SECTION III

- Working Principles for Risk Analysis
- Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods
- Policy of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups
- Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
- Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods
- Risk Assessment Policy for the Setting of Maximum Limits for Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods

CONTENTS OF THIS SECTION

This Section contains risk analysis policy documents adopted by the Commission, which apply to and guide the work of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies dealing with the protection of consumers' health. The Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius were adopted by the Commission in 2003.

The Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods and the Policy of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups were adopted by the Commission in 2005 and were amended in 2007, following the split of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants into the Codex Committees on Food Additives and on Contaminants in Foods.

The Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, the Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods and the Risk Assessment Policy for the Setting of Maximum Limits for Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods were adopted by the Commission in 2007.

WORKING PRINCIPLES FOR RISK ANALYSIS FOR APPLICATION IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS

SCOPE

1. These principles for risk analysis are intended for application in the framework of the Codex Alimentarius.

2. The objective of these Working Principles is to provide guidance to the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the joint FAO/WHO expert bodies and consultations, so that food safety and health aspects of Codex standards and related texts are based on risk analysis.

3. Within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its procedures, the responsibility for providing advice on risk management lies with the Commission and its subsidiary bodies (risk managers), while the responsibility for risk assessment lies primarily with the joint FAO/WHO expert bodies and consultations (risk assessors).

RISK ANALYSIS - GENERAL ASPECTS

4. The risk analysis used in Codex should be:

- applied consistently;
- open, transparent and documented;
- conducted in accordance with both 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* and the *Statements of Principle Relating to the Role of Food Safety Risk Assessment*[24] ; and,
- evaluated and reviewed as appropriate in the light of newly generated scientific data.

5. The risk analysis should follow a structured approach comprising the three distinct but closely linked components of risk analysis (risk assessment, risk management and risk communication) as defined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission[25], each component being integral to the overall risk analysis.

6. The three components of risk analysis should be documented fully and systematically in a transparent manner. While respecting legitimate concerns to

[24] See Appendix: General Decisions of the Commission

[25] See Definitions of Risk Analysis Terms Related to Food Safety.

preserve confidentiality, documentation should be accessible to all interested parties[26].

7. Effective communication and consultation with all interested parties should be ensured throughout the risk analysis.

8. The three components of risk analysis should be applied within an overarching framework for management of food related risks to human health.

9. There should be a functional separation of risk assessment and risk management, in order to ensure the scientific integrity of the risk assessment, to avoid confusion over the functions to be performed by risk assessors and risk managers and to reduce any conflict of interest. However, it is recognized that risk analysis is an iterative process, and interaction between risk managers and risk assessors is essential for practical application.

10. When there is evidence that a risk to human health exists but scientific data are insufficient or incomplete, the Codex Alimentarius Commission should not proceed to elaborate a standard but should consider elaborating a related text, such as a code of practice, provided that such a text would be supported by the available scientific evidence.

11. Precaution is an inherent element of risk analysis. Many sources of uncertainty exist in the process of risk assessment and risk management of food related hazards to human health. The degree of uncertainty and variability in the available scientific information should be explicitly considered in the risk analysis. Where there is sufficient scientific evidence to allow Codex to proceed to elaborate a standard or related text, the assumptions used for the risk assessment and the risk management options selected should reflect the degree of uncertainty and the characteristics of the hazard.

12. The needs and situations of developing countries should be specifically identified and taken into account by the responsible bodies in the different stages of the risk analysis.

RISK ASSESSMENT POLICY

13. Determination of risk assessment policy should be included as a specific component of risk management.

14. Risk assessment policy should be established by risk managers in advance of risk assessment, in consultation with risk assessors and all other interested

---

[26] For the purpose of the present document, the term “interested parties” refers to “risk assessors, risk managers, consumers, industry, the academic community and, as appropriate, other relevant parties and their representative organizations” (see definition of “Risk Communication”)

parties. This procedure aims at ensuring that the risk assessment is systematic, complete, unbiased and transparent.

15. The mandate given by risk managers to risk assessors should be as clear as possible.

16. Where necessary, risk managers should ask risk assessors to evaluate the potential changes in risk resulting from different risk management options.

RISK ASSESSMENT[27]

17. The scope and purpose of the particular risk assessment being carried out should be clearly stated and in accordance with risk assessment policy. The output form and possible alternative outputs of the risk assessment should be defined

18. Experts responsible for risk assessment should be selected in a transparent manner on the basis of their expertise, experience, and their independence with regard to the interests involved. The procedures used to select these experts should be documented including a public declaration of any potential conflict of interest. This declaration should also identify and detail their individual expertise, experience and independence. Expert bodies and consultations should ensure effective participation of experts from different parts of the world, including experts from developing countries.

19. Risk assessment should be conducted in accordance with the Statements of Principle Relating to the Role of Food Safety Risk Assessment and should incorporate the four steps of the risk assessment, i.e. hazard identification, hazard characterization, exposure assessment and risk characterization.

20. Risk assessment should be based on all available scientific data. It should use available quantitative information to the greatest extent possible. Risk assessment may also take into account qualitative information.

21. Risk assessment should take into account relevant production, storage and handling practices used throughout the food chain including traditional practices, methods of analysis, sampling and inspection and the prevalence of specific adverse health effects.

22. Risk assessment should seek and incorporate relevant data from different parts of the world, including that from developing countries. These data should particularly include epidemiological surveillance data, analytical and exposure data. Where relevant data are not available from developing countries, the Commission should request that FAO/WHO initiate time-bound studies for this

---

[27] Reference is made to the Statements *of Principle Relating to the Role of Food Safety Risk Assessment:* See Appendix: *General Decisions of the Commission.*

purpose. The conduct of the risk assessment should not be inappropriately delayed pending receipt of these data; however, the risk assessment should be reconsidered when such data are available.

23. Constraints, uncertainties and assumptions having an impact on the risk assessment should be explicitly considered at each step in the risk assessment and documented in a transparent manner. Expression of uncertainty or variability in risk estimates may be qualitative or quantitative, but should be quantified to the extent that is scientifically achievable.

24. Risk assessments should be based on realistic exposure scenarios, with consideration of different situations being defined by risk assessment policy. They should include consideration of susceptible and high-risk population groups. Acute, chronic (including long-term), cumulative and/or combined adverse health effects should be taken into account in carrying out risk assessment, where relevant.

25. The report of the risk assessment should indicate any constraints, uncertainties, assumptions and their impact on the risk assessment. Minority opinions should also be recorded. The responsibility for resolving the impact of uncertainty on the risk management decision lies with the risk manager, not the risk assessors.

26. The conclusion of the risk assessment including a risk estimate, if available, should be presented in a readily understandable and useful form to risk managers and made available to other risk assessors and interested parties so that they can review the assessment.

RISK MANAGEMENT

27. While recognizing the dual purposes of the Codex Alimentarius are protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in the food trade, Codex decisions and recommendations on risk management should have as their primary objective the protection of the health of consumers. Unjustified differences in the level of consumer health protection to address similar risks in different situations should be avoided.

28. Risk management should follow a structured approach including preliminary risk management activities[28], evaluation of risk management options, monitoring and review of the decision taken. The decisions should be based on

[28] For the purpose of these Principles, preliminary risk management activities are taken to include: identification of a food safety problem; establishment of a risk profile; ranking of the hazard for risk assessment and risk management priority; establishment of risk assessment policy for the conduct of the risk assessment; commissioning of the risk assessment; and consideration of the result of the risk assessment.

risk assessment, and taking into account, where appropriate, other legitimate factors relevant for the health protection of consumers and for the promotion of fair practices in food trade, in accordance with the Criteria for the Consideration of the Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principles[29].

29. The Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies, acting as risk managers in the context of these Working Principles, should ensure that the conclusion of the risk assessment is presented before making final proposals or decisions on the available risk management options, in particular in the setting of standards or maximum levels, bearing in mind the guidance given in paragraph 10.

30. In achieving agreed outcomes, risk management should take into account relevant production, storage and handling practices used throughout the food chain including traditional practices, methods of analysis, sampling and inspection, feasibility of enforcement and compliance, and the prevalence of specific adverse health effects.

31. The risk management process should be transparent, consistent and fully documented. Codex decisions and recommendations on risk management should be documented, and where appropriate clearly identified in individual Codex standards and related texts so as to facilitate a wider understanding of the risk management process by all interested parties.

32. The outcome of the preliminary risk management activities and the risk assessment should be combined with the evaluation of available risk management options in order to reach a decision on management of the risk.

33. Risk management options should be assessed in terms of the scope and purpose of risk analysis and the level of consumer health protection they achieve. The option of not taking any action should also be considered.

34. In order to avoid unjustified trade barriers, risk management should ensure transparency and consistency in the decision-making process in all cases. Examination of the full range of risk management options should, as far as possible, take into account an assessment of their potential advantages and disadvantages. When making a choice among different risk management options, which are equally effective in protecting the health of the consumer, the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should seek and take into consideration the potential impact of such measures on trade among its Member countries and select measures that are no more trade-restrictive than necessary.

35. Risk management should take into account the economic consequences and the feasibility of risk management options. Risk management should also recog-

[29] See Appendix: General Decisions of the Commission.

nize the need for alternative options in the establishment of standards, guidelines and other recommendations, consistent with the protection of consumers' health. In taking these elements into consideration, the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should give particular attention to the circumstances of developing countries.

36. Risk management should be a continuing process that takes into account all newly generated data in the evaluation and review of risk management decisions. Food standards and related texts should be reviewed regularly and updated as necessary to reflect new scientific knowledge and other information relevant to risk analysis.

RISK COMMUNICATION

37. Risk communication should:

i) promote awareness and understanding of the specific issues under consideration during the risk analysis;

ii) promote consistency and transparency in formulating risk management options/recommendations;

iii) provide a sound basis for understanding the risk management decisions proposed;

iv) improve the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the risk analysis;

v) strengthen the working relationships among participants;

vi) foster public understanding of the process, so as to enhance trust and confidence in the safety of the food supply;

vii) promote the appropriate involvement of all interested parties; and

viii) exchange information in relation to the concerns of interested parties about the risks associated with food.

38. Risk analysis should include clear, interactive and documented communication, amongst risk assessors (Joint FAO/WHO expert bodies and consultations) and risk managers (Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies), and reciprocal communication with member countries and all interested parties in all aspects of the process.

39. Risk communication should be more than the dissemination of information. Its major function should be to ensure that all information and opinion required for effective risk management is incorporated into the decision making process.

40. Risk communication involving interested parties should include a transparent explanation of the risk assessment policy and of the assessment of risk, including the uncertainty. The need for specific standards or related texts and

the procedures followed to determine them, including how the uncertainty was dealt with, should also be clearly explained. It should indicate any constraints, uncertainties, assumptions and their impact on the risk analysis, and minority opinions that had been expressed in the course of the risk assessment (see para. 25).

41. The guidance on risk communication in this document is addressed to all those involved in carrying out risk analysis within the framework of Codex Alimentarius. However, it is also of importance for this work to be made as transparent and accessible as possible to those not directly engaged in the process and other interested parties while respecting legitimate concerns to preserve confidentiality (see para. 6).

RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES AND THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS

SECTION 1. SCOPE

1) This document addresses the respective applications of risk analysis principles by the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). For matters which cannot be addressed by JECFA, this document does not preclude the possible consideration of recommendations arising from other internationally recognized expert bodies, as approved by the Commission.
2) This document should be read in conjunction with the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*.

SECTION 2. CCFA/CCCF and JECFA

3) CCFA/CCCF and JECFA recognize that communication between risk assessors and risk managers is critical to the success of their risk analysis activities.
4) CCFA/CCCF and JECFA should continue to develop procedures to enhance communication between the two committees.
5) CCFA/CCCF and JECFA should ensure that their contributions to the risk analysis process involve all interested parties and are fully transparent and thoroughly documented. While respecting legitimate concerns to preserve confidentiality, documentation should be made available, upon request, in a timely manner to all interested parties.
6) JECFA, in consultation with CCFA/CCCF, should continue to explore developing minimum quality criteria for data requirements necessary for JECFA to perform risk assessments. These criteria are used by CCFA/CCCF in preparing its Priority List for JECFA. The JECFA Secretariat should consider whether these minimum quality criteria for data have been met when preparing the provisional agenda for meetings of JECFA.

SECTION 3. CCFA/CCCF

7) CCFA/CCCF are primarily responsible for recommending risk management proposals for adoption by the CAC.

8) CCFA/CCCF shall base their risk management recommendations to the CAC on JECFA's risk assessments, including safety assessments[30], of food additives, naturally occurring toxicants, and contaminants in food.

9) In cases where JECFA has performed a safety assessment and CCFA/CCCF or the CAC determines that additional scientific guidance is necessary, CCFA/CCCF or CAC may make a more specific request to JECFA to obtain the scientific guidance necessary for a risk management decision.

10) CCFA's risk management recommendations to the CAC with respect to food additives shall be guided by the principles described in the Preamble and relevant annexes of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives.

11) CCCF's risk management recommendations to the CAC with respect to contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants shall be guided by the principles described in the Preamble and relevant annexes of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Naturally Occurring Toxins in Food.

12) CCFA/CCCF's risk management recommendations to the CAC that involve health and safety aspects of food standards shall be based on JECFA's risk assessments and other legitimate factors relevant to the health protection of consumers and to ensuring fair practices in food trade in accordance with the *Criteria for the Consideration of the Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principles*.

13) CCFA/CCCF's risk management recommendations to the CAC shall take into account the relevant uncertainties and safety factors described by JECFA.

14) CCFA shall endorse maximum use levels only for those additives for which 1) JECFA has established specifications of identity and purity and 2) JECFA has completed a safety assessment or has performed a quantitative risk assessment.

15) CCCF shall endorse maximum levels only for those contaminants for which 1) JECFA has completed a safety assessment or has performed a quantitative risk assessment and 2) the level of the contaminant in food can be determined through appropriate sampling plans and analysis methods, as adopted by Codex. CCCF should take into consideration the analytical

---

[30] A Safety Assessment is defined as a scientifically-based process consisting of: 1) the determination of a NOEL (No Observed Effect Level) for a chemical, biological, or physical agent from animal feeding studies and other scientific considerations; 2) the subsequent application of safety factors to establish an ADI or tolerable intake; and 3) comparison of the ADI or tolerable intake with probable exposure to the agent (Temporary definition to be modified when JECFA definition is available).

capabilities of developing countries unless public health considerations require otherwise.

16) CCFA/CCCF shall take into account differences in regional and national food consumption patterns and dietary exposure as assessed by JECFA when recommending maximum use levels for additives or maximum levels for contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in food.

17) Before finalising proposals for maximum levels for contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants, CCCF shall seek the scientific advice of JECFA about the validity of the analysis and sampling aspects, about the distribution of concentrations of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in foods and about other relevant technical and scientific aspects, including dietary exposure, as necessary to provide for a suitable scientific basis for its advice to CCCF.

18) When establishing its standards, codes of practice, and guidelines, CCFA/CCCF shall clearly state when it applies any other legitimate factors relevant to the health protection of consumers and to ensuring fair practices in food trade in accordance with the *Criteria for the Consideration of the Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principles*, in addition to JECFA's risk assessment, and specify its reasons for doing so.

19) CCFA/CCCF's risk communication with JECFA includes prioritising substances for JECFA review with the view towards obtaining the best available risk assessment for purposes of elaborating safe conditions of use for food additives and elaborating safe maximum levels or codes of practice for contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in food.

20) CCFA/CCCF shall consider the following when preparing its priority list of substances for JECFA review:

    - Consumer protection from the point of view of health and prevention of unfair trade practices;
    - CCFA/CCCF's Terms of Reference;
    - JECFA's Terms of Reference;
    - The Codex Alimentarius Commission's Strategic Plan, its relevant plans of work and *Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities*;
    - The quality, quantity, adequacy, and availability of data pertinent to performing a risk assessment, including data from developing countries;
    - The prospect of completing the work in a reasonable period of time;
    - The diversity of national legislation and any apparent impediments to international trade;
    - The impact on international trade (i.e., magnitude of the problem in international trade);

- The needs and concerns of developing countries; and,
- Work already undertaken by other international organizations;

21) When referring substances to JECFA, CCFA/CCCF shall provide background information and clearly explain the reasons for the request when chemicals are nominated for evaluation;

22) CCFA/CCCF may also refer a range of risk management options, with a view toward obtaining JECFA's guidance on the attendant risks and the likely risk reductions associated with each option.

23) CCFA/CCCF requests JECFA to review any methods and guidelines being considered by CCFA/CCCF for assessing maximum use levels for additives or maximum levels for contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants. CCFA/CCCF makes any such request with a view toward obtaining JECFA's guidance on the limitations, applicability, and appropriate means for implementation of a method or guideline for CCFA/CCCF's work.

SECTION 4. JECFA

24) JECFA is primarily responsible for performing the risk assessments upon which CCFA/CCCF and ultimately the CAC base their risk management decisions.

25) JECFA's scientific experts should be selected on the basis of their competence and independence, taking into account geographical representation to ensure that all regions are represented.

26) JECFA should strive to provide CCFA/CCCF with science-based risk assessments that include the four components of risk assessment as defined by CAC and safety assessments that can serve as the basis for CCFA/CCCF's risk-management discussions. For contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants, JECFA should determine to the extent possible the risks associated with various levels of intake. Because of the lack of appropriate information, including data in humans, however, this may be possible in only a few cases for the foreseeable future. For additives, JECFA should continue to use its safety assessment process for establishing ADIs.

27) JECFA should strive to provide CCFA/CCCF with science-based quantitative risk assessments and safety assessments for food additives, contaminants, and naturally occurring toxicants in a transparent manner.

28) JECFA should provide CCFA/CCCF with information on the applicability and any constraints of the risk assessment to the general population to particular sub-populations and should as far as possible identify potential risks to populations of potentially enhanced vulnerability (e.g. children, women of child-bearing age, the elderly).

29) JECFA should also strive to provide CCFA with specifications of identity and purity essential to assessing risk associated with the use of additives.

30) JECFA should strive to base its risk assessments on global data, including data from developing countries. These data should include epidemiological surveillance data and exposure studies.

31) JECFA is responsible for evaluating exposure to additives, contaminants, and naturally occurring toxicants.

32) When evaluating intake of additives or contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants during its risk assessment, JECFA should take into account regional differences in food consumption patterns.

33) JECFA should provide to CCCF its scientific views on the validity and the distribution aspects of the available data regarding contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in foods which have been used for exposure assessments, and should give details on the magnitude of the contribution to the exposure from specific foods as may be relevant for risk management actions or options of CCCF.

34) JECFA should communicate to CCFA/CCCF the magnitude and source of uncertainties in its risk assessments. When communicating this information, JECFA should provide CCFA/CCCF with a description of the methodology and procedures by which JECFA estimated any uncertainty in its risk assessment.

35) JECFA should communicate to CCFA/CCCF the basis for all assumptions used in its risk assessments including default assumptions used to account for uncertainties.

36) JECFA's risk assessment output to CCFA/CCCF is limited to presenting its deliberations and the conclusions of its risk assessments and safety assessments in a complete and transparent manner. JECFA's communication of its risk assessments should not include the consequences of its analyses on trade or other non-public health consequence. Should JECFA include risk assessments of alternative risk management options, JECFA should ensure that these are consistent with the Working Principles for Risk Analysis for the Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius and Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods.

37) When establishing the agenda for a JECFA meeting, the JECFA Secretariat work closely with CCFA/CCCF to ensure that CCFA/CCCF's risk management priorities are addressed in a timely manner. With respect to food additives, the JECFA Secretariat should normally give first priority to compounds that have been assigned a temporary ADI, or equivalent. Second priority should normally be given to food additives or groups of additives that have previously been evaluated and for which an ADI, or

equivalent, has been estimated, and for which new information is available. Third priority should normally be given to food additives that have not been previously evaluated. With respect to contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants, the JECFA Secretariat should give priority to substances that present both a significant risk to public health and are a known or expected problem in international trade.

38) When establishing the agenda for a JECFA meeting, the JECFA Secretariat should give priority to substances that are known or expected problems in international trade or that present an emergency or imminent public health risk.

POLICY OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT OF CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN FOODS OR FOOD GROUPS

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

1. Maximum Levels (MLs) do not need to be set for all foods that contain a contaminant or a toxin. The Preamble of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (GSCTF) states in Section 1.3.2 that "maximum levels (MLs) shall only be set for those foods in which the contaminant may be found in amounts that are significant for the total exposure of the consumer. They should be set in such a way that the consumer is adequately protected". Setting standards for foods that contribute little to dietary exposure would mandate enforcement activities that do not contribute significantly to health outcomes.

2. Exposure assessment is one of the four components of risk assessment within the risk analysis framework adopted by Codex as the basis for all standard-setting processes. The estimated contribution of specific foods or food groups to the total dietary exposure to a contaminant as it relates to a quantitative health hazard endpoint (e.g. PMTDI, PTWI) provides further information needed for the setting of priorities for the risk management of specific foods/food groups. Exposure assessments must be guided by clearly articulated policies elaborated by Codex with the aim of increasing the transparency of risk management decisions.

3. The purpose of this Annex is to outline steps in contaminant data selection and analysis undertaken by JECFA when requested by the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) to conduct a dietary exposure assessment.

4. The following components highlight aspects of JECFA's exposure assessment of contaminants and toxins that contribute to ensuring transparency and consistency of science-based risk assessments. Exposure assessments of contaminants and toxins in foods are performed by JECFA at the request of CCCF. CCCF will take this information into account when considering risk management options and making recommendations regarding contaminants and toxins in foods.

SECTION 2. ESTIMATION OF TOTAL DIETARY EXPOSURE TO A CONTAMINANT OR TOXIN FROM FOODS/FOOD GROUPS

5. JECFA uses available data from member countries and from GEMS/Food Operating Program for analytical laboratories system on contaminant levels

in foods and the amount of foods consumed to estimate total dietary exposure to a contaminant or toxin. This is expressed as a percentage of the tolerable intake (e.g. PTDI, PTWI, or other appropriate toxicological reference point). For a carcinogen with no clear threshold, JECFA uses available data on intake combined with data on carcinogenic potency to estimate potential population risks.

6. Median/mean contaminant levels in foods are determined from available analytical data submitted by countries and from other sources. These data are combined with information available for the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets to generate dietary exposure estimates for regions in the world. JECFA provides an estimate as to which of the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets are likely to approach or exceed the tolerable intake.

7. In some cases, available national contaminant and/or individual food consumption data may be used by JECFA to provide more accurate estimates of total dietary exposure, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children.

8. JECFA performs exposure assessments if requested by CCCF using the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets and, if needed, available national consumption data to estimate the impact on dietary exposure of proposed alternative maximum levels to inform CCCF about these risk management options.

SECTION 3. IDENTIFICATION OF FOODS/FOOD GROUPS THAT CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO TOTAL DIETARY EXPOSURE OF THE CONTAMINANT OR TOXIN

9. From dietary exposure estimates JECFA identifies foods/food groups that contribute significantly to the exposure according to CCCF's criteria for selecting food groups that contribute to exposure.

10. The CCCF determines criteria for selecting foods/food groups that contribute significantly to total dietary exposure of a contaminant or toxin. These criteria are based upon the percentage of the tolerable intake (or similar health hazard endpoint) that is contributed by a given food/food group and the number of geographic regions (as defined by the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets) for which dietary exposures exceed that percentage.

11. The criteria are as follows:

    a) Foods or food groups for which exposure to the contaminant or toxin contributes approximately 10%[31] or more of the tolerable intake (or

[31] Rounded to the nearest 1/10th of a percent.

similar health hazard endpoint) in one of the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets;

or,

b) Foods or food groups for which exposure to the contaminant or toxin contributes approximately 5% or more of the tolerable intake (or similar health hazard endpoint) in two or more of the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets;

or,

c) Foods or food groups that may have a significant impact on exposure for specific groups of consumers, although exposure may not exceed 5% of the tolerable intake (or similar health hazard endpoint) in any of the GEMS/Food Consumption Cluster Diets. These would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

SECTION 4. GENERATION OF DISTRIBUTION CURVES FOR CONCENTRATIONS OF THE CONTAMINANT IN SPECIFIC FOODS/FOOD GROUPS (CONCURRENT WITH SECTION 2, OR SUBSEQUENT STEP)

12. If requested by CCCF, JECFA uses available analytical data on contaminant or toxin levels in foods/food groups identified as significant contributors to dietary exposure to generate distribution curves of contaminant concentrations in individual foods. CCCF will take this information into account when considering risk management options and, if appropriate, for proposing the lowest achievable levels for contaminants/toxins in food on a global basis.

13. Ideally, individual data from composite samples or aggregated analytical data would be used by JECFA to construct the distribution curves. When such data are not available, aggregated data would be used (for example mean and geometric standard deviation). However, methods to construct distribution curves using aggregated data would need to be validated by JECFA.

14. In presenting the distribution curves to CCCF, JECFA should, to the extent possible, provide a comprehensive overview of the ranges of contamination of foods (i.e., both the maximum and outlier values) and of the proportion of foods/food groups that contain contaminants/toxins at those levels.

SECTION 5. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL AND PRODUCTION PRACTICES ON CONTAMINANT LEVELS IN FOODS/FOOD GROUPS (CONCURRENT WITH SECTION 2, OR SUBSEQUENT STEP)

15. If requested by CCCF, JECFA assesses the potential impact of different agricultural and production practices on contaminant levels in foods to the extent that scientific data are available to support such assessments. CCCF takes this information into account when considering risk management options and for proposing Codes of Practice.

16. Taking this information into account, CCCF proposes risk management decisions. To refine them, CCCF may request JECFA to undertake a second assessment to consider specific exposure scenarios based on proposed risk management options. The methodology for assessing potential contaminant exposure in relation to proposed risk management options needs to be further developed by JECFA.

RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

SCOPE

1. This document addresses the respective applications of risk analysis principles by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) as the risk management body and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) as the risk assessment body and facilitates the uniform application of the Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius. This document should be read in conjunction with the Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius.

ROLES OF CCPR AND JMPR IN RISK ANALYSIS

INTERACTION BETWEEN CCPR AND JMPR

2. In addressing pesticide residue issues in Codex, providing advice on risk management is the responsibility of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) and CCPR while conducting risk assessment is the responsibility of JMPR.

3. CCPR and JMPR recognize that an adequate communication between risk assessors and risk managers is an essential requirement for successfully performing their risk analysis activities.

4. CCPR and JMPR should continue to develop procedures to enhance communication between the two bodies.

5. CCPR and JMPR should ensure that their respective contributions to the risk analysis process result in outputs that are scientifically based, fully transparent, thoroughly documented and available in a timely manner to members[32].

6. JMPR, in consultation with CCPR, should continue to explore developing minimum data requirements necessary for JMPR to perform risk assessments.

---

[32] Submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed; FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper, 170, 2002, ISBN 92-5-104759-6

7. These requirements should be used by CCPR as a fundamental criterion as described in the Annex in preparing its Priority List for JMPR. The JMPR Secretariat should consider whether these minimum data requirements have been met when preparing the provisional agenda for meetings of JMPR.

ROLE OF CCPR

8. CCPR is primarily responsible for recommending risk management proposals for adoption by the CAC.

9. CCPR shall base its risk management recommendations, such as MRLs, to the CAC following JMPR's risk assessments of the respective pesticides, and considering, where appropriate, other legitimate factors such as relevant to the health protection of consumers and for the promotion of fair practices in food trade.

10. In cases where JMPR has performed a risk assessment and CCPR or the CAC determines that additional scientific guidance is necessary, CCPR or CAC may make a specific request to JMPR to provide further scientific guidance necessary for a risk management decision.

11. CCPR's risk management recommendations to the CAC shall take into account the relevant uncertainties as described by JMPR.

12. CCPR shall consider maximum residue limits (MRLs) only for those pesticides for which JMPR has completed a full safety evaluation.

13. CCPR shall base its recommendations on the GEMS/Food diets used to identify consumption patterns on a global scale when recommending MRLs in food. The GEMS/Food diets are used to assess the risk of chronic exposure. The acute exposure calculations are not based on those diets, but available consumption data provided by members.

14. When establishing its standards, CCPR shall clearly state when it applies any considerations based on other legitimate factors in addition to JMPR's risk assessment and recommended maximum residue levels and specify its reasons for doing so.

15. CCPR shall consider the following when preparing its priority list of compounds for JMPR evaluation:

- CCPR's Terms of Reference;
- JMPR's Terms of Reference;
- The Codex Alimentarius Commission's Strategic Plan;
- The Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities;

- The Criteria for Inclusion of Compounds on the Priority List;
- The Criteria for Selecting Food Commodities for which Codex MRLs or Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits (EMRLs) should be Established;
- The Criteria for Evaluation of New Chemicals;
- The Criteria for Prioritization Process of Compounds for Evaluation by JMPR
- A commitment to provide the necessary data for the evaluation in time.

16. When referring substances to JMPR, the CCPR shall provide background information and clearly specify the reasons for the request when chemicals are nominated for evaluation.

17. When referring substances to JMPR, the CCPR may also refer a range of risk management options, with a view toward obtaining JMPR's guidance on the attendant risks and the likely risk reductions associated with each option.

18. CCPR shall request JMPR to review any methods and guidelines being considered by CCPR for assessing maximum limits for pesticides.

ROLE OF JMPR

19. The Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) consists of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group. It is an independent scientific expert body convened by both Directors General of FAO and WHO according to the rules of both organizations, charged with the task to provide scientific advice on pesticide residues.

20. This guidance document applies to the work of JMPR in the context of Codex and in particular as it relates to advice requests from CCPR.

21. JMPR is primarily responsible for performing the risk assessments upon which CCPR and ultimately the CAC base their risk management decisions. JMPR also proposes MRLs based on Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs)/ registered uses or in specific cases, such as EMRLs, based on monitoring data.

22. JMPR provides CCPR with science-based risk assessments that include the four components of risk assessment as defined by CAC and safety assessments that can serve as the basis for CCPR's risk-management discussions. JMPR should continue to use its risk assessment process for establishing Acceptable Daily Intakes (ADIs) and Acute Reference Doses (ARfDs) where appropriate.

23. JMPR should identify and communicate to CCPR in its assessments any information on the applicability and any constraints of the risk assessment to the general population and to particular sub-populations and will as far as possible identify potential risks to populations of potentially enhanced vulnerability (e.g. children).

24. JMPR is responsible for evaluating exposure to pesticides. JMPR should strive to base its exposure assessment and hence the dietary risk assessments on global data, including that from developing countries. In addition to GEMS/Food data, monitoring data and exposure studies may be used. The GEMS/Food diets are used to assess the risk of chronic exposure. The acute exposure calculations are not based on those diets, but on the available high percentile consumption data as provided by members.

25. JMPR should communicate to CCPR the magnitude and source of uncertainties in its risk assessments. When communicating this information, JMPR should provide CCPR a description of the methodology and procedures by which JMPR estimated any uncertainty in its risk assessment.

26. JMPR should communicate to CCPR the basis for all assumptions used in its risk assessments.

ANNEX: LIST OF RISK MANAGEMENT POLICIES USED BY CCPR

1. This part of the document addresses the risk management policy that is used by the Codex Committee on Pesticides Residues (CCPR) when discussing the risk assessments, the exposure to pesticides and the proposals for MRLs which are the outcomes of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticides Residues (JMPR).

ESTABLISHMENT OF MRLs/EMRLs

Procedure for Proposing Pesticides for Codex Priority Lists

2. CCPR has developed a policy document in relation to establishing a priority list of pesticides for evaluation or re-evaluation by JMPR[33].

3. Before a pesticide can be considered for the Priority List, it must:

- be available for use as a commercial product; and
- not have been already accepted for consideration.

[33] Criteria for Prioritization Process of Compounds for Evaluation by JMPR, Procedural Manual

4. To meet the criteria for inclusion in the priority list, the use of the pesticide must: give rise to residues in or on a food or feed commodity moving in international trade, the presence of which is (or may be) a matter of public health concern and thus create (or have the potential to create) problems in international trade.

5. When prioritising new chemicals for evaluation by the JMPR, the Committee will consider the following criteria:

1. If the chemical has a reduced acute and/or chronic toxicity risk to humans compared with other chemicals in its classification (insecticide, fungicide, herbicide);
2. The date when the chemical was nominated for evaluation;
3. Commitment by the sponsor of the compound to provide supporting data for review with a firm date for data submission;
5. The availability of regional/national reviews and risk assessments, and coordination with other regional/national lists; and
6. Allocating priorities to new chemicals, so that at least 50% of evaluations are for new chemicals, if possible.

6. When prioritising chemicals for periodic re-evaluation by the JMPR, the Committee will consider the following criteria:

1. If the intake and/or toxicity profile indicate some level of public health concern;
2. Chemicals that have not been reviewed toxicologically for more than 15 years and/or not having a significant review of maximum residue limits for 15 years;
3. The year the chemical is listed in the list for Candidate Chemicals for Periodic Re-evaluation –Not Yet Scheduled;
4. The date that data will be submitted;
5. Whether the CCPR has been advised by a national government that the chemical has been responsible for trade disruption;
6. If there is a closely related chemical that is a candidate for periodic re-evaluation that can be evaluated concurrently; and
7. The availability of current labels arising from recent national re-evaluations.

7. Once the JMPR has reviewed a chemical, three scenarios may occur:

- the data confirm the existing Codex MRL, it remains in place, or
- a new MRL is recommended or an amendment of an existing MRL. The new or amended proposal enters at Step 3 of the Codex

procedure. The existing MRL remains in place for no more than four years or

- insufficient data have been submitted to confirm or amend an existing Codex MRL. The Codex MRL is recommended for withdrawal. However, the manufacturer or countries may provide a commitment to the JMPR and CCPR to provide the necessary data for review within four years. The existing Codex MRL is maintained for a period of no more than four years pending the review of the additional data. A second period of four years is not granted.

MRLs for Commodities of Animal Origin

8. Farm animal metabolism studies are required whenever a pesticide is applied directly to livestock, to animal premises or housing, or when significant residues remain in crops or commodities used in animal feed, in forage crops, or in plant parts that could be used in animal feeds. The results of farm animal feeding studies and residues in animal feed serve also as a primary source of information for estimating maximum residue levels in animal products.

9. If no adequate studies are available, no MRLs will be established for commodities of animal origin. MRLs for feeds (and the primary crops) should not be established in the absence of animal transfer data. Where the exposure of livestock to pesticides through feeds leads to residues at the limit of quantitation, MRLs at the LOQ must be established for animal commodities. MRLs should be established for all mammalian species where pesticides on feeds are concerned and for specific species (e.g cattle, sheep) where direct treatments of pesticides are concerned.

10. Where the recommended maximum residue limits for animal commodities resulting from direct treatment of the animal, regardless of whether they are recommended by JMPR or JECFA, and from residues in animal feed do not agree, the higher recommendation will prevail.

MRLs for Processed or Ready-to-eat Foods or Feeds

11. CCPR agreed not to establish MRLs for processed foods and feeds unless separate higher MRLs are necessary for specific processed commodities.

MRLs for spices

12. CCPR agreed that MRLs for spices can be established on the basis of monitoring data in accordance with the guidelines established by JMPR.

MRLs for fat-soluble pesticides

13 If a pesticide is determined as "fat soluble" after consideration of the following factors, it is indicated with the text "The residues are fat soluble" in the residue definition:

- When available, it is the partitioning of the residue (as defined) in muscle versus fat in the metabolism studies and livestock feeding studies that determines the designation of a residue as being "fat soluble".
- In the absence of useful information on the distribution of residues in muscle and fat, residues with logPow>3 are likely to be "fat soluble"

14. For fat soluble pesticides, two MRLs are recommended if data permit: one for whole milk and one for milk fat. For enforcement purposes, a comparison can be made either of the residue in milk fat with the MRL for milk fat or of the residue in whole milk with the MRL for milk.

Establishment of MRLs

15. The CCPR is entrusted with the elaboration of Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) of pesticide residues in food and feed. The JMPR is using the WHO Guidelines for predicting dietery intake of pesticides residues (revised)(1997)[34]. The JMPR is recommending MRLs establishing Supervised Trial Median Residues (STMRs) for new and periodic review compounds for dietary intake purposes. In cases the intake exceeds the Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI) in one or more of the regional diets, the JMPR, when recommending MRLs, flags this situation indicating the type of data which may be useful to further refine the dietary intake estimate.

16. When the ADI is exceeded in one or more regional diets, then the MRLs will not advance to Step 8 pending further refinement of the intake at the international level. If further refinement is not possible then MRLs are withdrawn until the remaining MRLs give no longer rise to intake concerns. This procedure should be reviewed at regular interval.

17. The JMPR is currently routinely establishing acute reference doses (ARfDs), where appropriate, and indicates cases where an ARfD is not necessary. The 1999 JMPR for the first time calculated the short-term dietary intake estimates following an approach using the International and National Estimates of Short-term Intake (IESTI, NESTI). The procedure allows for estimating the short-term risk for relevant subgroups of the population, like children. The JMPR flags cases when the IESTI for a given commodity exceeds the acute RfD.

---

[34] Programme of Food Safety and Food Aid; WHO/FSF/FOS/97.7

18. When the ARfD is exceeded for a given commodity, then the MRLs will not advance to Step 8 pending further refinement of the intake at the international level.

19. When a Draft MRL has been returned to Step 6 three times, the CCPR should ask JMPR to examine residue data from other appropriate GAPs and to recommend MRLs which cause no dietary intake concerns if possible.

20. If further refinement is not possible then MRLs are withdrawn. More sophisticated methodologies such as probabilistic approaches are under investigation at the moment.

21. The estimate of the short-term dietary intake requires substantial food consumption data that currently are only sparsely available. Governments are urged to generate relevant consumption data and to submit these data to the WHO.

Utilization of Steps 5/8 for elaboration of MRLs

22. Preconditions for utilization of Step 5/8 Procedure

- New MRL circulated at Step 3
- JMPR report available electronically by early February
- No intake concerns identified by JMPR

23. Steps 5/8 Procedure (Recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7 and adopt the MRL at Step 8)

- If the preconditions listed above are met.
- If a delegation has a concern with advancing a given MRL, a concern form should be completed detailing the concern along with a description of the data that will be submitted to substantiate the concern preferably as comments at Step 3, or at the latest, one month after the CCPR session.
- If the JMPR Secretariat or the CCPR can address that concern at the upcoming CCPR session, and the JMPR position remains unchanged, the CCPR will decide if the MRL will be advanced to Step 5/8.
- If the concern cannot be addressed at the meeting, the MRL will be advanced to Step 5 at the CCPR session and the concern will be addressed by the JMPR as soon as possible but the rest of the MRLs should be advanced to Step 5/8.

- The result of the consideration of the concern by the JMPR will be considered at the next CCPR session. If the JMPR position remains unchanged, the CCPR will decide if the MRL will be advanced to Step 8.

Establishment of EMRLs

24. The Extraneous Maximum Residue Limit (EMRL) refers to a pesticide residue or a contaminant arising from environmental sources (including former agricultural uses) other than the use of the pesticide or contaminant substance directly or indirectly on the commodity. It is the maximum concentration of a pesticide residue that is recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission to be legally permitted or recognized as acceptable in or on a food, agricultural commodity or animal feed.

25. Chemicals for which EMRLs are most likely to be needed are persistent in the environment for a relatively long period after uses haven been discontinued and are expected to occur in foods or feeds at levels of sufficient concern to warrant monitoring.

26. All relevant and geographically representative monitoring data (including nil-residue results) are required to make reasonable estimates to cover international trade. JMPR has developed a standard format for reporting pesticide residues monitoring data[35].

27. The JMPR compares data distribution in terms of the likely percentages of violations that might occur if a given EMRL is proposed to the CCPR.

28. Because residues gradually decrease, CCPR evaluates every 5 years, if possible, the existing EMRLs, based on the reassessments of the JMPR.

29. The CCPR generally agreed at the 30th Session on the potential elements for inclusion in a set of criteria for estimation of EMRLs while it also agreed not to initiate a full exercise of criteria elaboration.

Periodic Review Procedure

30. The Committee agreed on the Periodic Review Procedure, which was endorsed by the CAC and attached to the list of MRLs prepared for each session of the CCPR. Those Codex MRLs confirmed by JMPR under the Periodic Review shall be distributed to members and interested organizations for comments.

---

[35] Submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed; FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper, 170, 2002, ISBN 92-5-104759-6

Deleting Codex MRLs

31. Every year new compounds are introduced. These compounds are often new pesticides which are safer than existing ones. Old compounds are then no longer supported/produced by industry and existing Codex MRLs can be deleted.

32. If information is delivered between two sessions of CCPR, that a certain compound is no longer supported, this information will be shared during the first coming session (t=0). The proposal will be to delete the existing MRLs at the following session (t=0+1 year).

33. It may happen that compounds are no longer supported in Codex, but are supported in some selected countries. If there is no international trade in commodities where the active compounds may have been used, CCPR will not establish MRLs.

MRLs AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS

34. JMPR needs data and information for their evaluations. Among these are methods of analysis. Methods should include specialized methods used in supervised trials and enforcement methods.

35. If no methods of analysis are available for enforcing MRLs for a specific compound, no MRLs will be established by CCPR.

RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS

1. PURPOSE – SCOPE

1. The purpose of this document is to specify Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods.

2. PARTIES INVOLVED

2. The *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for application in the framework of the Codex Alimentarius* has defined the responsibilities of the various parties involved. The responsibility for providing advice on risk management concerning residues of veterinary drugs lies with the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary body, the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF), while the responsibility for risk assessment lies primarily with the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA).

3. According to its mandate, the responsibilities of the CCRVDF regarding veterinary drug residues in food are:

(a) to determine priorities for the consideration of residues of veterinary drugs in foods;

(b) to recommend maximum residue limits (MRLs) for such veterinary drugs;

(c) to develop codes of practice as may be required;

(d) to consider methods of sampling and analysis for the determination of veterinary drug residues in foods.

4. The CCRVDF shall base its risk management recommendations to the Codex Alimentarius Commission on JECFA's risk assessments of veterinary drugs in relation to proposed MRLs.

5. The CCRVDF is primarily responsible for recommending risk management proposals for adoption by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

6. JECFA is primarily responsible for providing independent scientific advice, the risk assessment, upon which the CCRVDF base their risk management decisions. It assists the CCRVDF by evaluating the available scientific data on the veterinary drug prioritised by the CCRVDF. JECFA also provides advice directly to FAO and WHO and to Member governments.

7. Scientific experts from JECFA are selected in a transparent manner by FAO and WHO under their rules for expert committees on the basis of the competence, expertise, experience in the evaluation of compounds used as veterinary drugs and their independence with regard to the interests involved, taking into account geographical representation where possible.

3. RISK MANAGEMENT IN CCRVDF

8. Risk management should follow a structured approach including:

- preliminary risk management activities;
- evaluation of risk management options; and
- monitoring and review of decisions taken.

9. The decisions should be based on risk assessment, and take into account, where appropriate, other legitimate factors relevant for the health protection of consumers and for fair practices in food trade, in accordance with the *Criteria for the Consideration of the Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principles*[36].

3.1 PRELIMINARY RISK MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

10. This first phase of risk management covers:

- Establishment of risk assessment policy for the conduct of the risk assessments;
- Identification of a food safety problem;
- Establishment of a preliminary risk profile;
- Ranking of the hazard for risk assessment and risk management priority;
- Commissioning of the risk assessment; and
- Consideration of the result of the risk assessment.

[36] 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 Appendix

3.1.1 RISK ASSESSMENT POLICY FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT

11. The responsibilities of the CCRVDF and JECFA and their interactions along with core principles and expectations of JECFA evaluations are provided in *Risk Assessment Policy for the Setting of MRLs in Food*, established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

3.1.2 ESTABLISHMENT OF PRIORITY LIST

12. The CCRVDF identifies, with the assistance of Members, the veterinary drugs that may pose a consumer safety problem and/or have a potential adverse impact on international trade. The CCRVDF establishes a priority list for assessment by JECFA.

13. In order to appear on the priority list of veterinary drugs for the establishment of a MRL, the proposed veterinary drug shall meet some or all of the following criteria:

- A Member has proposed the compound for evaluation;
- A Member has established good veterinary practices with regard to the compound;
- The compound has the potential to cause public health and/or international trade problems;
- It is available as a commercial product; and
- There is a commitment that a dossier will be made available.

14. The CCRVDF takes into account the protection of confidential information in accordance with WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) - Section 7: Protection of Undisclosed Information - Article 39, and makes every effort to encourage the willingness of sponsors to provide data for JECFA assessment.

3.1.3 ESTABLISHMENT OF A PRELIMINARY RISK PROFILE

15. Member(s) request(s) the inclusion of a veterinary drug on the priority list. The available information for evaluating the request shall be provided either directly by the Member(s) or by the sponsor. A preliminary risk profile shall be developed by the Member(s) making the request, using the template presented in the Annex.

16. The CCRVDF considers the preliminary risk profile and makes a decision on whether or not to include the veterinary drug in the priority list.

3.1.4 RANKING OF THE HAZARD FOR RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT PRIORITY

17. The CCRVDF establishes an ad-hoc Working Group open to all its Members and observers, to make recommendations on the veterinary drugs to include into (or to remove from) the priority list of veterinary drugs for the JECFA assessment. The CCRVDF considers these recommendations before agreeing on the priority list, taking into account pending issues such as temporary Acceptable Daily Intakes (ADIs) and/or MRLs. In its report, the CCRVDF shall specify the reasons for its choice and the criteria used to establish the order of priority.

18. Prior to development of MRLs for new veterinary drugs not previously evaluated by JECFA, a proposal for this work shall be sent to the Codex Alimentarius Commission with a request for approval as new work in accordance with the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts*.

3.1.5 COMMISSIONING OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT

19. After approval by the Codex Alimentarius Commission of the priority list of veterinary drugs as new work, the CCRVDF forwards it to JECFA with the qualitative preliminary risk profile as well as specific guidance on the CCRVDF risk assessment request. JECFA, WHO and FAO experts then proceed with the assessment of risks related to these veterinary drugs, based on the dossier provided and/or all other available scientific information.

3.1.6 CONSIDERATION OF THE RESULT OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT

20. When the JECFA risk assessment is completed, a detailed report is prepared for the subsequent session of the CCRVDF for consideration. This report shall clearly indicate the choices made during the risk assessment with respect to scientific uncertainties and the level of confidence in the studies provided.

21. When the data are insufficient, JECFA may recommend temporary MRL on the basis of a temporary ADI using additional safety considerations[37]. If JECFA cannot propose an ADI and/or MRLs due to lack of data, its report should clearly indicate the gaps and a timeframe in which data should be submitted, in order to allow Members to make an appropriate risk management decision.

---

[37] Definition of "Codex maximum limit for residues of veterinary drugs", Codex Procedural Manual.

22. The JECFA assessment reports related to the concerned veterinary drugs should be made available in sufficient time prior to a CCRVDF meeting to allow for careful consideration by Members. If this is, in exceptional cases, not possible, a provisional report should be made available.

23. JECFA should, if necessary, propose different risk management options. In consequence, JECFA should present, in its report, different risk management options for the CCRVDF to consider. The reporting format should clearly distinguish between the risk assessment and the evaluation of the risk management options.

24. The CCRVDF may ask JECFA any additional explanation.

25. Reasons, discussions and conclusions (or the absence thereof) on risk assessment should be clearly documented, in JECFA reports, for each option reviewed. The risk management decision taken by the CCRVDF (or the absence thereof) should also be fully documented.

3.2 EVALUATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

26. The CCRVDF shall proceed with a critical evaluation of the JECFA proposals on MRLs and may consider other legitimate factors relevant for health protection and fair trade practices in the framework of the risk analysis. According to the 2nd statement of principle, the criteria for the consideration of other factors should be taken into account. These other legitimate factors are those agreed during the 12th session of the CCRVDF [38] and subsequent amendments made by this Committee.

27. The CCRVDF either recommends the MRLs as proposed by JECFA, modifies them in consideration of other legitimate factors, considers other measures or asks JECFA for reconsideration of the residue evaluation for the veterinary drug in question.

28. Particular attention should be given to availability of analytical methods used for residue detection.

3.3 MONITORING AND REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN

29. Members may ask for the review of decisions taken by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. To this end, veterinary drugs should be proposed for inclusion in the priority list. In particular, review of decisions may be necessary if they pose difficulties in the application of the *Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for the Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods* (CAC/GL 16-1993).

---

[38] ALINORM 01/31 paragraph 11.

30. The CCRVDF may request JECFA to review any new scientific knowledge and other information relevant to risk assessment and concerning decisions already taken, including the established MRLs.

31. The risk assessment policy for MRL shall be reconsidered based on new issues and experience with the risk analysis of veterinary drugs. To this end, interaction with JECFA is essential. A review may be undertaken of the veterinary drugs appearing on prior JECFA agendas for which no ADI or MRL has been recommended.

4. RISK COMMUNICATION IN THE CONTEXT OF RISK MANAGEMENT

32. In accordance with the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*, the CCRVDF, in cooperation with JECFA, shall ensure that the risk analysis process is fully transparent and thoroughly documented and that results are made available in a timely manner to Members. The CCRVDF recognises that communication between risk assessors and risk managers is critical to the success of risk analysis activities.

33. In order to ensure the transparency of the assessment process in JECFA, the CCRVDF provides comments on the guidelines related to assessment procedures being drafted or published by JECFA.

ANNEX

TEMPLATE FOR INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR PRIORITIZATION BY CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

1. Member(s) submitting the request for inclusion
2. Veterinary drug names
3. Trade names
4. Chemical names
5. Names and addresses of basic producers

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND RATIONALE

6. Identification of the food safety issue (residue hazard)
7. Assessment against the criteria for the inclusion on the priority list

RISK PROFILE ELEMENTS

8. Justification for use
9. Veterinary use pattern
10. Commodities for which Codex MRLs are required

RISK ASSESSMENT NEEDS AND QUESTIONS FOR THE RISK ASSESSORS

11. Identify the feasibility that such an evaluation can be carried out in a reasonable framework
12. Specific request to risk assessors

AVAILABLE INFORMATION[39]

13. Countries where the veterinary drugs is registered
14. National/Regional MRLs or any other applicable tolerances
15. List of data (pharmacology, toxicology, metabolism, residue depletion, analytical methods) available

---

[39] When preparing a preliminary risk profile, Member(s) should take into account the updated data requirement, to enable evaluation of a veterinary drug for the establishment of an ADI and MRLs, published by JECFA.

TIMETABLE

16. Date when data could be submitted to JECFA

RISK ASSESSMENT POLICY FOR THE SETTING OF MAXIMUM LIMITS FOR RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS

ROLE OF JECFA

1. The Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) is an independent scientific expert body convened by both Directors-General of FAO and WHO according to the rules of both organizations, charged with the task to provide scientific advice on veterinary drug residues in food.

2. This annex applies to the work of JECFA in the context of Codex and in particular as it relates to advice requests from the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF).

(a) JECFA provides CCRVDF with science-based risk assessments conducted in accordance with the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius* and incorporating the four steps of risk assessment. JECFA should continue to use its risk assessment process for establishing Acceptable Daily Intakes (ADIs) and proposing Maximum Residues Limits (MRLs).

(b) JECFA should take into account all available scientific data to establish its risk assessment. It should use available quantitative information to the greatest extent possible and also qualitative information.

(c) Constraints, uncertainties and assumptions that have an impact on the risk assessment need be clearly communicated by JECFA.

(d) JECFA should provide CCRVDF with information on the applicability, public health consequences and any constraints of the risk assessment to the general population and to particular sub-populations and, as far as possible, should identify potential risks to specific group of populations of potentially enhanced vulnerability (e.g. children).

(e) Risk assessment should be based on realistic exposure scenarios.

(f) When the veterinary drug is used both in veterinary medicine and as a pesticide, a harmonised approach between JECFA and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) should be followed.

(g) MRLs, that are compatible with the ADI, should be set for all species based on appropriate consumption figures. When requested by CCRVDF, extension of MRLs between species will be considered if appropriate data are available.

DATA PROTECTION

3. Considering the importance of intellectual property in the context of data submission for scientific evaluation, JECFA has established procedures to cover the confidentiality of certain data submitted. These procedures enable the sponsor to declare which data is to be considered as confidential. The procedure includes a formal consultation with the sponsor.

EXPRESSION OF RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS IN TERMS OF MRLS

4. MRLs have to be established for target animal tissues (e.g. muscle, fat, or fat and skin, kidney, liver), and specific food commodities (e.g. eggs, milk, honey) originating from the target animals species to which a veterinary drug can be administered according to good veterinary practice.

5. However, if residue levels in various target tissues are very different, JECFA is requested to consider MRLs for a minimum of two. In this case, the establishment of MRLs for muscle or fat is preferred to enable the control of the safety of carcasses moving in international trade.

6. When the calculation of MRLs to be compatible with the ADI may be associated with a lengthy withdrawal period, JECFA should clearly describe the situation in its report.

SECTION IV

- Subsidiary Bodies
- Membership
- Organigram

CONTENTS OF THIS SECTION

This Section contains factual information about the Codex Alimentarius Commission, including a list of the Commission's Sessions and sessions of the Executive Committee.

The list of the Commission's Subsidiary Bodies gives the Terms of Reference of all Codex Committees established under Rule XI.1 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure. Each body (including the Commission and the Executive Committee) is also identified by its unique reference code used in all official correspondence. The meetings of each subsidiary body are listed. The structure of the Commission's subsidiary bodies is shown diagrammatically on the inside back cover.

The countries and organizations which form the Commission's Membership are listed (as of October 2007). The Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme provides up-dated information on Codex Contact Points at regular intervals, namely on its website: http://www.codexalimentarius.net.

SESSIONS OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

(**CX-701**)[40]

SESSION	PLACE AND DATES
1st	Rome, 25 June - 3 July 1963
2nd	Geneva, 28 September - 7 October 1964
3rd	Rome, 19-28 October 1965
4th	Rome, 7-14 November 1966
5th	Rome, 20 February - 1 March 1968
6th	Geneva, 4-14 March 1969
7th	Rome, 7-17 April 1970
8th	Geneva, 30 June - 9 July 1971
9th	Rome, 6-17 November 1972
10th	Rome, 1-11 July 1974
11th	Rome, 29 March - 9 April 1976
12th	Rome, 17-28 April 1978
13th	Rome, 3-14 December 1979
14th	Geneva, 29 June - 10 July 1981
15th	Rome, 4-15 July 1983
16th	Geneva, 1-12 July 1985
17th	Rome, 29 June - 10 July 1987
18th	Geneva, 3-12 July 1989
19th	Rome, 1-10 July 1991
20th	Geneva, 28 June - 7 July 1993
21st	Rome, 3-8 July 1995
22nd	Geneva, 23-28 June 1997
23rd	Rome, 28 June - 3 July 1999
24th	Geneva, 2-7 July 2001
25th	Geneva, 13-15 February 2003[41]
26th	Rome, 30 June – 7 July 2003
27th	Geneva, 28 June - 3 July 2004
28th	Rome, 4-9 July 2005
29th	Geneva, 3-7 July 2006
30th	Rome, 2-7 July 2007

[40] The reference code, followed by the number of the session, used in official correspondence.

[41] Extraordinary session.

SESSIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

(CX-702)

SESSION	PLACE AND DATES
1st	Rome, 3 July 1963
2nd	Washington D.C., 25-26 May 1964
3rd	Geneva, 25-26 September 1964
4th	Geneva, 7 October 1964
5th	Rome, 3-4 June 1965
6th	Rome, 18 October 1965
7th	Rome, 28 October 1965
8th	Rome, 14-16 June 1966
9th	Rome, 4 November 1966
10th	Rome, 16-18 May 1967
11th	Rome, 19 February 1968
12th	Rome, 5-7 June 1968
13th	Geneva, 3 March 1969
14th	Rome, 17-19 September 1969
15th	Rome, 3 April 1970
16th	Geneva, 9-11 February 1971
17th	Geneva, 25 June 1971
18th	Rome, 15-18 May 1972
19th	Geneva, 3-5 July 1973
20th	Rome, 28 June 1974
21st	Geneva, 17-19 June 1975
22nd	Rome, 23-24 March 1976
23rd	Geneva, 12-15 July 1977
24th	Rome,13-14 April 1978
25th	Geneva, 10-13 July 1979
26th	Rome, 26-27 November 1979
27th	Geneva, 13-17 October 1980
28th	Geneva, 25-26 June 1981
29th	Geneva, 12-16 July 1982
30th	Rome, 30 June – 1 July 1983
31st	Geneva, 25-29 June 1984
32nd	Geneva, 27-28 June 1985
33rd	Rome, 30 June – 4 July 1986

SESSION	PLACE AND DATES
34th	Rome, 25-26 June 1987
35th	Geneva, 4-8 July 1988
36th	Geneva, 29-30 June 1989
37th	Rome, 3-6 July 1990
38th	Rome, 27-28 June 1991
39th	Geneva, 30 June - 3 July 1992
40th	Geneva, 24-25 June 1993
41st	Rome, 28-30 June 1994
42nd	Rome, 28-30 June 1995
43rd	Geneva, 4-7 June 1996
44th	Geneva, 19-20 June 1997
45th	Rome, 3-5 June 1998
46th	Rome, 24-25 June 1999
47th	Geneva, 28-30 June 2000
48th	Geneva, 28-29 June 2001
49th	Geneva, 26-27 September 2001[42]
50th	Rome, 26-28 June 2002
51st	Geneva, 10-11 February 2003[43]
52nd	Rome, 26-27 June 2003
53rd	Geneva, 4-6 February 2004
54th	Geneva, 24-26 June 2004
55th	Rome, 9-11 February 2005
56th	Rome, 30 June-2 July 2005
57th	Geneva, 6-9 December 2005
58th	Geneva, 28 June – 1 July 2006
59th	Rome, 2-7 July 2007

[42] Extraordinary session.

[43] Extraordinary session.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

SUBSIDIARY BODY UNDER RULE XI.1(a)

JOINT FAO/WHO COMMITTEE OF GOVERNMENT EXPERTS ON THE CODE OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS (CX-703)

Established by FAO and WHO in 1958 and integrated into the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme in 1962 as a subsidiary body of the Codex Alimentarius Commission under Rule XI.1(a). Re-named "Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products" in 1993 and re-established as a subsidiary body under Rule XI.1(b)(i) (see *Rules of Procedure* in Section I).

Sessions

1st	Rome, 8-12 September 1958
2nd	Rome, 13-17 April 1959
3rd	Rome, 22-26 February 1960
4th	Rome, 6-10 March 1961
5th	Rome, 2-6 April 1962
6th	Rome, 17-21 June 1963
7th	Rome, 4-8 May 1964
8th	Rome, 24-29 May 1965
9th	Rome, 20-25 June 1966
10th	Rome, 25-31 August 1967
11th	Rome, 10-15 June 1968
12th	Rome, 7-12 July 1969
13th	Rome,, 15-20 June 1970
14th	Rome,, 6-11 September 1971
15th	Rome, 25-30 September 1972
16th	Rome, 10-15 September 1973
17th	Rome, 14-19 April 1975
18th	Rome, 13-18 September 1976
19th	Rome, 12-17 June 1978
20th	Rome, 26-30 April 1982
21st	Rome, 2-6 June 1986
22nd	Rome, 5-9 November 1990

Terms of Reference:

To establish international codes and standards concerning milk and milk products.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES UNDER RULE XI.1(b)(i)

CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES (CX-716)

Host Government: France

Sessions:

1st	Paris, 4-8 October 1965
2nd	Paris, 16-19 October 1967
3rd	Paris, 9-13 December 1968
4th	Paris, 4-8 March 1974
5th	Paris, 19-23 January 1976
6th	Paris, 15-19 October 1979
7th	Paris, 6-10 April 1981
8th	Paris, 24-28 November 1986
9th	Paris, 24-28 April 1989
10th	Paris, 7-11 September 1992
11th	Paris, 25-29 April 1994
12th	Paris, 25-28 November 1996
13th	Paris, 7-11 September 1998
14th	Paris, 19-23 April 1999
15th	Paris, 10-14 April 2000
16th	Paris, 23-27 April 2001
17th	Paris, 15-19 April 2002
18th	Paris, 7-11 April 2003
19th	Paris, 17–21 November 2003[44]
20th	Paris, 3-7 May 2004
21st	Paris, 8-12 November 2004[44]
22nd	Paris, 11-15 April 2005
23rd	Paris, 10-14 April 2006
24th	Paris, 2-6 April 2007

[44] Extraordinary Session

Terms of Reference:

To deal with such procedural and general matters as are referred to it by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Such matters have included the establishment of the General Principles which define the purpose and scope of the Codex Alimentarius, the nature of Codex standards and the forms of acceptance by countries of Codex standards; the development of Guidelines for Codex Committees; the development of a mechanism for examining any economic impact statements submitted by governments concerning possible implications for their economies of some of the individual standards or some of the provisions thereof; the establishment of a Code of Ethics for the International Trade in Food.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (CX-711)

Renamed as Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants by the 17th Session of the Commission (1987); renamed again by the 29th Session of the Commission (2006) as Codex Committee on Food Additives, due to the creation of a Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CX-735).

Host Government: China (since 39th Session), Netherlands (1st to 38th Sessions)

Sessions:

1st	The Hague, 19-22 May 1964
2nd	The Hague, 10-14 May 1965
3rd	The Hague, 9-13 May 1966
4th	The Hague, 11-15 September 1967
5th	Arnhem, 18-22 March 1968
6th	Arnhem, 15-22 October 1969
7th	The Hague, 12-16 October 1970
8th	Wageningen, 29 May - 2 June 1972
9th	Wageningen, 10-14 December 1973
10th	The Hague, 2-7 June 1975
11th	The Hague, 31 May - 6 June 1977
12th	The Hague, 10-16 October 1978
13th	The Hague, 11-17 September 1979
14th	The Hague, 25 November - 1 December 1980
15th	The Hague, 16-22 March 1982
16th	The Hague, 22-28 March 1983
17th	The Hague, 10-16 April 1984
18th	The Hague, 5-11 November 1985
19th	The Hague, 17-23 March 1987
20th	The Hague, 7-12 March 1988
21st	The Hague, 13-18 March 1989

22nd	The Hague, 19-24 March 1990
23rd	The Hague, 4-9 March 1991
24th	The Hague, 23-28 March 1992
25th	The Hague, 22-26 March 1993
26th	The Hague, 7-11 March 1994
27th	The Hague, 20-24 March 1995
28th	Manila, Philippines, 18-22 March 1996
29th	The Hague, 17-21 March 1997
30th	The Hague, 9-13 March 1998
31st	The Hague, 22-26 March 1999
32nd	Beijing, China, 20-24 March 2000
33rd	The Hague, 12-16 March 2001
34th	Rotterdam, 11-15 March 2002
35th	Arusha, Tanzania, 17-21 March 2003
36th	Rotterdam, 22-26 March 2004
37th	The Hague, 25-29 April 2005
38th	The Hague, 24-28 April 2006
39th	Beijing, China, 24-28 April 2007

Terms of reference:

(a) to establish or endorse acceptable maximum levels for individual food additives;

(b) to prepare priority lists of food additives for risk assessment by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives;

(c) to assign functional classes to individual food additives;

(d) to recommend specifications of identity and purity for food additives for adoption by the Commission;

(e) to consider methods of analysis for the determination of additives in food; and

(f) to consider and elaborate standards or codes for related subjects such as the labelling of food additives when sold as such.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS (CX-735)

Host Government: Netherlands

Sessions:

1st	Beijing, China, 16-20 April 2007

***Terms of reference**:*

(a) to establish or endorse permitted maximum levels, and where necessary revise existing guidelines levels, for contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in food and feed;

(b) to prepare priority lists of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants for risk assessment by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives;

(c) to consider and elaborate methods of analysis and sampling for the determination of contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in food and feed;

(d) to consider and elaborate standards or codes of practice for related subjects; and

(e) to consider other matters assigned to it by the Commission in relation to contaminants and naturally occurring toxicants in food and feed.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE (CX-712)

Host Government: United States of America

Sessions:

1st	Washington D.C., 27-28 May 1964
2nd	Rome, 14-16 June 1965
3rd	Rome, 31 May - 3 June 1966
4th	Washington D.C., 12-16 June 1967
5th	Washington D.C., 6-10 May 1968
6th	Washington D.C., 5-9 May 1969
7th	Washington D.C., 25-29 May 1970
8th	Washington D.C., 14-18 June 1971
9th	Washington D.C., 19-23 June 1972
10th	Washington D.C., 14-18 May 1973
11th	Washington D.C., 10-14 June 1974
12th	Washington D.C., 12-16 May 1975
13th	Rome, 10-14 May 1976
14th	Washington D.C., 29 August - 2 September 1977
15th	Washington D.C., 18-22 September 1978
16th	Washington D.C., 23-27 July 1979
17th	Washington D.C., 17-21 November 1980
18th	Washington D.C., 22-26 February 1982

19th	Washington D.C., 26-30 September 1983
20th	Washington D.C., 1-5 October 1984
21st	Washington D.C., 23-27 September 1985
22nd	Washington D.C., 20-24 October 1986
23rd	Washington D.C., 21-25 March 1988
24th	Washington D.C., 16-20 October 1989
25th	Washington D.C., 28 October - 1 November 1991
26th	Washington D.C., 1-5 March 1993
27th	Washington D.C., 17-21 October 1994
28th	Washington D.C., 27 November - 1 December 1995
29th	Washington D.C., 21-25 October 1996
30th	Washington D.C., 20-24 October 1997
31st	Orlando, Florida, 26-30 October 1998
32nd	Washington D.C., 29 November - 4 December 1999
33rd	Washington D.C., 23-28 October 2000
34th	Bangkok, Thailand, 8-13 October 2001
35th	Orlando, Florida, 27 January-1 February 2003
36th	Washington D.C., 29 March-3 April 2004
37th	Buenos Aires, Argentina, 14-19 March 2005
38th	Houston, United States, 4-9 December 2006

Terms of reference:

(a) to draft basic provisions on food hygiene applicable to all food[45];

(b) to consider, amend if necessary and endorse provisions on hygiene prepared by Codex commodity committees and contained in Codex commodity standards, and

(c) to consider, amend if necessary, and endorse provisions on hygiene prepared by Codex commodity committees and contained in Codex codes of practice unless, in specific cases, the Commission has decided otherwise, or

(d) to draft provisions on hygiene applicable to specific food items or food groups, whether coming within the terms of reference of a Codex commodity committee or not;

(e) to consider specific hygiene problems assigned to it by the Commission,

[45] The term "hygiene" includes, where necessary, microbiological specifications for food and associated methodology.

(f) to suggest and prioritize areas where there is a need for microbiological risk assessment at the international level and to develop questions to be addressed by the risk assessors;

(g) to consider microbiological risk management matters in relation to food hygiene, including food irradiation, and in relation to the risk assessment of FAO and WHO.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING (CX-714)

Host Government: Canada

Sessions:

1st	Ottawa, 21-25 June 1965
2nd	Ottawa, 25-29 July 1966
3rd	Ottawa, 26-30 June 1967
4th	Ottawa, 23-28 September 1968
5th	Rome, 6 April 1970
6th	Geneva, 28-29 June 1971
7th	Ottawa, 5-10 June 1972
8th	Ottawa, 28 May - 1 June 1973
9th	Rome, 26-27 June 1974
10th	Ottawa, 26-30 May 1975
11th	Rome, 25-26 March 1976
12th	Ottawa, 16-20 May 1977
13th	Ottawa, 16-20 July 1979
14th	Rome, 28-30 November 1979
15th	Ottawa, 10-14 November 1980
16th	Ottawa, 17-21 May 1982
17th	Ottawa, 12-21 October 1983
18th	Ottawa, 11-18 March 1985
19th	Ottawa, 9-13 March 1987
20th	Ottawa, 3-7 April 1989
21st	Ottawa, 11-15 March 1991
22nd	Ottawa, 26-30 April 1993
23rd	Ottawa, 24-28 October 1994
24th	Ottawa, 14-17 May 1996
25th	Ottawa, 15-18 April 1997
26th	Ottawa, 26-29 May 1998
27th	Ottawa, 27-30 April 1999
28th	Ottawa, 5-9 May 2000
29th	Ottawa, 1-4 May 2001

30th	Halifax, 6-10 May 2002
31st	Ottawa, 28 April - 2 May 2003
32nd	Montréal, 10-14 May 2004
33rd	Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia, 9-13 May 2005
34th	Ottawa, 1-5 May 2006
35th	Ottawa, 30 April – 4 May 2007

Terms of reference:

(a) to draft provisions on labelling applicable to all foods;

(b) to consider, amend if necessary, and endorse draft specific provisions on labelling prepared by the Codex Committees drafting standards, codes of practice and guidelines;

(c) to study specific labelling problems assigned to it by the Commission;

(d) to study problems associated with the advertisement of food with particular reference to claims and misleading descriptions.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING (CX-715)

Host Government: Hungary (since 7th session), Federal Republic of Germany (1st to 6th sessions)

Sessions:

1st	Berlin, 23-24 September 1965
2nd	Berlin, 20-23 September 1966
3rd	Berlin, 24-27 October 1967
4th	Berlin, 11-15 November 1968
5th	Cologne, 1-6 December 1969
6th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 24-28 January 1971
7th	Budapest, 12-18 September 1972
8th	Budapest, 3-7 September 1973
9th	Budapest, 27-31 October 1975
10th	Budapest, 24-28 October 1977
11th	Budapest, 2-6 July 1979
12th	Budapest, 11-15 May 1981
13th	Budapest, 29 November - 3 December 1982
14th	Budapest, 26-30 November 1984
15th	Budapest, 10-14 November 1986
16th	Budapest, 14-19 November 1988
17th	Budapest, 8-12 April 1991

18th	Budapest, 9-13 November 1992
19th	Budapest, 21-25 March 1994
20th	Budapest, 2-6 October 1995
21st	Budapest, 10-14 March 1997
22nd	Budapest, 23-27 November 1998
23rd	Budapest, 26 February – March 2001
24th	Budapest, 18-22 November 2002
25th	Budapest, 8-12 March 2004
26th	Budapest, 4-8 April 2005
27th	Budapest, 15-19 May 2006
28th	Budapest, 5-9 March 2007

Terms of reference:

(a) to define the criteria appropriate to Codex Methods of Analysis and Sampling;

(b) to serve as a coordinating body for Codex with other international groups working in methods of analysis and sampling and quality assurance systems for laboratories;

(c) to specify, on the basis of final recommendations submitted to it by the other bodies referred to in (b) above, Reference Methods of Analysis and Sampling appropriate to Codex Standards which are generally applicable to a number of foods;

(d) to consider, amend, if necessary, and endorse, as appropriate, methods of analysis and sampling proposed by Codex (Commodity) Committees, except that methods of analysis and sampling for residues of pesticides or veterinary drugs in food, the assessment of micro biological quality and safety in food, and the assessment of specifications for food additives, do not fall within the terms of reference of this Committee;

(e) to elaborate sampling plans and procedures, as may be required;

(f) to consider specific sampling and analysis problems submitted to it by the Commission or any of its Committees;

(g) to define procedures, protocols, guidelines or related texts for the assessment of food laboratory proficiency, as well as quality assurance systems for laboratories.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (CX-718)

Host Government: China (since 39th Session), Netherlands (1st to 38th Sessions)

Sessions:

1st	The Hague, 17-21 January 1966
2nd	The Hague, 18-22 September 1967
3rd	Arnhem, 30 September - 4 October 1968
4th	Arnhem, 6-14 October 1969
5th	The Hague, 28 September - 6 October 1970
6th	The Hague, 16-23 October 1972
7th	The Hague, 4-9 February 1974
8th	The Hague, 3-8 March 1975
9th	The Hague, 14-21 February 1977
10th	The Hague, 29 May - 5 June 1978
11th	The Hague, 11-18 June 1979
12th	The Hague, 2-9 June 1980
13th	The Hague, 15-20 June 1981
14th	The Hague, 14-21 June 1982
15th	The Hague, 3-10 October 1983
16th	The Hague, 24 May - 4 June 1984
17th	The Hague, 25 March - 1 April 1985
18th	The Hague, 21-28 April 1986
19th	The Hague, 6-13 April 1987
20th	The Hague, 18-25 April 1988
21st	The Hague, 10-17 April 1989
22nd	The Hague, 23-30 April 1990
23rd	The Hague, 15-22 April 1991
24th	The Hague, 6-13 April 1992
25th	Havana, Cuba, 19-26 April 1993
26th	The Hague, 11-18 April 1994
27th	The Hague, 24 April -1 May 1995
28th	The Hague, 15-20 April 1996
29th	The Hague, 7-12 April 1997
30th	The Hague, 20-25 April 1998
31st	The Hague, 12-17 April 1999
32nd	The Hague, 1-8 May 2000
33rd	The Hague, 2-7 April 2001
34th	The Hague, 13-18 May 2002

35th	Rotterdam, 31 March - 5 April 2003
36th	New Delhi, India, 19-24 April 2004
37th	The Hague, 18-23 April 2005
38th	Fortaleza, Brazil, 3-8 April 2006
39th	Beijing, China, 7-12 May 2007

Terms of reference:

(a) to establish maximum limits for pesticide residues in specific food items or in groups of food;

(b) to establish maximum limits for pesticide residues in certain animal feeding stuffs moving in international trade where this is justified for reasons of protection of human health;

(c) to prepare priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR);

(d) to consider methods of sampling and analysis for the determination of pesticide residues in food and feed;

(e) to consider other matters in relation to the safety of food and feed containing pesticide residues; and

(f) to establish maximum limits for environmental and industrial contaminants showing chemical or other similarity to pesticides, in specific food items or groups of food.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS (CX-730)

Host Government: United States of America

Sessions:

1st	Washington, D.C. 27-31 October, 1986
2nd	Washington, D.C. 30 November - 4 December 1987
3rd	Washington, D.C. 31 October - 4 November 1988
4th	Washington, D.C. 24-27 October 1989
5th	Washington, D.C. 16-19 October 1990
6th	Washington, D.C. 22-25 October 1991
7th	Washington, D.C., 20-23 October 1992
8th	Washington, D.C., 7-10 June 1994
9th	Washington, D.C., 5-8 December 1995
10th	San José (Costa Rica), 29 October - 1 November 1996

11th	Washington D.C., 15-18 September 1998
12th	Washington, D.C., 28-31 March 2000
13th	Charleston, South Carolina, 4-7 December 2001
14th	Arlington, Virginia, 4-7 March 2003
15th	Alexandria, Virginia, 26-29 October 2004
16th	Cancun, Mexico, 8-12 May 2006
17th	Beckenridge, Colorado, 3-7 September 2007

Terms of reference:

(a) to determine priorities for the consideration of residues of veterinary drugs in foods;

(b) to recommend maximum levels of such substances;

(c) to develop codes of practice as may be required;

(d) to consider methods of sampling and analysis for the determination of veterinary drug residues in foods.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD IMPORT AND EXPORT CERTIFICATION AND INSPECTION SYSTEMS (CX-733)

Host Government: Australia

Sessions:

1st	Canberra, 21-25 September 1992
2nd	Canberra, 29 November-3 December 1993
3rd	Canberra, 27 February-3 March 1995
4th	Sydney, 19-23 February 1996
5th	Sydney, 17-21 February 1997
6th	Melbourne, 23-27 February 1998
7th	Melbourne, 22-26 February 1999
8th	Adelaide, 21-25 February 2000
9th	Perth, 11-15 December 2000
10th	Brisbane, 25 February-1 March 2002
11th	Adelaide, 2-6 December 2002
12th	Brisbane, 1-5 December 2003
13th	Melbourne, 6-10 December 2004
14th	Melbourne, 28 November - 2 December 2005
15th	Mar del Plata, Argentina, 6 - 10 November 2006

Terms of reference:

(a) to develop principles and guidelines for food import and export inspection and certification systems with a view to harmonising methods and procedures which protect the health of consumers, ensure fair trading practices and facilitate international trade in foodstuffs;

(b) to develop principles and guidelines for the application of measures by the competent authorities of exporting and importing countries to provide assurance where necessary that foodstuffs comply with requirements, especially statutory health requirements;

(c) to develop guidelines for the utilisation, as and when appropriate, of quality assurance systems[46] to ensure that foodstuffs conform with requirements and to promote the recognition of these systems in facilitating trade in food products under bilateral/multilateral arrangements by countries;

(d) to develop guidelines and criteria with respect to format, declarations and language of such official certificates as countries may require with a view towards international harmonization;

(e) to make recommendations for information exchange in relation to food import/export control;

(f) to consult as necessary with other international groups working on matters related to food inspection and certification systems;

(g) to consider other matters assigned to it by the Commission in relation to food inspection and certification systems.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND FOODS FOR SPECIAL DIETARY USES (CX-720)

Host Government: Federal Republic of Germany

Sessions:

1st	Freiburg in Breisgau, 2-5 May 1966
2nd	Freiburg in Breisgau, 6-10 November 1967
3rd	Cologne, 14-18 October 1968
4th	Cologne, 3-7 November 1969
5th	Bonn, 30 November-4 December 1970

[46] ***Quality assurance*** means all those planned and systematic actions necessary to provide adequate confidence that a product or service will satisfy given requirements for quality (ISO-8402 Quality - Vocabulary)

6th	Bonn, 6-10 December 1971
7th	Cologne, 10-14 October 1972
8th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 9-14 September 1974
9th	Bonn, 22-26 September 1975
10th	Bonn, 28 February - 4 March 1977
11th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 23-27 October 1978
12th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 29 September - 3 October 1980
13th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 20-24 September 1982
14th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 24 January - 1 February 1985
15th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 12-16 January 1987
16th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 29 September - 7 October 1988
17th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 18-22 February 1991
18th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 28 September - 2 October 1992
19th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 27-31 March 1995
20th	Bonn Bad Godesberg, 7-11 October 1996
21st	Berlin, 21-25 September 1998
22nd	Berlin, 19-23 June 2000
23rd	Berlin, 26-30 November 2001
24th	Berlin, 4-8 November 2002
25th	Bonn, 3-7 November 2003
26th	Bonn, 1-5 November 2004
27th	Bonn, 21-25 November 2005
28th	Chiang Mai, Thailand, 30 October - 3 November 2006

Terms of reference:

(a) to study specific nutritional problems assigned to it by the Commission and advise the Commission on general nutrition issues;

(b) to draft general provisions, as appropriate, concerning the nutritional aspects of all foods;

(c) to develop standards, guidelines or related texts for foods for special dietary uses, in cooperation with other committees where necessary;

(d) to consider, amend if necessary, and endorse provisions on nutritional aspects proposed for inclusion Codex standards, guidelines and related texts.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON COCOA PRODUCTS AND CHOCOLATE (CX-708)

Host Government: Switzerland

Sessions:

1st	Neuchâtel, 5-6 November 1963
2nd	Montreux, 22-24 April 1964
3rd	Zürich, 10-12 March 1965
4th	Berne, 15-17 March 1966
5th	Lugano, 9-12 May 1967
6th	Montreux, 2-5 July 1968
7th	Horgen, (Zürich), 23-27 June 1969
8th	Lucerne, 29 June - 3 July 1970
9th	Neuchâtel, 27 September - 1 October 1971
10th	Lausanne, 7-11 May 1973
11th	Zürich, 2-6 December 1974
12th	Bienne, 1-5 November 1976
13th	Aarau, 2-6 April 1979
14th	Lausanne, 21-25 April 1980
15th	Neuchâtel, 29 March - 2 April 1982
16th	Thun, 30 September - 2 October 1996
17th	Berne, 16-18 November 1998
18th	Fribourg, 2-4 November 2000
19th	Fribourg, 3-5 October 2001

Adjourned *sine die*

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for cocoa products and chocolate.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON SUGARS (CX-710)

Host Government: United Kingdom

Sessions:

1st	London, 3-5 March 1964
2nd	London, 2-4 March 1965
3rd	London, 1-3 March 1966
4th	London, 18-21 April 1967
5th	London, 10-12 September 1968
6th	London, 19-22 March 1974

7th London, 9-11 February 2000

Adjourned *sine die*

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for all types of sugars and sugar products.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (CX-713)

Host Government: United States of America

Sessions:

1st Washington, D.C., 29-30 May 1964
2nd Rome, 8-11 June 1965
3rd Rome, 6-10 June 1966
4th Washington, D.C., 19-23 June 1967
5th Washington, D.C., 13-17 May 1968
6th Washington, D.C., 12-16 May 1969
7th Washington, D.C., 1-5 June 1970
8th Washington, D.C., 7-11 June 1971
9th Washington, D.C., 12-16 June 1972
10th Washington, D.C., 21-25 May 1973
11th Washington, D.C., 3-7 June 1974
12th Washington, D.C., 19-23 May 1975
13th Washington, D.C., 9-13 May 1977
14th Washington, D.C., 25-29 September 1978
15th Washington, D.C., 17-21 March 1980
16th Washington, D.C., 22-26 March 1982
17th Washington, D.C., 13-17 February 1984
18th Washington, D.C., 10-14 March 1986
19th Washington, D.C., 16-20 March 1998
20th Washington, D.C., 11-15 September 2000
21st San Antonio, Texas, 23-27 September 2002
22nd Washington, D.C., 27 September - 1 October 2004
23rd Arlington, Virginia, 16-21 October 2006

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for all types of processed fruits and vegetables including dried products, canned dried peas and beans, jams and jellies, but not dried prunes, or fruit and vegetable juices. The Commission has also allocated to this Committee the work of revision of standards for quick frozen fruits and vegetables.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FATS AND OILS (CX-709)

Host Government: Malaysia (since 21st Session), United Kingdom (1st to 20th Sessions)

Sessions:

1st	London, 25-27 February 1964
2nd	London, 6-8 April 1965
3rd	London, 29 March - 1 April 1966
4th	London, 24-28 April 1967
5th	London, 16-20 September 1968
6th	Madrid, 17-20 November 1969
7th	London, 25-29 March 1974
8th	London, 24-28 November 1975
9th	London, 28 November - 2 December 1977
10th	London, 4-8 December 1978
11th	London, 23-27 June 1980
12th	London, 19-23 April 1982
13th	London, 23-27 February 1987
14th	London, 27 September - 1 October 1993
15th	London, 4-8 November 1996
16th	London, 8-12 March 1999
17th	London, 19-23 February 2001
18th	London, 3-7 February 2003
19th	London, 21-25 February 2005
20th	London, 19-23 February 2007

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for fats and oils of animal, vegetable and marine origin including margarine and olive oil.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT (CX-717)

Host Government: Federal Republic of Germany

Sessions:

1st	Kulmbach, 28-30 October 1965
2nd	Kulmbach, 5-8 July 1966
3rd	Kulmbach, 15-17 November 1967
4th	Kulmbach, 18-20 June 1969
5th	Bonn, 16-20 November 1970
6th	Kulmbach, 1-5 November 1971
7th	Kulmbach, 25-29 June 1973

Dissolved by the 16th Session of the Commission (1985).

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards and/or descriptive texts and/or codes of practice as may seem appropriate for the classification, description and grading of carcasses and cuts of beef, veal, mutton, lamb and pork.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT HYGIENE (CX-723)

Established as the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene by the 8th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (1971). The terms of reference and the name of the Committee were amended by the 24th Session of the Commission (2001) to include poultry. The specific reference to poultry in the name and terms of reference was removed by the 26th Session of the Commission (2003).

Host Government: New Zealand

Sessions:

1st	London, 10-15 April 1972
2nd	London, 18-22 June 1973
3rd	London, 25-29 November 1974
4th	London, 18-22 May 1981
5th	London, 11-15 October 1982
6th	Rome, 14-18 October 1991
7th	Rome, 29 March - 2 April 1993
8th	Wellington, 18-22 February 2002
9th	Wellington, 17-21 February 2003
10th	Auckland, 16-20 February 2004

11th Christchurch, 14-17 February 2005

Adjourned sine *die.*

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards and/or codes of practice as appropriate for meat hygiene.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PROCESSED MEAT AND POULTRY PRODUCTS (CX-721)

Host Government: Denmark

Sessions:

1st Kulmbach, 4-5 July 1966
2nd Copenhagen, 2-6 October 1967
3rd Copenhagen, 24-28 June 1968
4th Copenhagen, 9-13 June 1969
5th Copenhagen, 23-27 November 1970
6th Copenhagen, 17-21 April 1972
7th Copenhagen, 3-7 December 1973
8th Copenhagen, 10-14 March 1975
9th Copenhagen, 29 November - 3 December 1976
10th Copenhagen, 20-24 November 1978
11th Copenhagen, 22-26 September 1980
12th Copenhagen, 4-8 October 1982
13th Copenhagen, 23-26 October 1984
14th Copenhagen, 12-16 September 1988
15th Copenhagen, 8-12 October 1990

Abolished by the 23rd Session of the Commission (1999).

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for processed meat products, including consumer packaged meat, and for processed poultry meat products.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS (CX-722)

Host Government: Norway

Sessions:

1st	Bergen, 29 August - 2 September 1966
2nd	Bergen, 9-13 October 1967
3rd	Bergen, 7-11 October 1968
4th	Bergen, 29 September - 8 October 1969
5th	Bergen, 5-10 October 1970
6th	Bergen, 4-8 October 1971
7th	Bergen, 2-7 October 1972
8th	Bergen, 1-6 October 1973
9th	Bergen, 30 September - 5 October 1974
10th	Bergen, 29 September - 4 October 1975
11th	Bergen, 27 September - 2 October 1976
12th	Bergen, 3-8 October 1977
13th	Bergen, 7-11 May 1979
14th	Bergen, 5-10 May 1980
15th	Bergen, 3-8 May 1982
16th	Bergen, 7-11 May 1984
17th	Oslo, 5-9 May 1986
18th	Bergen, 2-6 May 1988
19th	Bergen, 11-15 June 1990
20th	Bergen, 1-5 June 1992
21st	Bergen, 2-6 May 1994
22nd	Bergen, 6-10 May 1996
23rd	Bergen, 8-12 June 1998
24th	Ålesund, 5-9 June 2000
25th	Ålesund, 3-7 June 2002
26th	Ålesund, 13-17 October 2003
27th	Cape Town, South Africa, 28 February- 4 March 2005
28th	Beijing, China, 18-22 September 2006

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for fresh, frozen (including quick frozen) or otherwise processed fish, crustaceans and molluscs.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON EDIBLE ICES (CX-724)

Host Government: Sweden

Sessions:

1st	Stockholm, 18-22 February 1974
2nd	Stockholm, 23-27 June 1975
3rd	Stockholm, 11-15 October 1976

Abolished by the 22nd Session of the Commission (1997).

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards as appropriate for all types of edible ices, including mixes and powders used for their manufacture.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON SOUPS AND BROTHS (CX-726)

Host Government: Switzerland

Sessions:

1st	Berne, 3-7 November 1975
2nd	St. Gallen, 7-11 November 1977

Abolished by the 24th Session of the Commission (2001).

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for soups, broths, bouillons and consommés.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON CEREALS, PULSES AND LEGUMES (CX-729)

Host Government: United States of America

Sessions:

1st	Washington, D.C., 24-28 March 1980
2nd	Washington, D.C., 27 April - 1 May 1981
3rd	Washington, D.C., 25-29 October 1982
4th	Washington, D.C., 24-28 September 1984
5th	Washington, D.C., 17-21 March 1986
6th	Washington, D.C., 24-28 October 1988
7th	Washington, D.C., 22-26 October 1990

8th Washington, D.C., 26-30 October 1992
9th Washington, D.C., 31 October - 4 November 1994

Adjourned *sine die*.

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards and/or codes of practice as may be appropriate for cereals, pulses, legumes and their products.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON VEGETABLE PROTEINS (CX-728)

Host Government: Canada

Sessions:

1st Ottawa, 3-7 November 1980
2nd Ottawa, 1-5 March 1983
3rd Ottawa, 6-10 February 1984
4th Havana, 2-6 February 1987
5th Ottawa, 6-10 February 1989

Adjourned *sine die.*

Terms of reference:

To elaborate definitions and worldwide standards for vegetable protein products deriving from any member of the plant kingdom as they come into use for human consumption, and to elaborate guidelines on utilization of such vegetable protein products in the food supply system, on nutritional requirements and safety, on labelling and on other aspects as may seem appropriate.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (CX-731)

Established by the 17th Session of the Commission (1987) as the Codex Committee on Tropical Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. Its name and Terms of Reference were amended by the 21st Session of the Commission (1995).

Host Government: Mexico

Sessions:

1st Mexico City, 6-10 June 1988
2nd Mexico City, 5-9 March 1990
3rd Mexico City, 23-27 September 1991

4th	Mexico City, 1-5 February 1993
5th	Mexico City, 5-9 September 1994
6th	Mexico City, 29 January - 2 February 1996
7th	Mexico City, 8-12 September 1997
8th	Mexico City, 1-5 March 1999
9th	Mexico City, 9-13 October 2000
10th	Mexico City, 10-14 June 2002
11th	Mexico City, 8-12 September 2003
12th	Mexico City, 16-20 May 2005
13th	Mexico City, 25-29 September 2006

Terms of Reference:

(a) to elaborate worldwide standards and codes of practice as may be appropriate for fresh fruits and vegetables;

(b) to consult with the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards in the elaboration of worldwide standards and codes of practice with particular regard to ensuring that there is no duplication of standards or codes of practice and that they follow the same broad format[47];

(c) to consult, as necessary, with other international organizations which are active in the area of standardization of fresh fruits and vegetables.

---

[47] The Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe:

1. may recommend that a worldwide Codex standard for fresh fruits and vegetables should be elaborated and submit its recommendation either to the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for consideration or to the Commission for approval;

2. may prepare "proposed draft standards" for fresh fruits or vegetables at the request of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables or of the Commission for distribution by the Codex Secretariat at Step 3 of the Codex Procedure, and for further action by the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables;

3. may wish to consider "proposed draft standards" and "draft standards" for fresh fruits and vegetables and transmit comments on them to the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables at Steps 3 and 6 of the Codex Procedure; and

4. may perform specific tasks in relation to the elaboration of standards for fresh fruits and vegetables at the request of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

Codex "proposed draft standards" and "draft standards" for fresh fruits and vegetables at Steps 3 and 6 of the Codex Procedure should be submitted to the UN/ECE Secretariat for obtaining comments.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS (CX-703)

Host Government: New Zealand

Sessions:

1st	Rome, 28 November - 2 December 1994
2nd	Rome, 27-31 May 1996
3rd	Montevideo (Uruguay), 18-22 May 1998
4th	Wellington, 28 February - 3 March 2000
5th	Wellington, 8-12 April 2002
6th	Auckland, 26-30 April 2004
7th	Queenstown, 27 March – 1 April 2006

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards, codes and related texts for milk and milk products.

CODEX COMMITTEE ON NATURAL MINERAL WATERS (CX-719)

The Committee was established by the Commission as a Regional (European) Codex Committee, but has since been allocated the task of elaborating worldwide standards for natural mineral waters and bottled (packaged) water other than natural mineral water.

Host Government: Switzerland

Sessions:

1st	Baden, Aargau, 24-25 February 1966
2nd	Montreux, 6-7 July 1967
3rd	Bad Ragaz, - 9 May 1968
4th	Vienna, 12-13 June 1972
5th	Thun, 3-5 October 1996
6th	Berne, 19-21 November 1998
7th	Fribourg, 30 October – 1 November 2000

Terms of reference:

To elaborate regional standards for natural mineral waters.

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON FRUIT AND VEGETABLE JUICES (CX-801)

Host Government: Brazil

Sessions:

1st	Brasilia, 18-22 September 2000
2nd	Rio de Janeiro, 23-26 April 2002
3rd	Salvador (Bahia), 6-10 May 2003
4th	Fortaleza, 11-15 October 2004

Dissolved by the 28th Session of the Commission (2005) upon completion of its mandate.

Terms of Reference:

The *ad hoc* Task Force shall:

(a) revise and consolidate the existing Codex standards and guidelines for fruit and vegetable juices and related products, giving preference to general standards;

(b) revise and up-date the methods of analysis and sampling for these products;

(c) complete its work prior to the 28th Session of the Commission (2005).

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON FOODS DERIVED FROM BIOTECHNOLOGY (CX-802)

Host Government: Japan

Sessions:

1st	Chiba, 14-17 March 2000
2nd	Chiba, 25-29 March 2001
3rd	Yokohama, 4-8 March 2002
4th	Yokohama, 11-14 March 2003
5th	Chiba, 19-23 September 2005
6th	Chiba, 27 November - 1 December 2006
7th	Chiba, 24-28 September 2007

The *ad hoc* Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived from Biotechnology was dissolved by the 26th Session of the Commission (2003) upon completion of its initial mandate. The Task Force was re-established by the 27th Session of the Commission (2004).

Objectives (1999-2003)

To develop standards, guidelines or recommendations, as appropriate, for foods derived from biotechnology or traits introduced into foods by biotechnology, on the basis of scientific evidence, risk analysis and having regard, where appropriate, to other legitimate factors relevant to the health of consumers and the promotion of fair trade practices.

Terms of Reference (1999-2003)

(a) To elaborate standards, guidelines, or other principles, as appropriate, for foods derived from biotechnology;

(b) To coordinate and closely collaborate, as necessary, with appropriate Codex Committees within their mandate as relates to foods derived from biotechnology; and

(c) To take full account of existing work carried out by national authorities, FAO, WHO, other international organizations and other relevant international fora.

Objectives (2004-)

To develop standards, guidelines or recommendations, as appropriate, for foods derived from modern biotechnology or traits introduced into foods by modern biotechnology, on the basis of scientific evidence, risk analysis and having regard, where appropriate, to other legitimate factors relevant to the health of consumers and the promotion of fair practices in the food trade.

Time frame (2004-)

The Task Force shall complete its work within four years. The Task Force should submit a full report in 2009.

Terms of Reference (2004-)

(a) To elaborate standards, guidelines, or other principles, as appropriate, for foods derived from modern biotechnology, taking account, in particular, of the Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods derived from Modern Biotechnology;

(b) To coordinate and closely collaborate, as necessary, with appropriate Codex Committees within their mandate as relates to foods derived from modern biotechnology; and

(c) To take account of existing work carried out by national authorities, FAO, WHO, other international organizations and other relevant international fora.

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANIMAL FEEDING (CX-803)

Host Government: Denmark

Sessions:

1st	Copenhagen, 13-15 June 2000
2nd	Copenhagen, 19-21 March 2001
3rd	Copenhagen, 17-20 June 2002
4th	Copenhagen, 25-28 March 2003
5th	Copenhagen, 17-20 May 2004

Dissolved by the 27th Session of the Commission (2004) upon completion of its mandate.

Objectives

With the aim of ensuring the safety and quality of foods of animal origin, the Task Force should develop guidelines or standards as appropriate on Good Animal Feeding practices.

Terms of Reference

(a) To complete and extend the work already done by relevant Codex Committees on the Draft Code of Practice for Good Animal Feeding.

(b) To address other aspects which are important for food safety, such as problems related to toxic substances, pathogens, microbial resistance, new technologies, storage, control measures, traceability, etc.

(c) To take full account of and collaborate with, as appropriate, work carried out by relevant Codex Committees, and other relevant international bodies, including FAO, WHO, OIE and IPPC.

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE (CX-804)

Host Government: Republic of Korea

Sessions:

1st Seoul, 23-26 October 2007

Objectives

To develop science based guidance, taking full account of its risk analysis principles and the work and standards of other relevant international Organizations, such as FAO, WHO and OIE. The intent of this guidance is to assess the risks to human health associated with the presence in food and feed including aquaculture and the transmission through food and feed of antimicrobial resistant microorganisms and antimicrobial resistance genes and to develop appropriate risk management advice based on that assessment to reduce such risk.

Terms of reference

To develop guidance on methodology and processes for risk assessment, its application to the antimicrobials used in human and veterinary medicine as provided by FAO/WHO through JEMRA, and in close cooperation with OIE, with subsequent consideration of risk management options. In this process work undertaken in this field at national, regional and international levels should be taken into account.

Time frame

The Task Force shall complete its work within four sessions, starting in 2007.

AD HOC CODEX INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON THE PROCESSING AND HANDLING OF QUICK FROZEN FOODS (CX-805)

Host Government: Thailand

Objectives

To finalize the International Code of Practice for the Processing and Handling of Quick Frozen Foods.

Terms of Reference

To resolve all outstanding issues including quality and safety provisions with a view to the advancement of the Code to Step 8.

Time frame

The Task Force shall complete its work within two (2) years, with one (1) Session of the Task Force.

SUBSIDIARY BODIES UNDER RULE XI.1(b)(ii)

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR AFRICA (CX-707)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic location of Africa.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission;

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	Rome, Italy, 24-27 June 1974
2nd	Accra, 15-19 September 1975
3rd	Accra, 26-30 September 1977
4th	Dakar, 3-7 September 1979
5th	Dakar, 25-29 May 1981
6th	Nairobi, 31 October - 5 November 1983
7th	Nairobi, 12-18 February 1985
8th	Cairo, 29 November - 3 December 1988
9th	Cairo, 3-7 December 1990
10th	Abuja, 3-6 November 1992
11th	Abuja, 8-11 May 1995
12th	Harare, 19-22 November 1996
13th	Harare, 3-6 November 1998
14th	Kampala, 27-30 November 2000
15th	Kampala, 26-29 November 2002
16th	Rome, Italy, 25-28 January 2005
17th	Rabat, Morocco, 23-26 January 2007

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR ASIA (CX-727)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic location of Asia.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission;

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	New Delhi, 10-16 January 1977
2nd	Manila, 20-26 March 1979
3rd	Colombo, 2-8 February 1982
4th	Phetchburi, 28 February - 5 March 1984
5th	Yogyakarta, 8-14 April 1986
6th	Denpasar, 26 January - 1 February 1988
7th	Chiang-Mai, 5-12 February 1990
8th	Kuala Lumpur, 27-31 January 1992
9th	Beijing, 24-27 May 1994
10th	Tokyo, 5-8 March 1996
11th	Chiang Rai, 16-19 December 1997
12th	Chaing-Mai, 23-26 November 1999
13th	Kuala Lumpur, 17-20 September 2002
14th	Jeju, 7-10 September 2004
15th	Seoul, 21-24 November 2006

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE (CX-706)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic location of Europe, including Israel, Turkey and the Russian Federation.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission;

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	Berne, 1-2 July 1965
2nd	Rome, 20 October 1965
3rd	Vienna, 24-27 May 1966
4th	Rome, 8 November 1966
5th	Vienna, 6-8 September 1967
6th	Vienna, 4-8 November 1968
7th	Vienna, 7-10 October 1969
8th	Vienna, 27-29 October 1971
9th	Vienna, 14-16 June 1972
10th	Vienna, 13-17 June 1977
11th	Innsbruck, 28 May - 1 June 1979
12th	Innsbruck, 16-20 March 1981
13th	Innsbruck, 27 September - 1 October 1982
14th	Thun, 4-8 June 1984
15th	Thun, 16-20 June 1986
16th	Vienna, 27 June - 1 July 1988

17th	Vienna, 28 May - 1 June 1990
18th	Stockholm, 11-15 May 1992
19th	Stockholm, 16-20 May 1994
20th	Uppsala, 23-26 April 1996
21st	Madrid, 5-8 May 1998
22nd	Madrid, 3-6 October 2000
23rd	Bratislava, 10-13 September 2002
24th	Bratislava, 20-23 September 2004
25th	Vilnius, Lithuania, 15-18 January 2007

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (CX-725)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic location of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission;

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	Rome, 25-26 March 1976
2nd	Montevideo, 9-15 December 1980
3rd	Havana, 27 March - 2 April 1984
4th	Havana, 17-22 April 1985
5th	Havana, 11-16 February 1987
6th	San José, 20-24 February 1989
7th	San José, 1-10 July 1991
8th	Brasília, 16-20 March 1993
9th	Brasília, 3-7 April 1995
10th	Montevideo, 25-28 February 1997
11th	Montevideo, 8-11 December 1998
12th	Santo Domingo, 13-16 February 2001
13th	Santo Domingo, 9-13 December 2002
14th	Buenos Aires, 29 November - 3 December 2004
15th	Mar del Plata, 13-17 November 2006

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE NEAR EAST (CX-734)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO that are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, within the geographic locations of the Near East as defined by FAO or the Eastern Mediterranean by WHO.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission;

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	Cairo, 29 January - 1 February 2001
2nd	Cairo, 20-23 January 2003
3rd	Amman, 7-10 March 2005
4rth	Amman, 26 February -1 March 2007

FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR NORTH AMERICA AND THE SOUTH WEST PACIFIC (CX-732)

Membership:

Membership of the Committee is open to all Member Nations and Associate Members of FAO and/or WHO which are members of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, with the geographic locations of North America and the South West Pacific.

Terms of reference:

(a) defines the problems and needs of the region concerning food standards and food control;

(b) promotes within the Committee contacts for the mutual exchange of information on proposed regulatory initiatives and problems arising from food control and stimulates the strengthening of food control infrastructures;

(c) recommends to the Commission the development of worldwide standards for products of interest to the region, including products considered by the Committee to have an international market potential in the future;

(d) develops regional standards for food products moving exclusively or almost exclusively in intra regional trade;

(e) draws the attention of the Commission to any aspects of the Commission's work of particular significance to the region;

(f) promotes coordination of all regional food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations within the region;

(g) exercises a general coordinating role for the region and such other functions as may be entrusted to it by the Commission,

(h) promotes the use of Codex standards and related texts by members.

Sessions:

1st	Honolulu, 30 April - 4 May 1990
2nd	Canberra, 2-6 December 1991
3rd	Vancouver, 31 May - 3 June 1994
4th	Rotorua, 30 April - 3 May 1996
5th	Seattle, 6-9 October 1998
6th	Perth, 5-8 December 2000
7th	Vancouver, 29 October - 1 November 2002
8th	Apia, Samoa, 19-22 October 2004
9th	Apia, Samoa, 10-13 October 2006

OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES

JOINT UNECE/CODEX ALIMENTARIUS GROUPS OF EXPERTS ON STANDARDIZATION[48]

Quick Frozen Foods (CX-705)

Sessions:

1st	Geneva, 6-10 September 1965
2nd	Geneva, 5-9 September 1966
3rd	Rome, 18-22 September 1967
4th	Geneva, 2-6 September 1968
5th	Rome, 22-26 September 1969
6th	Rome, 27-31 July 1970
7th	Geneva, 6-10 December 1971
8th	Geneva, 30 April - 4 May 1973
9th	Rome, 7-11 October 1974
10th	Geneva, 6-10 October 1975
11th	Geneva, 14-18 March 1977
12th	Rome, 30 October - 6 November 1978
13th	Rome, 15-19 September 1980

[48] These Joint UNECE/Codex Alimentarius groups of experts were not subsidiary bodies under any specific rule of the Codex Alimentarius Commission but followed the same procedure as Codex Commodity Committees for the elaboration of Codex standards.

Abolished by the 23rd Session of the Commission (1999). The work of the Joint Group of Experts was transferred to the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (see the Terms of Reference of that Committee).

Terms of reference:

The Joint UNECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods will be responsible for the development of standards for quick frozen foods in accordance with the General Principles of the Codex Alimentarius. The Joint Group will be responsible for general considerations, definitions, a framework of individual standards for quick frozen food products and for the actual elaboration of standards for quick frozen food products not specifically allotted by the Commission to another Codex Committee, such as Fish and Fishery Products, Meat, Processed Meat and Poultry Products. Standards drawn up by Codex commodity committees for quick frozen foods should be in accordance with the general standard laid down by the Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on the Standardization of Quick Frozen Foods and should, at an appropriate stage, be referred to it for coordination purposes.

Fruit Juices (CX-704)

Sessions:

1st	Geneva, 6-10 April 1964
2nd	Geneva, 29 March - 2 April 1965
3rd	Geneva, 21-25 February 1966
4th	Geneva, 10-14 April 1967
5th	Rome, 25-29 March 1968
6th	Geneva, 27-31 October 1969
7th	Rome, 20-24 July 1970
8th	Geneva, 8-12 March 1971
9th	Rome, 20-24 March 1972
10th	Geneva, 16-20 July 1973
11th	Rome, 14-18 October 1974
12th	Geneva, 19-23 July 1976
13th	Geneva, 26-30 June 1978
14th	Geneva, 9-13 June 1980
15th	Rome, 8-12 February 1982
16th	Geneva, 30 April - 4 May 1984
17th	Rome, 26-30 May 1986
18th	Geneva, 16-20 May 1988

19th Rome, 12-16 November 1990

Abolished by the 23rd Session of the Commission (1999). The work of the Joint Group was transferred to the Codex *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Fruit Juices.

Terms of reference:

To elaborate worldwide standards for fruit juices, concentrated fruit juices and nectars.

JOINT CODEX/IOOC MEETING ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF TABLE OLIVES[49]

Sessions:

1st Madrid, 13-16 December 1971
2nd Madrid, 24-27 April 1973

As approved by the 18th Session of the Commission, the Joint Codex/IOOC meeting was held on an ad hoc basis in order to elaborate a Standard for Table Olives.

[49] The meeting was not a subsidiary body under any specific rule of the Codex Alimentarius Commission but followed the same procedure as Codex Commodity Committees for the elaboration of Codex standards.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

(AS OF 30 OCTOBER 2007)

MEMBER COUNTRIES

Africa

1. Angola
2. Benin
3. Botswana
4. Burkina Faso
5. Burundi
6. Cameroon
7. Cape Verde
8. Central African Republic
9. Chad
10. Congo
11. Côte d'Ivoire
12. Democratic Republic of the Congo
13. Equatorial Guinea
14. Eritrea
15. Ethiopia
16. Gabon
17. Gambia
18. Ghana
19. Guinea
20. Guinea-Bissau
21. Kenya
22. Lesotho
23. Liberia
24. Madagascar
25. Malawi
26. Mali
27. Mauritania
28. Mauritius
29. Morocco
30. Mozambique
31. Namibia
32. Niger
33. Nigeria
34. Rwanda
35. Senegal
36. Seychelles
37. Sierra Leone
38. South Africa
39. Swaziland
40. Togo
41. Uganda
42. United Republic of Tanzania
43. Zambia
44. Zimbabwe

Asia

45. Afghanistan
46. Bangladesh
47. Brunei Darussalam
48. Bhutan
49. Cambodia
50. China
51. Democratic People's Republic of Korea
52. India
53. Indonesia
54. Japan
55. Lao People's Democratic Republic
56. Malaysia
57. Mongolia
58. Myanmar
59. Nepal
60. Pakistan

61. Philippines
62. Republic of Korea
63. Singapore
64. Sri Lanka
65. Thailand
66. Viet Nam

Europe

67. Albania
68. Armenia
69. Austria
70. Belarus
71. Belgium
72. Bosnia and Herzegovina
73. Bulgaria
74. Croatia
75. Cyprus
76. Czech Republic
77. Denmark
78. Estonia
79. Finland
80. France
81. Georgia
82. Germany
83. Greece
84. Hungary
85. Iceland
86. Ireland
87. Israel
88. Italy
89. Kazakhstan
90. Kyrgyz Republic
91. Latvia
92. Lithuania
93. Luxembourg
94. Malta
95. Moldova
96. Netherlands
97. Norway
98. Poland
99. Portugal
100. Romania
101. Russian Federation
102. Serbia
103. Slovak Republic
104. Slovenia
105. Spain
106. Sweden
107. Switzerland
108. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
109. Turkey
110. Ukraine
111. United Kingdom
112. Uzbekistan

Member Organization:
European Community

Latin America and the Caribbean

113. Antigua and Barbuda
114. Argentina
115. Bahamas
116. Barbados
117. Belize
118. Bolivia
119. Brazil
120. Chile
121. Colombia
122. Costa Rica
123. Cuba
124. Dominica
125. Dominican Republic
126. Ecuador
127. El Salvador
128. Grenada
129. Guatemala
130. Guyana
131. Haiti
132. Honduras
133. Jamaica
134. Mexico

135. Nicaragua
136. Panama
137. Paraguay
138. Peru
139. Saint Kitts and Nevis
140. Saint Lucia
141. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
142. Suriname
143. Trinidad and Tobago
144. Uruguay
145. Venezuela

Near East

146. Algeria
147. Bahrain
148. Egypt
149. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
150. Iraq
151. Jordan
152. Kuwait
153. Lebanon
154. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
155. Oman
156. Qatar
157. Saudi Arabia
158. Sudan
159. Syrian Arab Republic
160. Tunisia
161. United Arab Emirates
162. Yemen

North America

163. Canada
164. United States of America

South-West Pacific

165. Australia
166. Cook Islands
167. Fiji
168. Kiribati
169. Micronesia, Federated States of
170. New Zealand
171. Papua New Guinea
172. Samoa
173. Solomon Islands
174. Tonga
175. Vanuatu

MEMBER ORGANIZATION

1. European Community

APPENDIX: GENERAL DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION

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[50]

1. The food standards, guidelines and other recommendations of Codex Alimentarius shall be based on the principle of sound scientific analysis and evidence, involving a thorough review of all relevant information, in order that the standards assure the quality and safety of the food supply.

2. When elaborating and deciding upon food standards Codex Alimentarius will have regard, where appropriate, to other legitimate factors relevant for the health protection of consumers and for the promotion of fair practices in food trade.

3. In this regard it is noted that food labelling plays an important role in furthering both of these objectives.

4. When the situation arises that members of Codex agree on the necessary level of protection of public health but hold differing views about other considerations, members may abstain from acceptance of the relevant standard without necessarily preventing the decision by Codex.

Criteria for the Consideration of the Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principle[51]

- when health and safety matters are concerned, the *Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science* and the *Statements of Principle Relating to the Role of Food Safety Risk Assessment* should be followed;
- other legitimate factors relevant for health protection and fair trade practices may be identified in the risk management process, and risk managers should indicate how these factors affect the selection of risk management options and the development of standards, guidelines and related texts;
- consideration of other factors should not affect the scientific basis of risk analysis; in this process, the separation between risk assessment and risk management should be respected, in order to ensure the scientific integrity of the risk assessment;

50 Decision of the 21st Session of the Commission, 1995.

51 Decision of the 24th Session of the Commission, 2001.

- it should be recognized that some legitimate concerns of governments when establishing their national legislation are not generally applicable or relevant worldwide;[52]
- only those other factors which can be accepted on a worldwide basis, or on a regional basis in the case of regional standards and related texts, should be taken into account in the framework of Codex;
- the consideration of specific other factors in the development of risk management recommendations of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies should be clearly documented, including the rationale for their integration, on a case-by-case basis;
- the feasibility of risk management options due to the nature and particular constraints of the production or processing methods, transport and storage, especially in developing countries, may be considered; concerns related to economic interests and trade issues in general should be substantiated by quantifiable data;
- the integration of other legitimate factors in risk management should not create unjustified barriers to trade[53]; particular attention should be given to the impact on developing countries of the inclusion of such other factors.

---

[52] Confusion should be avoided between justification of national measures under the SPS and TBT Agreements and their validity at the international level.

[53] According to the WTO principles, and taking into account the particular provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements.

STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLE RELATING TO THE ROLE OF FOOD SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT[54]

1. Health and safety aspects of Codex decisions and recommendations should be based on a risk assessment, as appropriate to the circumstances.

2. Food safety risk assessment should be soundly based on science, should incorporate the four steps of the risk assessment process, and should be documented in a transparent manner.

3. There should be a functional separation of risk assessment and risk management, while recognizing that some interactions are essential for a pragmatic approach.

4. Risk assessment should use available quantitative information to the greatest extent possible and risk characterizations should be presented in a readily understandable and useful form.

54 Decision of the 22nd Session of the Commission, 1997.

MEASURES TO FACILITATE CONSENSUS[55]

The Codex Alimentarius Commission, desiring that every effort should be made to reach agreement on the adoption or amendment of standards by consensus, recommends the following measures to facilitate consensus:

- Refraining from submitting proposals in the step process where the scientific basis is not well established on current data and, where necessary, carry out further studies in order to clarify controversial issues;
- Providing for thorough discussions and documentation of the issues at meetings of the committees concerned;
- Organizing informal meetings of the parties concerned where disagreements arise, provided that the objectives of any such meetings are clearly defined by the Committee concerned and that participation is open to all interested delegations and observers in order to preserve transparency;
- Redefining, where possible, the scope of the subject matter being considered for the elaboration of standards in order to cut out issues on which consensus could not be reached;
- Providing that matters are not progressed from step to step until all relevant concerns are taken into account and adequate compromises worked out;
- Emphasizing to Committees and their Chairpersons that matters should not be passed on to the Commission until such time as consensus has been achieved at the technical level;
- Facilitating the increased involvement and participation of developing countries.

---

[55] Decision of the 26th Session of the Commission, 2003.

INDEX

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

I

J

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V

W