

CODEx ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 4

CRD05

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEx ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Eighty-sixth Session

FAO Headquarters

Rome, Italy

1 – 5 July 2024

CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS OF THE CODEx STRATEGIC PLAN 2026-2031: VISION; MISSION, CORE VALUES; A NARRATIVE ON DRIVERS FOR CHANGE; THE ROLE OF CODEx; HIGH LEVEL DESCRIPTION OF CODEx WAYS OF WORKING

Prepared by the Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

The paper for CCEXEC86 on the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031 (CX/EXEC 24/86/4) reviews the action undertaken to engage with Members and Observers and to seek their views on elements of the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031 that had been agreed by CCEXEC85. These included a Circular Letter issued in January 2024 (CL 2024/10-EXEC) and informal regional consultations facilitated by the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons of CAC and Regional Coordinators. The appendices to the CCEXEC86 paper include a report on the informal consultations and a table of responses to the Circular Letter.

This CRD presents the consultation text agreed by CCEXEC85, annotated with the comments received from Members and Observers. This is intended to support the efficient review by CCEXEC86 of the comments received on draft elements of the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031, and transparently demonstrate that CCEXEC86 will have paid due regard to all comments received when reviewing the text.

The usual conventions are followed, in that proposed additions are underlined and proposed deletions are shown in strike-through. Where there are mutually exclusive proposals on a given point of the text, these are shown in the side bar and the relevant body text is highlighted. The side bar also indicates the origin of the proposals.

Vision

“Where the world comes together to **create science-based food safety and quality standards** to protect **everyone everywhere** using new production, information and communication technologies, and building consumer trust”

There was an overwhelming view from the informal consultations that the vision as set out in the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025 remained appropriate, relevant, and a useful communication tool; Australia, Indonesia, Canada, Thailand, GAFTA, Guatemala, COCEREAL supported this approach in response to CL.

Informal consultations and Zambia proposed “develop”, Uganda proposed “establish”

Zambia

Informal consultations proposed “food and feed standards”; EU, Czechia, Portugal, Norway proposed “food standards”; Portugal proposes “consumer protection standards”

Informal consultations proposed “...to protect consumers, as part of the transition to sustainable food systems”; Zambia proposes “...to protect consumer health”

Peru

Czechia suggested an alternative vision: “Building safer and more sustainable food systems through international food standards”. Benin suggested an alternative vision “A world united to set food safety and quality standards, in order to protect human health”. Finland suggested an alternative vision “Where the world comes together to build safe and sustainable food systems through international food standards”. European Union, Portugal, Norway suggested an alternative vision “Building safer and more sustainable food systems through international food standards”

Mission

“Protect consumer health, enable them to make informed choices, and promote fair practices in the food trade by setting international, science-based food ~~safety and quality~~ standards contributing to sustainable food systems.”

There was an overwhelming view from the informal consultations that the mission as set out in the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025 remained appropriate, relevant, and a useful communication tool. Australia, Indonesia, Thailand, Canada, Guatemala, COCEREAL, GAFTA supported this approach.

United Kingdom

Czechia, Finland, EU, Portugal, Norway

EU, Portugal, Norway

Czechia suggested an alternative mission: “Protect consumer health and promote fair practices in the food trade by setting international, science-based food safety and quality standards contributing to sustainable food systems”. Consumers International suggested an alternative mission “Protect consumer health and promote fair practices in the food trade by setting international, science-based food safety, quality and information standards, based on a systemic One Health approach”

Note to secretariat: ensure the focus and impact of the vision and mission are communicated accurately in the French language version (as noted in informal consultations)

Core values

The Codex Alimentarius Commission re-commits itself to the following core values, which will guide its work to fulfil its strategic vision:

- Inclusiveness
- Collaboration
- Consensus building² ← *Informal consultations*
- Transparency
- Sustainability ← *Egypt*
- Science-based ← *Informal consultations*
- Innovation: embracing cutting-edge technologies, scientific advancements and novel approaches to address emerging food safety challenges ← *Saudi Arabia, Iran*
- Continuous learning and development: prompting consistent development and enhancing understanding and skills among stakeholders, fostering a resilient and sustainable food system for current and future generations ← *Saudi Arabia*
- Non-discrimination or bias towards the core values ← *Iraq*
- Ethical ← *Iran*
- Reliability ← *Iran*
- Altruism ← *Iran*
- Nurturing the next generations ← *Iran*
- Rights-based ← *Consumers International*

There was an overwhelming view from the informal consultations that the core values as set out in the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025 remained appropriate, relevant, and a useful communication tool. Australia, Thailand, Malaysia, Canada, Guatemala, Nepal supported this approach.

² Consensus should be based on the Measures to Facilitate Consensus included in the Procedural Manual

Introduction

The Codex Alimentarius Commission was established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1963. Today it has 188 Member Countries and one Member Organization. In addition, 240 intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations are accredited as Observers.

In general, the informal consultations provided a sense that this sections was balanced and provided a good basis for the work of Codex in coming years. Iran, Nepal supported the current text.

The Commission's statutory purpose³ is the development of international food standards, guidelines and codes of practice in order to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the international food trade.

Uganda

Morocco

With increased globalization and increases in the volumes of food traded internationally, the Commission must also be capable of responding in a timely manner to the impacts of emerging trends and challenges to consumer health protection ~~or~~ or fair practices in the international food trade, to the extent that steps to address those impacts are amenable to standardization.

Australia strongly supported emphasis on timeliness

Morocco

In conducting its work, the Commission takes into account, where appropriate, the relevant policies, strategies and guidelines of FAO and WHO, and of other intergovernmental organizations consistent with fulfilling its unique purpose to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the international food trade through the development of international food standards, based on the scientific advice provided by FAO/WHO joint expert committees and ad hoc consultations. Codex works closely on matters of common interest with such organizations, as appropriate.

Morocco

Peru

³ Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Article 1(a)

Introduction (continued)

[The objective of this strategic plan is to advance deliver the statutory purpose of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. This document does not superseded, extend of contradict the Codex statutory purpose or provisions of the Procedural Manual.]

COCEREAL, IDF/FIL, CropLife International, GAFTA

Australia, Brazil, Guatemala, USA, Japan, Canada, Thailand, New Zealand support inclusion of the bracketed text; EU, Czechia, Finland, Portugal, Norway support deletion pf the bracketed text)

Through the implementation of this strategic plan, it is hoped that significant improvements in global food safety and fair food trade practices can be achieved

Indonesia

Drivers for change

The environment in which Codex operates continues to evolve. Changes in the global feed and food supply chain system, resource optimization efforts, ~~reduction of~~ increased focus on reducing food loss and waste, food security and safety concerns, increased human, animal and plant pest and disease pressure, malnutrition, demographic changes, innovations in food science and technology including their ethical implications, digitalization and AI, mitigating food fraud, climate change, [loss of biodiversity,]

The informal consultations provided a general sense that this section was balanced and provided a good basis for the work of Codex in coming years, and that Codex has a role to address the drivers of change to the extent it can contribute within its statutory purpose. IDF/FIL supported this view, stating that there should be no change in the scope of Codex work as a result

USA

CropLife International, IDF/FIL, Indonesia, GAFTA

Iran

EU, UK, Consumers International, Czechia, Finland, Norway

USA

Some Members from two regions in the informal consultations expressed concerns about the inclusion of a reference to biodiversity loss, which they saw as either outside the statutory purpose of Codex, or having a link to food safety that was tenuous at best. Australia, China, Guatemala, USA, Canada, Costa Rica supported this view in their responses to the CL. Another Member in the informal consultations would support inclusion of a reference to biodiversity loss, if this was explicitly and directly linked to the statutory purpose of Codex. Thailand proposed an initial evaluation of the relevance of biodiversity loss to the purpose of Codex. Other Members in the informal consultations supported the importance of including countering biodiversity loss as a driver of change and suggested that a wealth of evidence already existed on the links between biodiversity and food safety and security. EU, UK, Czechia, Finland, Indonesia, New Zealand, Consumers International, Norway, Iran supported this view in their responses to the CL

Drivers for change (continued)

pollution contamination, and water scarcity,
food price inflation and new market models,
nutrition for sustainable and healthy diets,
climate-smart and environmentally
sustainable food systems, circular and
resource efficient food systems, food systems
innovation and empowerment of
communities, transparency in the food
industry, improving the resilience of the food
supply chain may introduce new opportunities
 and challenges.

*Consumers International**UK, Consumers International**Consumers International**Iran*

Both the FAO and WHO strategic directions on
 food safety acknowledge the importance of
 food control systems, based on principles and
 scientific evidence, in achieving the UN
 Sustainable Development Goals. They also
 recognize the importance of agri-food systems
 in responding to major global drivers ranging
 from environmental changes and digital
 advances to emerging hazards in the food
 chain and the approaches to mitigating these
 challenges, such as food system
 transformation and promotion of the One
 Health approach.⁴ Codex will therefore
continue to work towards supporting
healthier and sustainable food systems by
supporting consumers to make healthy and
sustainable choices.

*Morocco**UK, Consumers International*

The One Health joint plan of action (2022-
2026) of FAO, the UN Environment
Programme (UNEP), WHO and the World
Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH)
quadripartite also highlights the importance
of a One Health approach to food safety and
provides the opportunity for members to
promote the use of and improve the uptake
and impact of Codex standards.

*Canada**USA proposed moving this paragraph from
body text to a footnote*

⁴ FAO Strategic Framework 2022-2031, FAO
 Strategic Priorities for Food Safety within the FAO
 Strategic Framework 2022-2031 and WHO Global
 Strategy for Food Safety 2022-2030

Drivers for change (continued)

The World Trade Organization (WTO) acknowledges the centrality of Codex standard-setting standards, guidelines and codes of practice in the multilateral system in the context of emerging global challenges.

All these initiatives point to the important role food safety plays to support public health, food security and trade and the need to integrate foresight and preparedness for the emerging issues to come. They further highlight that food safety and quality has must play a critical role in the successful transformation of within the agrifood systems in order to meet the needs of the world.

Morocco

USA proposes moving this paragraph from body text to a footnote; Canada suggests that it would be better placed in the introduction. CropLife International suggests the alternative text for this paragraph "Through its global standard setting approach and role as a reference body to the World Trade Organization, Codex supports delivery of the sustainable development goals by supporting farmers in low- and middle-income countries that depend on agriculture for development, by enabling market access in high value markets for their produce; and, by smoothing trade flows supports transfer of food to where it is needed towards enabling sufficient food for all world citizens."

UK, Consumers International

USA

CropLife International, GAFTA

EU

The role of Codex

The informal consultations provided a general sense that this section was balanced and provided a good basis for the work of Codex in coming years, and that Codex has a role to address the drivers of change to the extent it can contribute within its statutory purpose. Australia, Malaysia, FIVS supported this view. Chile and IDF/FIL cautioned that if sustainability considerations were to be included as part of Codex standard setting process itself, this should be in an open, deliberate, transparent and inclusive way and by consensus of its Members. The European Union proposed that the work of Codex should be supportive of the efforts at global, regional and national level on the transformation of food systems and on the application of the One Health Approach and that, accordingly, Codex should gradually integrate the interfaces of agri-food systems and natural ecosystems in its risk analysis framework.

New Zealand acknowledges that if the Codex contribution to these global challenges within our statutory purpose is to be addressed, careful assessment of the issues, and prioritising and resourcing of the work of Codex will be critical to deliver on Codex standards and text, in order to have a significantly positive impact on the ensuring the safe trade of food in the period to 2031. Conversely, Australia and Thailand think Codex should not narrow its top-down strategic priorities to particular standards or certain elements of the drivers for change noted in the strategic plan. Guatemala proposed that Codex should be proactive in its approach to emerging issues, anticipating issues relevant to the work of committees so that challenges caused by drivers of change do not become crises. This was echoed by Singapore, who proposed Codex could prioritise addressing emerging issues and challenges to provide timely guidance to regulators, industry, and consumers.

The role of Codex

The Commission must maintain a steady focus on its statutory purpose. It must be sufficiently capable of being proactive, objective, and flexible and responding in a timely manner to emerging issues that impact ~~on~~ food safety and quality⁵ with the aim of protecting consumer health and ensuring fair practices in the food trade.

Morocco

The system for Codex standards elaboration has served well in the throughout over 60 years that Codex has been in existence.

Uganda

The system is anchored in the process described in the Procedural Manual with the product being Codex standards, guidelines and codes of practice, commonly referred to as Codex texts. The Commission, and its subsidiary committees, as risk manager, establishes develop Codex texts that when incorporated into national legislation by Members contribute to ensuring that food is safe and can be traded and that fair and consistent practices are adhered to. The scientific basis and principles for risk analysis that underpins Codex texts is fundamental to ensuring that Codex maintains its pre-eminence as the international reference for food safety protecting the health of consumers and fair practices in the international food trade, as well as the primary source of risk assessment and science and evidence-based food standards for many countries and recognized by the WTO. This scientific underpinning is provided by the FAO/WHO Scientific Advice Programme and in particular by the work of the expert meetings JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA, and JEMNU.

USA

USA

United Kingdom

United Kingdom, Consumers International

European Union, Portugal

Morocco

Morocco

CropLife International

Australia

⁵ The consideration of other factors in the Codex standard setting process is governed by 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. Consensus should be based on the Measures to Facilitate Consensus included in the Procedural Manual

The role of Codex (continued)

Being a reference for the WTO SPS agreement, in turn, provides for a predictable and reliable dispute settlement framework between countries, favouring harmonization and keeping trade open. This holds special value in the context of an emerging multipolar world with different legal systems at the local-regional level. Indeed, standards harmonization is fundamental to maintaining an open, equitable, and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system

COCERAL
Australia, Japan, COCERAL, Canada, GAFTA, Thailand, Costa Rica support “continue playing a” and USA, Uganda proposes “should continue to play a”, CopLife International suggests “continue having a”. EU, Czechia, Finland, Portugal, Norway, New Zealand, Iran support “strengthen its” as does Guatemala which suggests the alternative “enhance its” as a possible compromise; Indonesia suggests “strengthen and extend its”.

As we move into the future, Codex can [continue playing a/strengthen its] pivotal role in supporting the advancement of global goals by developing international food safety and quality standards based on the most up-to-date science and evidence and addressing the cross-border and jurisdictional challenges that are increasingly emerging.

USA
Canada
European Union suggests “prioritizing the development of international food standards that have a positive impact on the transformation towards sustainable food systems”

Collaboration and coordination with partners across the multilateral system for trade and food, offers Codex and its members numerous benefits, including enhanced food safety, quality and nutrition, strengthened partnerships, effective risk communication, increased credibility, promotion of international food trade, regulatory harmonization, and the ability possibility to address successfully confront complex global challenges.

United Kingdom
In the informal consultations, there was some concern about a possible conflict between focusing on the purpose of Codex while providing an enabling environment for food system transformation. New Zealand considers work should be prioritised and resourced relating to supporting and promoting practices and policies that assist food production to mitigate and adapt to climate change

USA
USA
Morocco
Finland
European Union, Portugal proposed adding “through a One Health approach”; Canada proposes adding “as it related to food and nutrition”

The role of Codex (continued)

Codex texts can provide to an enabling environment which facilitates the uptake and implementation of policies and programmes to address global challenges around areas such as climate change, the fight against hunger and poverty environment, sustainability, and trade. Examples include recent adoption of texts on the safe use and re-used of water in food production, and proposals to consider work related to new foods and production systems and to develop guidance on food safety considerations related to use of recycled packaging materials. In carrying out its mission and developing its texts

Codex recognises that the inherent international diversity of food systems means that, different differentiated values or solutions may be relevant in different national or regional situations or contexts.

USA proposes “Codex texts can contribute to an enabling environment that facilitates”; IDF/FIL, COCERAL, GAFTA proposes “Codex texts provide an environment that promotes food safety by facilitating”; CropLife International proposes “Codex supports innovation by providing an enabling environment for”

Brazil

CropLife International proposes a footnote referencing ‘International Agri-Food Network Position - Codex Alimentarius Contribution to Sustainability in Food and Agricultural Production 2023’, IAFN Coalition for an Enhanced Codex, at <https://t.ly/Vlj7f>

Suggested by USA, in line with proposal from some Members in the informal consultations for examples to demonstrate the important role that Codex is already playing in responding to global issues. Canada supported this approach.

Members in one region in the informal consultation suggested that the role of Codex should go further than creating an “enabling environment” and that a “no harm” principle should be included to ensure, on the basis of available evidence, that Codex standards do not have a negative impact on sustainability and biodiversity. The European Union and Kazakhstan proposed that Codex deprioritize standards that are likely to have a negative indirect impact on environmental or animal health. Another Member in the informal consultation viewed the balance we are trying to strike with the “enabling environment” as a failure, with a more appropriate compromise being the inclusion of language on avoiding setting standards on a hazard or a specific commodity with known negative environmental effects

Benin

The role of Codex (continued)

While advocating for the implementation of Codex texts in a manner that avoids or mitigates negative impacts on sustainability and biodiversity, we recognise that implementation is a matter for national governments.

Proposal made during informal consultations. One Member also suggested the use of an impact assessment tool that helps make countries aware of the possible biodiversity and sustainability impacts for them that might arise from implementation of Codex standards.

A high-level description of Codex ways of working

The Codex Alimentarius Commission re-commits itself to the following goals in its work ways of working, through which it will develop Codex texts ~~that will contribute to~~ achievement of its goals:

Address current, emerging and critical issues in a timely manner and in line with a One Health approach.

The focus and needs of Codex Members are evolving, as is the environment in which Codex operates. Codex will need to be proactive and flexible and to respond in a timely manner to the opportunities and challenges that result, with a focus on developing standards that facilitate trade and more effective, resilient and sustainable food systems, to the extent this does not introduce potential technical barriers to trade, which would exacerbate food insecurity and disadvantage developing countries. Codex will also need to work in line with a One Health approach for the developments of its standards or the coordination of food standards developed by other international organisations.

Informed by evidence and foresight activities, Codex should aim to anticipate critical issues when prioritising issues for standardisation. Codex should prioritise the development of standards that support the transformation towards more sustainable food systems.

There was an overwhelming view in the informal consultations that some or all of the current strategic goals remained relevant in the coming period. Members who supported rolling forward the current strategic goals in some form in the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031 – for examples as appropriate outcomes under a strategic goal relating to excellence in standard setting – variously identified each of the five current strategic goals as being of particular importance. Australia, Canada took the view that referring to these as “ways of working” undervalues their continuing importance.

Canada

European Union, Czechia, Portugal

Informal consultations

European Union, Portugal

Czechia, Norway

Develop standards based on ~~science~~ scientific evidence and Codex risk analysis principles.

Members and those engaged in the food trade who use Codex standards value the strong scientific and evidence base of Codex, and agreed OLFs that underpin agreed standards. Codex must continue to prioritize the securing of independent, timely and high-quality scientific advice to Codex through a fully and sustainably funded resourced program. FAO/WHO Scientific Advice Programme and in particular by the work of the expert meetings JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA, and JEMNU, ready to meet current and future demands for Codex texts.

Globally representative data are needed for scientific advice to be comprehensive and for Codex standards to be relevant to the global food supply. This requires, among other things, capacity building in developing countries that is specific to robust data generation, scientific analysis, and overall increased capacity to conduct such work.

Codex Members and Observers (including the global scientific community), as well as WHO and FAO capacity building programs, all have important roles to play.

Ultimately, the adoption and implementation of Codex standards should be encouraged both by Codex itself and its various stakeholders. Sharing information on the practical benefits to trade facilitation and best practices in implementing Codex texts in national legislation and along the supply chain should be standard practice among members.

CropLife International, who with FIVS and GAFTA support inclusion of this section and the emphasis on sustainable funding for scientific advice. CropLife international also proposes a reference to the Seventy-third World Health Assembly Resolution and its call for ensuring sustainable, predictable, consistent and sufficient resources from WHO and FAO for the provision of timely scientific advice on food safety to the Codex

Alimentarius Commission:

<https://shorturl.at/LRTU1>

CropLife International

United Kingdom, Consumers International

COCERAL

Australia

CropLife International

USA, Peru

CropLife International

Increase impact through the recognition and use of Codex standards

← *Czechia proposed deletion of this heading and the text beneath it*

Communications that drives greater awareness, understanding, ~~and~~ recognition, adoption and use of available, harmonized standards are essential to the effectiveness of Codex. Monitoring the adoption of Codex standards enables assessment of their impact and identification of needs for their review.

← *IDF/FIL, COCERAL*

← *European Union, Portugal*

~~Even in the absence of adoption of Codex standards into national legislation, t~~The greater use of Codex standards by the food trade and other actors can substantially

← *COCERAL*

contribute to consumer health protection and ensuring fair practices in the food trade, even in the absence of adoption of Codex standards into national legislation.

← *IDF/FIL*

Promote effective coordination of all food standards work

When initiated by Members, Codex works closely within its statutory purpose on matters of common interest with other relevant international organizations to avoid duplication and development of contradictory standards by assigning lead organization and considering the individual remits and in order to support the adoption of a One Health approach at international, regional and national level. In particular, Codex should work with observer organizations to strengthen consumer and civil society engagement within Codex processes.

Codex will promote collaboration between FAO, WHO, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to address food security challenges related to the drivers of change, integrating solutions that address human, animal and plant health.

Indonesia

EU, Czechia, Finland, Morocco, Singapore, UK, Indonesia, Consumers International, Thailand, Portugal, Norway, Finland, China, IDF/FIL, GAFTA support inclusion of this section.

Australia, Canada, USA, Japan support deletion of this section. Uganda proposes the alternative of moving this section to "role of Codex". New Zealand supports deletion of the heading but inclusion of the original paragraph that followed at an appropriate place in the text

Informal consultations with science-based observers

Costa Rica

CropLife International; Chile additionally proposed that an effective mechanism could be that the standards, guides or directives developed by Codex continue to refer to other standards or documents from multilateral organizations relevant to each topic

European Union, Portugal

Consumers International; UK highlighted the need for effective mechanisms for the participation of consumers

Guatemala supports inclusion of the text in this paragraph

Facilitate the participation of all Codex Members throughout the standard setting process

Members' abilities to participate actively in the development of Codex texts still varies widely and is dependent on the capacity and sustainability of national Codex systems.

While the responsibility for these systems resides with Members, there is a role for support that will help to close gaps in capabilities. Sources of funding and a broad range of formal and informal capacity building, partnering and technical knowledge sharing activities all play important roles in strengthening the capacity of Members for sustainable, active participation in Codex activities, supporting all Members in maintaining national systems Codex

USA

programmes and expanding the potential for co-hosting of committees and chairing of working groups, consistent with our the

USA

Codex core value of inclusiveness. Host countries are encouraged to actively use technology to increase participation and transparency and reduce negative environmental impact of Codex work practices.

USA

Norway, Czechia

Codex should also support the effective participation of civil society, including consumers and their representatives in the standards setting process

Consumers International

Enhance work management systems and practices that support the efficient and effective achievement of all strategic work plan goals

~~Our~~ Codex ways of working are supported by the continuing review and improvement of

← USA

Codex its work management systems and practices, in which an adequately resourced Codex Secretariat plays a crucial role.

← Finland

Improvements to workflows, proposal prioritisation and input/comment management and effective working outside committee sessions will support participation by Members with significant resource constraints and enhance inclusiveness in the standard-setting process. Horizon-scanning and foresight increase the ability of Codex to be proactive.

← GAFTA, COCERAL

← Consumers International

The Commission recognises that the effective development of Codex texts depends heavily on the resources contributed by host countries of subsidiary bodies and their working groups, particularly their chairpersons and secretariats, and Codex members who support participation of national experts in FAO/WHO joint independent expert committees and ad hoc consultations, and thanks them for their contributions.

← COCERAL, IDF/FIL, CropLife International, GAFTA

Global changes and their impact on the food supply chain

The entry of new high-value foods into the market can create a strong incentive for food fraud. Though food fraud mainly undermines food quality, it can result in a food safety issue if unsafe ingredients or substitutions are added to the food. Extended and complex global food supply chains and food ingredients increase the risk of intentional contamination and pose new challenges for traceability and authenticity of foods.

Rise of new technologies and digital transformation

Nanotechnology applications in the food sector, alternative food proteins, novel plant and animal breeding methods involving genetic editing offer the potential for developing species with new traits, such as disease resistance and drought tolerance. So, they must be fully assessed from a public health point of view before products are placed on the market.

Iran proposed these two new high-level ways of working