

# 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](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

Agenda Item 14

FL/47 CRD15

Original Language Only

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

Forty-seventh Session

Gatineau, Canada

15 – 19 May 2023

#### Approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of work of CCFL

(Comments of Burundi, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania)

#### Burundi

##### Issue 1:

The Committee is invited to confirm the need for a prioritization process for CCFL new work proposals and support a prioritization process that should only be applied when there are multiple new work proposals, taking into account the summary of comments in paragraph 7 (CX/FL 23/47/14).

**Comment:** Burundi supports that the prioritisation process should only be applied where there are multiple new work proposals.

**Justification:** The prioritisation process is aimed at identifying the priority work area for the Committee, hence when the work load is low it does not apply. This will ensure effective distribution of resources.

##### Issue 2:

The Committee support using a flexible approach to establish an ad hoc working group, as needed, that could be tasked with discussing, evaluating and prioritizing the new work proposals, and making recommendations to CCFL.

**Comment:** Burundi supports the establishment of an ad hoc working group, where the host secretariat of CCFL, should either chair or co-chair with another member state.

**Justification:** The involvement of the host secretariat in the leadership of the ad hoc working group will enable the host secretariat to administratively run the Committee effectively.

##### Issue 3:

Confirm that the Committee would focus efforts using the framework as presented in Annex I, which provides flexibility on how to apply prioritization criteria specific to CCFL, to help guide discussions and evaluate new work proposals by an ad hoc working group (Option 1).

**General Comment:** Burundi notes that this is acceptable as it is aligned to the previous submission in 1 and 2 above.

##### Issue 4.

Consider the proposal in Annex I of this document on an updated draft approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of new work, taking into account the comments summarized in paragraphs 7 to 10 above.

**General Comment:** Burundi supports the proposed improvements in the approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of work as indicated in Annex 1 of the discussion paper.

### South Africa

#### **Recommendations:**

The Committee is invited to:

(a) re-confirm the need for a prioritization process for CCFL new work proposals and support a prioritization process that should only be applied when there are multiple new work proposals, taking into account the summary of comments in paragraph 7.

- SA still re-confirms the need to develop prioritization process for CCFL new work proposals that should only be applied when there are multiple new work proposals to be considered.

**Rationale:** This would help the committee in prioritizing the new work proposals that would require urgent consideration due to high risk on consumers health or barriers to trade.

(b) support using a flexible approach to establish an ad hoc working group, as needed, that could be tasked with discussing, evaluating and prioritizing the new work proposals, and making recommendations to CCFL.

- South Africa supports the use of a flexible approach to establish an ad hoc electronic working group.

**Rationale:** This could assist with discussions, evaluations, prioritization of the new work proposals and also making recommendations to CCFL.

(c) confirm that the Committee would focus efforts using the framework as presented in Annex I, which provides flexibility on how to apply prioritization criteria specific to CCFL, to help guide discussions and evaluate new work proposals by an ad hoc working group (Option 1).

- South Africa supports the use of the framework as presented in Annex 1.

**Rationale:** The framework as presented in Annex 1 could contribute to providing flexibility when applying prioritization criteria specific to CCFL.

(d) Consider the proposal in Annex I of this document on an updated draft approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of new work, taking into account the comments summarized in paragraphs 7 to 10.

- Supports the proposed amendments in the updated draft approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of new work in Annex 1.

**Rationale:** We are of the opinion that the proposed amendments are appropriate and could make the draft approach and criteria for evaluation and prioritization of new work more effective.

### United Republic of Tanzania

The URT support a flexible approach to establish an ad hoc working group, as needed, that could be tasked with discussing, evaluating and prioritizing the new work proposals, and making recommendations to CCFL.

The URT confirm that the Committee would focus efforts using the framework as presented in Annex I, which provides flexibility on how to apply prioritization criteria specific to CCFL, to help guide discussions and evaluate new work proposals by an ad hoc working group (Option 1).

The URT recommends for consideration of the proposal in annex I with a need of establishing a mechanism for ranking new work proposals