additional languages to be detrimental to the work of the Commission, further resources to ensure better language coverage would need to be provided.

44. It was noted that the matter also needed to be taken up with the Host Governments of Codex Committees.

## OTHER BUSINESS

45. The Executive Committee was unable to consider the matters proposed for discussion under Other Business due to lack of time. It recommended that these matters be taken up directly by the Commission. These matters were:

- proposals to include in the Procedural Manual a reference to special and differential treatment of developing countries; and
- the response of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to the Communiqué of the 25<sup>th</sup> Economic Summit (G8 Summit) held in Cologne, Germany, on 20 June 1999, concerning biotechnology and other aspects of food safety.

---

<sup>22</sup> These options were: **Full** interpretation and document services in Arabic, Chinese English, French, and Spanish, with FAO/WHO (Codex) assuming responsibility for all services over and above the host government commitments; **Major** interpretation and documentation services, with FAO/WHO (Codex) matching the current services currently provided in English, French and Spanish with equal services in Chinese and Arabic (not all languages would be covered in all Committees); **Main** interpretation and documentation services, with FAO/WHO (Codex) providing interpretation and documentation in all languages for sessions of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Executive Committee (depending on composition) and Regional Coordinating Committees (depending on the Region) and reports of all Codex Committees (excludes provision of documents or interpretation services at Committee level); **Limited** services, with FAO/WHO (Codex) providing interpretation and main working documents in all languages only at sessions of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Executive Committee and Regional Committees; translation of the Commission's final report, Procedural Manual, and information documents.

**ALINORM 99/4****Appendix 1****JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME****EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION***Forty-sixth Session, 24-25 June 1999**FAO Headquarters, Malaysia Room, Rome, Italy***List of Participants****CHAIRPERSON**

Prof Pakdee Pothisiri  
 Secretary-General  
 The Food and Drug Administration  
 Ministry of Public Health  
 Tiwanond Road  
 Nonthaburi 11000  
 THAILAND  
**Phone:** +662 591 8441  
**Fax:** +662 591 8636  
**Email:** [ppakdee@health.moph.go.th](mailto:ppakdee@health.moph.go.th)

**VICE-CHAIRPERSONS**

Mr. Thomas J. Billy  
 Administrator  
 Food Safety and Inspection Service  
 U.S. Department of Agriculture  
 1400 Jefferson Dr.  
 Whitten Building  
 Washington, D.C. 20250  
 USA

Mr. S. Van Hoogstraten  
 Deputy Director-General  
 Ministry of Justice  
 Schedeldoekshaven 100  
 P.O. Box 20301  
 2500 EH The Hague  
 THE NETHERLANDS  
**Phone:** +31.(0).7.03.70.77.01  
**Fax:** +31.(0).7.03.70.79.99  
**e-mail:** [shoogstr@best-dep.minjus.nl](mailto:shoogstr@best-dep.minjus.nl)

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
AFRICA**

Dr. K. Amara  
 Directeur Générale de l'Agro-alimentaire  
 Ministère de l'Industrie  
 Cité Montplaisir TUNIS  
 TUNISIA

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
ASIA**

Dr Tee E. Siong  
Head  
Division of Human Nutrition  
Institute for Medical Research  
Jalan Pahang 50588  
Kuala Lumpur  
MALAYSIA

**ADVISERS TO THE REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR ASIA**

Dr. Maria Concepcion Lizada  
Acting Director  
Bureau of Agriculture and  
Fisheries Products Standards  
Office of the Secretary  
Department of Agriculture  
Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City  
PHILIPPINES

Ms Mariam Abdul Latif  
Assistant Director  
Food Quality Control Division  
Ministry of Health Malaysia  
Jalan Dungun  
50490 Kuala Lumpur  
MALAYSIA

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
EUROPE**

Mr. Hubert Ferry-Wilczek  
Sous-directeur  
Direction générale de l'alimentation  
Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche  
251 rue de Vaugirard  
75732 Paris Cedex 15  
FRANCE  
**Phone:** +33 1 4955 5872  
**Fax:** +33 1 4955 5948  
**e-mail:** ferry-wilczek@agriculture.gouv.fr

**ADVISERS TO THE REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
EUROPE**

Mme Roseline Lecourt  
Chargé de Mission  
Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de l'industrie  
59 Bld. Vincent Auriol  
75013 Paris Cedex 13  
FRANCE  
**Phone:** +33 1 4497 3470  
**Fax:** +33 1 4497 3037  
**e-mail:** lecourt.roseline@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr

Dr Stuart Slorach  
National Food Administration  
PO Box 622  
S-75126 Uppsala  
SWEDEN

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
LATIN AMERICA AND  
THE CARIBBEAN**

Ms. Maria Aparecida Martinelli  
Coordinator of the Codex Alimentarius Committee of Brazil  
(CCAB) and Officer of INMETRO  
Ministry of Development, Industry, and Trade  
SEPN 511, ED Bittar III,  
Bloco 'B', 4o Andar, Brasilia - DF  
BRAZIL CEP 70750-527  
**Phone:** +55 2161 340 2211  
**Fax:** +55 2161 347 3284  
**e-mail:** [mamartinelli@montreal.com.br](mailto:mamartinelli@montreal.com.br)

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
NORTH AMERICA**

Dr. Anne MacKenzie  
Associate Vice-President, Science Evaluation  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
59 Camelot Drive,  
Nepean, Ontario, K1A 0Y9  
CANADA  
**Phone:** +1 613 2252342  
**Fax:** +1 613 2286638  
**e-mail:** amackenzie@em.agr.ca

**ADVISERS TO REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR NORTH  
AMERICA**

Mr. Ron B. Burke  
Director, Bureau of Food Regulatory, International and  
Interagency Affairs  
Food Directorate, Health Protection Branch  
Health Canada  
Room 200, H.P.B. Building (0702C)  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2  
CANADA  
**Phone:** +1 613 9571748  
**Fax:** +1 613 9413537  
**e-mail:** codex\_canada@hc-sc.gc.ca

Dr. F. Edward Scarbrough  
Manager US Codex Office  
Food Safety and Inspection Service  
US Department of Agriculture  
Room 4861 South Building  
14th Independence Ave., SW  
Washington DC 20250  
USA  
**Phone:** +1 202 205 7760; +1 202 720 3157  
**e-mail:** uscodex@usda.gov

**REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR  
SOUTH WEST PACIFIC**

Mr Sundararaman Rajasekar  
Manager WTO/SPS  
Codex Coordinator and Contact Point for New Zealand  
MAF Policy - Ministry of Agriculture  
P.O. Box 2526  
Wellington  
NEW ZEALAND  
**Phone:** +64.4.474 4216  
**Fax:** +64.4.474 4163  
**e-mail:** raj@policy.maf.govt.nz

**ADVISERS TO REGIONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE FOR SOUTH  
WEST PACIFIC**

Dr Melanie O'Flynn  
Director  
Residues and Standards Branch  
National Office for Food Safety  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
GPB Box 858  
Canberra ACT 2601  
AUSTRALIA

Mr Peter Lienhe  
General Manager (Standards)  
Australian New Zealand Food Authority (ANZFA)  
55 Blackall Street  
BARTON ACT 2600  
AUSTRALIA  
**Phone:** +61 2 6271 2246  
**Fax:** +61 2 6271 2278  
**e-mail:** [peter.liehne@anzfa.gov.au](mailto:peter.liehne@anzfa.gov.au)

**OBSERVERS****COORDINATOR FOR AFRICA**

Dr. D.B. Nhari  
Government Analyst's Laboratory  
Ministry of Health  
P.O. Box CY 231  
Causeway  
Harare  
ZIMBABWE  
**Fax:** +263 4 708527

**COORDINATOR FOR EUROPE**

Dr. Felipe Mittelbrunn  
Consejero Técnico Secretaría de la Comisión Interministerial para  
la Ordenación Alimentaria  
Subdirección General de Higiene de los Alimentos  
Ministerio de Sanidad y Consumo  
Paseo del Prado 18-20  
28071 Madrid  
SPAIN  
**Phone:** +34 91.596.13.46  
**Fax:** +34 91.596.44.87  
**e-mail:** [fmittelbrunn@msc.es](mailto:fmittelbrunn@msc.es)

**COORDINATOR FOR LATIN  
AMERICA AND THE  
CARIBBEAN**

Mr Galdós G. Ugarte  
Director Unidad  
Asuntos Internacionales  
Ministerio de Ganadería  
Agricultura y Pesca  
Constituyente 1476  
Montevideo  
Uruguay  
**Phone:** +5982.402.63.58  
**Fax:** +5982.402.63.65

**SECRETARIAT****SECRETARY OF THE CODEX  
ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

Mr. G.D. Orriss  
Chief  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Food and Nutrition Division  
FAO, ROME  
**Phone:** +39.06.570.52042  
**Fax:** +39.06.570.54593  
**e-mail:** [gregory.orriss@fao.org](mailto:gregory.orriss@fao.org)

**FAO JOINT SESSION  
SECRETARY**

Dr. A.W. Randell  
Senior Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Food and Nutrition Division  
FAO, ROME  
**Phone:** +39.06.570.54390  
**Fax:** +39.06.570.54593  
**e-mail:** [alan.randell@fao.org](mailto:alan.randell@fao.org)

**WHO JOINT SESSION  
SECRETARY**

Dr. Gerald Moy  
Acting Coordinator  
Food Safety Programme  
Department of Protection of the Human Environment  
World Health Organization  
20 Avenue Appia  
CH-1211 Geneva 27  
SWITZERLAND  
**Phone:** +41.22.79.13698  
**Fax:** +41.22.79.14807  
**e-mail:** moyg@who.ch

**LEGAL COUNSEL****FAO**

Mr. Gerald Moore  
Legal Counsel  
FAO, ROME  
**Phone:** +39.06.5705 3319  
**e-mail:** gerald.moore@fao.org

**Appendix II****DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSION  
UNDER ITEM 4 OF THE COMMISSION'S PROVISIONAL AGENDA****The Codex Alimentarius Commission:**

Recognizing the importance of Codex work in providing recommendations to member countries at the international level on food safety and quality and the need to ensure the scientific basis of Codex standards and related texts;

Having regard to the status of Codex standards and related texts as a reference in international trade in the framework of the WTO SPS and TBT Agreements;

Recognizing the essential support provided to the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standard Programme by the ongoing Joint FAO/WHO Expert bodies (JECFA and JMPR) and the expert or technical consultations convened on an *ad hoc* basis to address specific food safety and quality issues;

Recognizing the importance of the independence and scientific integrity of the opinions of these bodies;

- Expresses its concern at possible reductions in the budget allocated to the operation of the FAO/WHO expert bodies and consultations;
- Draws the attention of its parent organizations, FAO and WHO to the need for continued financial support for the FAO/WHO expert bodies in order to provide regularly updated scientific advice to the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies;
- Welcomes the continuing efforts by the Directors-General of FAO and WHO to maintain and strengthen the independence and scientific excellence of this advice.