



**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
FAO/WHO REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE**

Twenty-eighth Session
Batumi, Georgia, 25-28 September 2012

DRAFT CODEX STRATEGIC PLAN 2014-2019

Compilation of Comments Provided to the 67th Session of the Executive Committee and the 35th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission on the June 2012 Version of the Draft Strategic Plan of the Codex Alimentarius Commission 2014-2019

(Prepared by the Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee)

1. Appendix 1 to this document contains a compilation of the comments provided to the 67th Session of the Executive Committee, and the input of the 35th Session of the Commission. This compilation also indicates how the comments were addressed in preparing the latest version of the Strategic Plan 2014 – 2019.
2. This compilation of comments and the way they were addressed is being provided to the Regional Coordinating Committees for their information and for transparency purposes.

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019

Compilation of Comments²

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>Introduction</p> <p>The Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) was established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1963. Today, it has more than 180 Members, and more than 200 inter-governmental and international non-governmental organizations are accredited as observers. The CAC’s main work is the development of international food standards¹, guidelines, and codes of practice to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade. The CAC also promotes the coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations.</p> <p>For food safety and nutrition matters, the Commission establishes its standards using the principles of risk analysis and bases its work on the scientific advice provided by the FAO and WHO expert committees. Food standards, guidelines and recommendations established by the CAC are recognized as reference points for food under the relevant WTO agreements.</p> <p>The 2014-2019 Strategic Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents the vision, goals, and objectives for the CAC and is supported by a more detailed work plan that includes activities, 	35 CAC	- Emerging issues and climate change should be taken into account as drivers that will influence and shape the future of the food safety agenda;	A new section has been added to identify the drivers for change. See section “Drivers for Change”.
	35 CAC	- The importance of nutrition should be more prominently included in the Strategic Plan, considering that Codex had done well on food safety and could make progress on nutrition quality of food products to respond to the objective of WHO of preventing non-communicable diseases; and	The Codex mandate to “protect the health of consumers” and “fair practices in food trade” is broader than just food safety. Therefore “nutrition” will be incorporated where appropriate to emphasize Codex’s role with respect to nutrition quality and labelling of foods.
	35 CAC	- The plan should not only focus on food safety issues but also address issues related to fair practices in the food trade.	See above.
	35 CAC	- Factors such as emerging risks, food security, effects of shifting population patterns and climate change should be discussed in a general statement that could be inserted after the Strategic Vision.	A new section on “Drivers for Change” has been added after the Introduction section. The introductory text sets the context of the subsequent provisions of the Strategic Plan and inclusion of these factors at this point results in these drivers being applicable where appropriate to all elements of the Strategic Plan.
	United States	- For food safety and nutrition matters, the Commission establishes its standards using the principles of risk analysis and bases its work on the scientific advice provided by the FAO and WHO expert committees.	Revision has been incorporated.

¹ The term “standards” is used to cover standards and all related texts.

² Comments made at the 35th session of Codex Alimentarius Commission and written comments submitted to the commission (CX/CAC 12/35/12 Add. 1) and CRD submitted to the 67th CCEXEC (CX/EXEC 67 CRD5) are reflected as appropriate.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>milestones, and measurable indicators to track progress toward accomplishment of the goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underpins the high priority placed on food safety and quality by FAO and WHO and ensures that the CAC will carry out the responsibilities given to it by FAO and WHO. Informs Members, inter-governmental and international non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders of how the CAC intends to fulfil its mandate and to meet the needs and expectations of its Members during the period 2014-2019. 			
<p>Strategic Vision Statement</p> <p><i>To be the preeminent international food standards-setting body to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade.</i></p>	35 CAC	- The statement should be written as a vision of how Codex is seen in future and not like an objective.	The current wording of the vision statement is consistent with vision statements in other organizations – i.e. an aspired goal.
	35 CAC	- The statement should include the words “Codex Alimentarius Commission” so that it was clear to whom the statement referred;	As the vision statement in the context of the Codex Strategic Plan 2014 – 2019 inclusion of the words “Codex Alimentarius Commission” might be considered redundant.
	35 CAC	- Rather than being the “pre-eminent body” Codex should be the “trusted body” for development of standards;	In this context, “pre-eminent” would imply trust as Codex would be recognized as being “excellent above others” (Oxford definition).
	35 CAC	- Codex should be “the only body” for standard-setting so as to avoid development of private standards, however it was recognised that there were other standard-setting bodies such as ISO;	The mandate of Codex includes “promoting coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and nongovernmental organizations.” (Article 1 of the Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.)
	Costa Rica	Eliminar de la versión al español las palabras “y trabajar” para que sea consistente con la redacción de la versión en inglés y no le cambie el sentido.	The Spanish version will be amended to remove the word “work” to make it consistent with the English version.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
	35 CAC	- The preservation of the environment should be included.	Preservation of the environment is outside of the Codex mandate but the effects on environmental conditions (e.g. contamination, climate change) are identified as drivers in the introduction. Repeating them in the vision statement would be redundant.
	35 CAC	- The words “to protect .” should be changed to “to contribute to the protection ..” since Codex standards are voluntary and do not directly protect consumers if they are not complied with.	While it is true that Codex standards are intended for voluntary use by governments, the statement as worded uses text directly from the Codex mandate.
<p>Codex Core Values</p> <p><i>In fulfilling its strategic vision, Codex adheres to core values that include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - collaboration - inclusiveness - consensus building - transparency <p>In conducting its work, CAC strives at ensuring that the concepts of public health, sound regulatory risk management and fair practise in the food trade are consistently followed in the Codex standard-setting process.</p>	35 CAC	- It was proposed that consideration should be given to the reordering of the key core values and the possible inclusion of other core values, such as the scientific basis of Codex work. However, it was noted that the core values expressed were the key core values and the listing was not meant to exclude other values, which were inherent in the work of Codex.	The list is not intended to reflect any prioritization of the core values. Additionally, it is not all-inclusive as there are other values that also inherent in the work of Codex. Trying to identify all values would be difficult.
	Costa Rica	Eliminar “sin, por ello, limitarse a los mismos”. En esta sección se están enunciando los valores fundamentales del Codex y no debe quedar abierto. Además no entendemos por qué esto se está modificando pues en la 66ª reunión del CCEXE se acordó que solamente se iban a modificar las actividades.	Limiting the list to a few core values would exclude some key values that many members believe are relevant to Codex work (e.g. science-based).
	Papua New Guinea	Under Codex Core Values, I suggest you include "excellence and relevance" to be consistent with the Vision and Mission statements.	While most would agree with these values, as indicated above it is felt that referring to an open list (i.e. includes...) implies that there are others.
<p>Strategic Goals</p> <p><u>Strategic Goal 1:</u> Establish international food standards that address current and emerging food issues.</p>	35 CAC	- Make the goal more explicit to address consumers’ concerns; emerging food safety issues; and feed, as it impacts on food safety; others who commented did not share this view;	In view of the diversification of concerns, it might be difficult to address this on a global basis. However, a new section has been added on “Drivers for Change” acknowledging that consumers have expectations and such expectations may influence positions of Codex members.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
	35 CAC	- Add the notion of acceptability of Codex standards to be in line with the Strategic Vision.	The concept of “acceptability” of Codex standards is implied by countries actually adopting or using such standards. Activity 1.1.4 addresses the use of Codex standards.
	35 CAC	- Include the need for the development of tools to assist with the implementation of the risk-based approach in Codex codes of practice.	This is a valid consideration however the development of tools is more of a capacity building activity related to implementation rather than an element in elaborating a standard.
<p>Objective 1.1: Establish new and review existing Codex standards, based on priorities of the CAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 Apply consistent decision-making and priority-setting criteria across Committees to ensure that the standards and work areas of highest priority are progressed in a timely manner. 1.1.2 Strengthen the critical review process to improve standards monitoring. 1.1.3 1.1.4 <p><i>***Note: 1.1.3 is considered to be a guiding principle that Codex should continue to follow, rather than an activity for the purpose of a strategic plan. Therefore, the intent of this activity has been reflected in the revised section of Codex Core Values.***</i></p>	Japan	<p>Objective 1.1: Establish new and review existing food Codex standards, based on priorities of the CAC.</p> <p><i>Rationale: consistency in usage of terms</i></p>	Revision has been incorporated. See revised Objective 1.1.
	Argentina	<p>Activity 1.1.4. It should read:</p> <p>1.1.4. Promotion of the use of Codex standards in the international trade and the basis the consistency of domestic regulations with Codex standards.</p>	<p>Use of Codex standards by member governments will result in consistency. The focus of this activity is to promote/encourage the use of Codex standards. Consistency would be a result of that use.</p> <p>This activity has been removed from this section and has been incorporated with revised activity 1.2.1. It was determined that this activity overlapped various other activities especially the newly added activity 1.2.3 and 1.3.2</p>
	Japan	<p>1.1.3 Incorporate-Ensure that the concepts of public health, sound regulatory frameworks, and fair trade practices are incorporated into Codex standards development.</p> <p><i>Rationale: protection of consumer health, sound regulatory frameworks, and fair trade practices are the purpose of Codex.</i></p>	As indicated in the rationale of this comment, the concepts identified in this activity are considered as a guiding principle that Codex should continue to follow. Therefore, this activity has been removed from the strategic plan and has been incorporated under the section Codex Core Values. Changes have been incorporated. See revised section Codex Core Values.
	Costa Rica	<p>1.1.3 Se propone modificar la redacción de manera que se invierta el sentido y se entienda que los marcos regulatorios de los países deben basarse en las normas del Codex tal y como lo establecen los acuerdos de OTC y MSF. Pues</p>	<p>The intent of this comment is unclear; is it applicable to 1.1.3 or is it in regards to 1.1.4? Complications with effective food control due to fragmented legislation and multiple jurisdictions are valid concerns. Ultimately it is the national</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>con la redacción actual está a la inversa dando a entender que las normas del Codex deben basarse en los marcos regulatorios de los países perteneciendo a la esfera de los gobiernos y que no tiene relación directa con el objetivo acordado.</p> <p>Es oportuno mencionar que en el Plan Estratégico del Codex 2008-2013, se brinda el mismo enfoque que tratamos de defender en esta oportunidad y cita en el párrafo 7:</p> <p><i>“7. En muchos países, el control efectivo de los alimentos se ve dificultado por la existencia de una legislación fragmentada, jurisdicciones múltiples y deficiencias en la vigilancia, la supervisión y la aplicación reglamentaria. La adopción de sistemas racionales de control y reglamentación de los alimentos a nivel nacional es esencial para garantizar la salud y la seguridad de la población del país y asegurar la inocuidad y calidad de los alimentos que son objeto de comercio internacional. La FAO y la OMS han logrado avances importantes en la promoción de marcos reglamentarios racionales a nivel nacional. A la vez que alienta a los miembros a utilizar las normas del Codex pertinentes, la Comisión exhorta con firmeza a la FAO y la OMS a fomentar sistemas nacionales de reglamentación que se basen en principios y directrices internacionales y abarquen todos los componentes de la cadena alimentaria...”</i></p>	<p>government that would need to take measures to rectify such situations but application of Codex standards would facilitate this process.</p>
<p><u>Objective 1.2:</u> Proactively identify emerging issues and member country needs and, where appropriate, develop relevant food standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Activities:</u> 	<p>CAC 35</p>	<p>Comment for Objective 4.1 stated <i>“It was suggested that a mechanism to measure the degree of uptake of Codex standards into national legislation could be added as an activity.”</i></p>	<p>Activity 1.2.3 has been added to reflect comments from CAC 35 with respect to developing a mechanism to measure the degree of uptake of Codex standards into national legislations. Also see Objective 4.1.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>1.2.1 Develop a process for proactively identifying emerging issues related to food safety and nutrition.</p> <p>1.2.2 Develop and revise international and regional standards as needed, in response to needs identified by Members and in response to factors that affect food safety and fair practices in the foods trade; [for example, emerging risks, food security, effects of shifting population patterns and climate change, and consumers concerns.]</p> <p>[1.2.3 Measure the extent to which Codex standards are adopted by members.]</p>	<p>Japan</p>	<p>Objective 1.2: Proactively identify emerging issues and member country needs and, where appropriate, develop relevant food standards.</p> <p><i>Rationale: Objective 1.2 could focus on initiatives to identify emerging issues and member country needs by deleting the text which is duplication of Objective 1.1.</i></p>	<p>This is the text agreed to by the Executive Committee.</p>
	<p>European Union</p>	<p>1.2.1: Develop a process for Pay particular attention to the early identification of the need for new standards, guidelines, and recommendations, particularly with respect to emerging food safety risks, unfair practices in food trade and the development of new technologies".</p>	<p>During the analysis of the current process, it can be determined that new process is not necessary and the processes in place could be strengthened.</p> <p>Comment regarding removal of guidelines and recommendations has been addressed. See revised option for 1.2.1.</p>
	<p>Argentina</p>	<p>Objective 1.2. Activity 1.2.2</p> <p>The evaluation of the mechanisms and procedures for the establishment of standards, to ensure that they take into consideration the latest scientific and technological advances.</p> <p>The intention of this paragraph is not clear, since Codex considers the technological and scientific advances in its proceedings. However, when there is an intention to modify the mechanisms and procedures for the establishment of standards, it is possible that a criterion of continuous improvement in the adoption of standards may be also introduced, which supposes the continuing revision of the standards to adapt them to the new developments or new products present in the markets, often associated with patents.</p> <p>Argentina disagrees with this form of work, considering that Codex represents the effort of more than 180 countries in the world. In view of this, we believe that Codex should focus on</p>	<p>The examples of “drivers” that influence Codex work have been removed and included in a new section. See section “Drivers for Change”.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>guaranteeing the safety of products, no matter if they are new or well-known, taking into consideration the technical and scientific information available; not to eliminate substances or compounds which continue being safe and secure, but to include new ones.</p>	
	Costa Rica	<p>1.2.2 Se solicita la revisión de esta actividad y Costa Rica sugiere agregar al final “tomando en consideración las necesidades de los países en desarrollo”.</p> <p>Es importante añadir la frase citada anteriormente porque se debe fomentar el avance tecnológico y científico en el Codex pero sin dejar de lado la situación y necesidades de los países en desarrollo. En la última viñeta del Plan Estratégico del Codex 2008-2013 del párrafo 6 se reafirma:</p> <p><i>“Al elaborar normas y textos afines del Codex y tomar decisiones al respecto, la CAC debe tomar en cuenta las consecuencias técnicas y económicas para todos los miembros, así como las necesidades especiales de los países en desarrollo por lo que respecta a la infraestructura, los recursos y la capacidad técnica y jurídica. Las normas y textos afines del Codex no deben tener por efecto la creación de obstáculos innecesarios, injustificados o discriminatorios a las exportaciones de los países en desarrollo”</i></p>	<p>1.2.2 has been deleted and the reference to new technologies has been incorporated into 1.2.3 which has been renumbered.</p>
	Argentina	<p>1.2.3: We believe that the “effect” of the climate change should be included as a factor that affects food safety. For this reason, we suggest to include the word “effect” in this wording.</p> <p>As regards consumers concerns, they should be addressed as long as they meet the conditions established in "The first Statement of Principle</p>	<p>Revision has been incorporated. See section “Drivers for Change”</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making Process and the Extent to Which Other Factors are Taken into Account".	
	Costa Rica	<p>1.2.3 Costa Rica sugiere eliminar los ejemplos del Plan Estratégico y redactar las actividades de manera objetiva sugiriendo la actividad de la siguiente forma:</p> <p><i>1.2.3. Elaboración y revisión de las normas internacionales y regionales que se requieran para satisfacer las necesidades determinadas por los miembros y responder ante factores que afecten a la inocuidad de los alimentos y las prácticas equitativas en el comercio de alimentos.</i></p>	Section 1.2.3 (renumbered as Section 1.2.2) has been revised. Specific examples have been removed. See revised Section 1.2.2.
	United States	1.2.1 Develop a process for the early identification of the need for new standards, guidelines, and recommendations, particularly with respect to emerging food safety and nutrition risks and new technologies.	1.2.1 has been revised to focus on the need for a process for the proactive identification of emerging issues and the reference to food safety and new technologies has been deleted as per discussions at the 67 th CCEXEC.
	Japan	<p>1.2.1 Develop a process for the early identification of the need for new standards, guidelines, and recommendations, particularly with respect to emerging food safety risks and new technologies.</p> <p><i>Rationale: the term “standards” is used to cover standards and all related texts in this document.</i></p>	See above.
	Japan	<p>1.2.3 Develop and revise international and regional standards as needed in response to Identify emerging issues and needs identified by of Members related and in response to factors that affect food safety and fair practices in the foods trade; for example, emerging risks, food security, shifting population patterns, climate change, and consumers concerns.</p> <p><i>Rationale: to place focus on initiatives to identify</i></p>	1.2.3 (renumbered to 1.2.2) has been revised to address emerging issues. The examples have been moved to a new section “Drivers for Change”.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		emerging issues and member country needs	
	Malaysia	<p>1.2.3 Develop and revise international and regional standards as needed in response to needs identified by Members and in response to factors that affect food safety and fair practices in the foods trade; for example, emerging risks and food security. shifting population patterns, climate change, and consumers concerns.</p> <p><i>Malaysia has some concerns with regard to inclusion of social issues such as shifting population patterns and climate change into the work of Codex.</i></p> <p><i>It is in our view that in its standard setting, Codex should only focus on issues that are directly related to its mandate and objectives that are protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair trade practices. Therefore, we propose deleting those last two items.</i></p>	See above. Revisions have been incorporated.
<p><u>Objective 1.3:</u> Strengthen coordination and cooperation with other international standards-setting organizations seeking to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Activities:</u> <p>Or</p> <p>[1.3.1 Promote collaboration in standards development in Codex with the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on standards that cover the farm to fork continuum and affect Codex and those organizations, through utilization of consistent methodologies and approaches in their development.]</p>	Malaysia	<p>Objective 1.3: Strengthen coordination and cooperation with other international <u>intergovernmental</u> standards-setting organizations seeking to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize opportunities.</p> <p><i>Malaysia acknowledges the fact that currently issues of food safety involves various organizations and thus, the need for closer collaboration with these organizations to increase efficiency on issues of common interest. However, we are of the opinion that coordination and cooperation should be only with international intergovernmental standards-setting organizations so as to ensure impartiality.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the mission, priorities and procedures with regard to inclusiveness and transparency of other international standard-</i></p>	There are a number of nongovernmental organizations that are also involved in setting food standards (e.g. ISO, IAEA). The mandate of Codex includes “promoting coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and nongovernmental organizations.” (Article 1 of the Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.)

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>1.3.2 Promote cooperative programs with other international governmental and non-governmental standards-setting organizations to identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</p> <p>***NOTE: Option 2 for 1.3.1 is being proposed as it is considered to be more focused and assertive, while still addressing the need to ensure that standards cover the entire farm to fork continuum.***</p>		<p><i>setting organizations are different from Codex.</i></p> <p><i>Malaysia also considers that the term of reference of each organization is clear and that there is no duplication of work. Hence, we propose deleting the final part of the sentence with regard to this matter.</i></p>	
	<p>Malaysia</p>	<p>1.3.1 Seek to enhance a culture of standards development with the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) that ensures all potential food safety risks and other consumer concerns are addressed from farm to fork, utilizing consistent methodologies and approaches in their development.</p> <p><i>We are not entirely clear on the intent and meaning of Activity 1.3.1. If it is to emphasize on developing standards of common interest with the OIE and IPPC, we feel that Activity 1.3.2 is suffice and provides a clearer mode of action. It would be good to ensure that activities laid down in the Strategic Plan are concise to avoid difficulties in assigning measurable indicators for tracking the progress of the activities.</i></p>	<p>Two potential options available for Activity 1.3.1. Option 1 is about promoting a culture of collaboration while option 2 is about promoting collaboration. Option 1 is considered to be broad for context of this strategic plan; while option 2 is more focused and assertive. Both options address the need to ensure that standards cover the entire farm to fork continuum. Therefore, Option 2 is being recommended due to the clarity and assertiveness it offers.</p> <p>1.3.2 (renumbered from 1.3.3) focusses on cooperation with other bodies aside from OIE and IPPC.</p>
	<p>Costa Rica</p>	<p>1.3.1 No estamos de acuerdo con la redacción propuesta de 1.3.1. pues esta actividad debe señalar sobre coordinación y cooperación y no mencionar aspectos de la granja a la mesa ni preocupaciones de consumidores. Por lo anterior, se considera mejor redacción la que estaba anteriormente:</p> <p><i>“Establecimiento de un mecanismo para la comunicación periódica con la Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal (OIE) y la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria (CIPV) a fin de facilitar la colaboración sobre normas que afecten al Codex</i></p>	<p>See above comment regarding status of revised section 1.3.1.</p> <p>The CCGP working group is mandated to a) develop guidance to better take into account relevant work undertaken by Codex and OIE and b) Identify means to consistently reference each other’s standards and guidance. This comment has been addressed in Activity 1.3.1 as that activity would encompass outcomes of the CCGP working group.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>y a dichas organizaciones.”</i></p> <p>Asimismo, se debe tomar en consideración lo discutido en el CCGP en donde se establece dentro del mandato a los grupos de trabajo establecidos, “70. ...<i>la colaboración en el desarrollo de normas de interés mutuo, respetando los mandatos y procedimientos del Codex Alimentarius y la OIE, e incluyendo un compromiso con un proceso abierto, transparente e inclusivo, el grupo de trabajo propondrá orientación destinada a mejorar los mecanismos para tener en cuenta los trabajos pertinentes que hayan sido realizados o estén en curso de realización por cada una de las organizaciones, e identificará medios para remitir de forma coherente a las normas y directrices de la otra organización, según proceda”.</i></p>	
	35 CAC	<p>- Several delegations expressed concern that the current wording of this objective included cooperation with international non-governmental standard-setting bodies and proposed that cooperation should be limited to intergovernmental standards-setting bodies. It was also proposed to delete the final part of the sentence relating to avoiding duplication of efforts, as it was the Commission’s prerogative to decide on its work programme. Other delegations, however, pointed out the need for cooperation also with other non-governmental bodies, which were already observers in Codex. They noted that private standard-setting organizations were being encouraged to base their standards on Codex and, therefore, cooperation and coordination with them were important. It was pointed out that coordination of all food standards work by international</p>	<p>There are a number of nongovernmental organizations that are also involved in setting food standards (e.g. ISO). The mandate of Codex includes “promoting coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and nongovernmental organizations.” (Article 1 of the Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission).</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		governmental and non-governmental organizations was part of the mandate of Codex.	
	United States	1.3.2 Promote collaboration in standards development with the OIE and IPPC on standards that affect both Codex and those organizations. Rationale: clarity.	See new option for 1.3.1
	Kenya	1.3.2 Promote collaboration in standards development in Codex with the OIE and IPPC on standards that affect Codex and those organizations	Revision has been incorporated. See Option two for revised Section 1.3.1.
	European Union	1.3.2: Promote collaboration in standards development with the OIE, and IPPC and other relevant inter-governmental organisations on standards that affect Codex and those organisations.	Importance of promoting collaboration with other inter-governmental organization is reflected in revised Objective 1.3 and specifically in revised Activity 1.3.2 (renumbered).
	Japan	1.3.2 Promote collaboration in standards development in Codex with the OIE and IPPC on standards that affect Codex and those organizations.	Changes made in option 2 of section 1.3.1.
	Japan	1.3.3 Promote cooperative programs mechanism with non-governmental standards-setting organizations to identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards. <i>Rationale: to clarify the meaning of the activity</i>	“Programs” would include mechanism. Mechanism would be process focussed, whereas programs tend to be outcome focused. Therefore, “programs” is considered the most appropriate term in this context.
	Kenya	1.3.3. Promote continuous cooperative programs mechanism with non-governmental standards setting organizations to identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.	See comments above regarding use of term mechanism.
	Costa Rica	1.3.2 Estamos de acuerdo	
	United States	1.3.3 Promote cooperative programs with non-governmental standards-setting organizations to	The concept of complementariness and duplicity are already addressed in the strategic objective

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>identify needs for new standards, to assure standards are complementary and not duplicative, and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</p> <p>Rationale: clarify the desired relationship between Codex standards and standards of these other organizations.</p>	1.3. 1.3.3 has been revised by the CCEXEC.
	European Union	<p>1.3.3: Promote cooperative programs with non-governmental standards-setting organizations to further the Codex mandate identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</p>	All Codex committees must operate within the limits set by the Procedural Manual. See revised option 1.3.3 (renumbered as 1.3.2)
	Malaysia	<p>1.3.3 Promote <u>Strengthen</u> cooperative programs with non-governmental other international intergovernmental standards-setting organizations to identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</p> <p><i>Please refer to our comments under Objective 1.3 above.</i></p>	See comments above regarding the Codex mandate.
<p><u>Strategic Goal 2:</u> Ensure the application of risk analysis principles in the development of Codex standards.</p>	Costa Rica	<p>Propuesta de nueva actividad en la meta estratégica 2</p> <p>Proponemos incluir una nueva actividad:</p> <p><i>Implementar en forma permanente cursos virtuales sobre temas relacionados con información científica y los principios de análisis de riesgo.</i></p>	This type of activity would support implementation of activity 3.2.2; therefore, this suggestion would be more appropriately addressed in the work plan.
<p><u>Objective 2.1:</u> Ensure consistent use of scientific advice and risk analysis principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Activities:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1 Use the scientific advice of FAO/WHO expert bodies to the fullest extent possible in food safety and nutrition 	Argentina	<p>Objective 2.1. and its activities</p> <p>It is necessary to clarify which FAO expert body it makes reference to, since it is other than the FAO/WHO expert bodies that provide scientific advice to Codex.</p> <p>Besides, we would like further clarification of point 2.1.2, in relation to the substantive use of</p>	This refers to any of the FAO/WHO expert bodies , not just the “standing” bodies (e.g. JECFA, Jmpr) but also the ad hoc expert bodies established from time to time by FAO/WHO to address specific issues. The intent of the objective is to ensure Codex Committee decisions are appropriate with regards to the scientific advice

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>standards development based on the <i>Working Principles of Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius</i>.</p> <p>2.1.2 Encourage sufficient engagement of scientific and technical expertise of member countries and their representatives in the development of Codex standards.</p> <p>2.1.3 Ensure that all relevant factors are fully considered in exploring risk management measures in the context of Codex standard development.</p> <p>2.1.4 Communicate the risk management decisions to all interested parties.</p>		<p>the scientific and technical expertise of member countries and their representatives in the elaboration of Codex standards. Could you please clarify the purpose of this? Would it serve to the establishment of a participation hierarchy? Would the member countries or their representatives be classified according to their expertise? Since this raises doubts, we don't feel comfortable with its inclusion.</p>	<p>provided.</p> <p>2.1.2 is referring to the representatives of member countries involved in Codex standard-setting work. The focus is not on the “scientific expertise” related to the expert bodies (risk assessment) but more to the members of delegations and those involved at the country level to ensure they have adequate scientific/technical expertise in their role as risk managers.</p>
	United States	<p>2.1.1 Use the scientific advice of FAO/WHO independent expert bodies to the fullest extent possible in food safety and nutrition standards development based on the <i>Working Principles of Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius</i>.</p>	<p>Revision has been incorporated. See revised Section 2.1.1.</p>
	European Union	<p>Add new Activity:</p> <p>2.1.3 Recognise, and use to the fullest, Codex's role as risk manager in the development of international and regional standards, in order to fully take into account factors that affect food safety and fair practices in the food trade, for example, emerging risks, food security, shifting population patterns, climate change and consumer concerns.</p>	<p>A new section has been added to identify the drivers for change. See section “Drivers for Change”.</p>
	European Union	<p>Add new activity 2.1.4:</p> <p>2.1.4 Communicate widely with interested parties, other international standard-setting organisations and the public at large, the rationale behind Codex decisions taken in fulfilment of its mandate to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade.</p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See newly added Activity 2.1.4</p>
<u>Objective 2.2:</u> Achieve sustainable access to	35 CAC	<p>- It was proposed to include in this objective “achieving optimum and sustainable access to</p>	<p>Funding issues related to the FAO/WHO expert bodies fall outside of the Codex mandate.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
scientific advice. • <u>Activities:</u> 2.2.1 Encourage FAO and WHO to allocate sufficient resources for the FAO/WHO expert bodies, in particular JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU. 2.2.2 Encourage continued financial support from Members for the FAO/WHO expert bodies, in particular JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU. 2.2.3 Explore other funding sources for FAO/WHO scientific advice.		scientific advice” and to highlight the importance of securing financial resources for the provision of scientific advice.	However, due to the importance of scientific advice to the standard setting process, it is prudent to identify in the Plan a need for the CAC to be aware of the funding issues and to encourage efforts toward achieving sustainable funding. As FAO and WHO have strict rules with respect to funding sources, there is no need to include a reference to ensuring the independent nature of the scientific advice as those rules would preclude conflict of interest situations.
	Kenya	2.2.3 Explore all sources of funding for FAO/WHO expert bodies support , recognizing the imperative to respect FAO/WHO research priorities in addition to the core funding provided by FAO and WHO.	Revisions have been incorporated as the activity has been modified. See revised section 2.2.3
	Japan	2.2.3 Explore all potential funding sources for FAO/WHO expert bodies, recognizing the imperative to respect FAO/WHO research priorities in addition to the core funding provided by FAO and WHO. <i>Rationale: “all funding” is not clear.</i>	See above.
	European Union	2.2.3: Explore all other funding for FAO/WHO expert bodies, recognizing the imperative to respect FAO/WHO research priorities in addition to the core funding provided by FAO and WHO.	Revisions have been incorporated. See revised section 2.2.3
	Argentina	Objective 2.2 Argentina is concerned about the inclusion of the exploration of forms of funding for the FAO/WHO expert bodies in the Plan.	See above.
	Malaysia	2.2.3 <i>Malaysia is strongly of the opinion that if funding is sourced from private sectors, it must be from a pooled fund (not from single company). Codex should only receive this fund without any reference to any particular company. This should be the policy and mechanism when</i>	See comments above in relation to input for 35 CAC for activity 2.2.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>receiving such fund. Similarly, this fund should be managed impartially and professionally by FAO/WHO to support various research projects and expert assistances.</i></p> <p><i>In order to ensure integrity and impartiality, research projects should not be sponsored exclusively by a single company. Additionally, the fund should be managed transparently and based on research priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Companies should also be made clear on the fact that their financial sources can be used for any type of project deemed necessary by FAO/WHO regardless of its relevance to the interest or nature of the companies.</i></p>	
<p><u>Objective 2.3:</u> Increase scientific input from developing countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Activities:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1 Encourage scientific food safety and nutrition data development capabilities in developing countries to support the provision of data in response to calls from FAO/WHO expert bodies. 2.3.2 Encourage sustained and continuous participation of technical and scientific experts from developing countries in the work of Codex. 2.3.3 Encourage FAO and WHO to support programs aimed at collection and use of data from developing countries. 	<p>35 CAC</p>	<p>- It was proposed that this objective should not be limited to developing countries, but reflects the need for increased scientific input from all countries. It was pointed out that some activities could focus on increased input from developing countries.</p>	<p>Agreed. Scientific input from all members in important and necessary. However, concerns have been expressed with regards to the lack of data received from the developing countries. The focus of this objective is on rectifying that gap.</p>
	<p>United States</p>	<p>2.3.1 Encourage scientific food safety and nutrition data development capabilities in developing countries.</p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See revised Section 2.3.1</p>
	<p>United States</p>	<p>2.3.1(bis) Encourage countries to collect data relevant to their countries and to respond to calls for data from FAO/WHO expert bodies.</p> <p>Rationale: operationalizes 2.3.1.</p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See revised section 2.3.1 which addresses this issue.</p>
	<p>Costa Rica</p>	<p>2.3.3 Se solicita aclarar la eliminación de la siguiente viñeta, Costa Rica apoya su reincorporación:</p> <p><i>Exploración de enfoques, por parte de la FAO y la OMS, con el fin de mejorar la participación de científicos de los países en desarrollo así como el uso de datos procedentes de dichos países.</i></p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See revised section 2.3.1</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
standard setting processes.]		<p>Se propone agregar una actividad: <i>Implementar un mecanismo oficial de reuniones virtuales (a través de videoconferencias), en algunos de los comités del Codex, a manera de Plan Piloto, a fin de favorecer las participaciones de los países que no cuentan con recursos para asistir.</i></p>	<p>arrangement”. Additionally, use of videoconferencing could also be relevant to Strategic Goal 4.1 “Effective and Efficient Work Management Systems and Practices”. Therefore, this suggestion is more appropriately considered in the work plan.</p>
	<p>European Union</p>	<p>3.1.2: Plan, with the involvement of interested Codex Members, the next steps for the Codex Trust Fund, which is due to end in 2015, or a successor initiative, to mitigate resource constraints for full Codex participation by Members.</p>	<p>Statement has been revised. See the revised activity 3.1.2</p>
	<p>Papua New Guinea</p>	<p>Under Strategic Goal 3, Objective 3.1: I suggest you add a new activity - 3.1.4 as follows: "Assist and support member countries develop innovative institutional arrangements to ensure effective participation."</p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See newly added activity 3.1.4. The activity has been re-phrased for the purpose of clarity.</p>
	<p>Japan</p>	<p>3.1.3 Develop a formal mentorship initiative, building on lessons learned from existing informal programs. <i>Rationale: This activity is duplication with Activity 3.2.2</i></p>	<p>This activity 3.1.3 has been deleted. Revisions have been incorporated.</p>
	<p>European Union</p>	<p>3.1.3: Develop guidance for mentoring a formal mentorship initiative, building on lessons learned from existing informal programs.</p>	<p>Activity 3.1.3 has been removed.</p>
	<p>Kenya</p>	<p>Delete Activity 3.1.3: 3.1.3 Develop a formal mentorship initiative, building on lessons learned from existing informal programs. <i>Rationale: it is a repetition of Activity 3.2.2</i></p>	<p>Activity 3.1.3 has been removed.</p>
	<p>Malaysia</p>	<p><i>Malaysia proposes inserting a new Activity 3.1.4 as follows (i.e. point transferred from activity</i></p>	<p>Revisions have been incorporated. See revised Section 3.1.3.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>3.2.5):</p> <p>3.1.4 <u>Expand co-hosting of Committee meetings and work groups to enhance skills of developing country members.</u></p>	
<p><u>Objective 3.2:</u> Promote capacity building programs that assist countries in creating sustainable national Codex structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Activities:</u> 3.2.1 Encourage FAO and WHO to support the creation of sustainable national Codex-related structures. 3.2.2 Promote capacity building programs that assist developing countries in prioritizing their participation in Codex committees and task forces. 3.2.3 Develop guidance for partnership initiatives, building on lessons learned and encourage their use. 3.2.4 Leverage, where practical, the use of Codex meetings as a forum to effectively conduct educational and technical capacity building activities. 3.2.5 Expand co-hosting of Committee meetings and working groups to enhance skills of developing country Members. 	<p>35 CAC</p>	<p>- It was suggested to delete this objective as FAO and WHO, and not Codex, were responsible for capacity building programmes. It was pointed out that should this objective be retained, the purpose needed to be clarified and the activities amended accordingly.</p>	<p>It is recognized that Codex does not undertake capacity building programs. However, capacity building programs are necessary to enhance the ability of members to effectively participate in Codex activities. Therefore, the role of Codex would be to encourage the implementation of such capacity building programs by other organizations (e.g. FAO and WHO) while not undertaking such activities itself.</p>
	<p>Malaysia</p>	<p>Objective 3.2:</p> <p><u>Promote FAO and WHO to continue to undertake capacity building programs that assist countries in creating sustainable national Codex structures.</u></p> <p><i>Malaysia is of the view that programs of capacity building should not be reflected in the Codex Strategic Plan given that 'capacity building' is not in the terms of reference of Codex. It should be recognized that 'capacity building' is a continuous activity under the parent body i.e. FAO/WHO.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, we propose the above amendments.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Focus is on promoting development and implementation of capacity building activities by other organizations (e.g. FAO and WHO) and not by Codex itself. This is reflected in revised section 3.2.1.</p>
	<p>Malaysia</p>	<p>3.2.1 Encourage support for Codex activities by FAO and WHO and member governments through the creation and sustainability of national Codex related structures. FAO and WHO continue to increase capacity building program in developing countries in the creation of national Codex-related structures.</p> <p><i>Malaysia proposes the above amendments in line</i></p>	<p>Change has been incorporated. See revised section 3.2.1.</p>

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<i>with our comments under Objective 3.2 above.</i>	
	Malaysia	<p>3.2.2 Promote FAO and WHO to continue strengthen their capacity building programs that assist developing countries in prioritizing their participation in Codex committees and task forces.</p> <p><i>Malaysia feels that what is more important is for FAO and WHO to assist developing countries in participating in Codex meetings rather than ‘in prioritizing their participation’. It is only by physically participating in Codex meetings can members from developing countries gain the necessary knowledge and experience in Codex matters, so as to be able to plan and develop national Codex structures.</i></p> <p><i>In our view, assisting developing countries in prioritizing their participation in Codex may not be of much use as ‘prioritizing’ merely arranges their participation in order of importance and does not mean that they will or can attend the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, we propose amending Activity 3.2.2 as shown above.</i></p>	<p>Objective 3.1 addresses the needs of increased participation from developing countries in Codex committees and task forces. Specifically, see activities 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.</p> <p>Activity 3.2.2 focuses on the need to promote capacity building programs that assist developing countries prioritize their participation in committees and activities important to them based on their needs.</p>
	Kenya	<p>3.2.3 Encourage the use of mentoring by using countries that have established National Codex Contact points especially from developing countries to mentor least developing countries to bring them up at least at the same level.</p> <p><i>Rationale: We think that mentoring is very important for countries that have recently/just join CAC as a member or those ones who have been there for sometimes but are unable to participate in codex activities effectively.</i></p>	<p>This comment is more appropriately addressed in Objective 3.1 which specifically focuses on increasing effective participation of developing countries in Codex. Activity 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 address the need for partnership initiatives, including co-hosting of Codex meetings. See revised activities 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.</p>
	Malaysia	3.2.3 Encourage the use of mentoring and	Revision has been incorporated.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>cooperative programs.</p> <p><i>Malaysia proposes deleting Activity 3.2.3 as this point is already covered under Activity 3.1.3.</i></p>	
	Malaysia	<p>3.2.4 Promote <u>Encourage</u> the use of FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees as a forum to host educational and technical capacity building activities.</p> <p><i>Malaysia proposes the above amendments in line with our comments under Objective 3.2 above.</i></p>	Revision has been incorporated.
	Malaysia	<p>3.2.5 Expand co-hosting of Committee meetings and Work Groups to enhance skills of developing country Members.</p> <p><i>Malaysia proposes transferring this point to Objective 3.1. (please refer to our comments under new Activity 3.1.4, proposed above).</i></p>	Revision has been incorporated. See revised section 3.1.3
	Japan	<p>3.2.3 Encourage the use of mentoring and cooperative programs.</p> <p><i>Rationale: We think that mentoring is included in cooperative programs.</i></p>	Revision has been incorporated. See revised section 3.2.3
	35 CAC	- There was general agreement with the proposal of the CCEXEC to delete this objective.	Objective 3.3 has been deleted. Revision has been incorporated.
	Papua New Guinea	<p>Under Strategic Goal 3, Objective 3.3:</p> <p>I suggest you add a new activity - 2.3.2 as follows: "Encourage and support member countries to develop simpler and robust methods for use in the field."</p>	Objective 3.3 has been deleted.
	Malaysia	<p>Objective 3.3: Assist in addressing the needs of developing countries by leveraging the work of existing international food safety and food related economic development programs.</p> <p><i>Malaysia proposes deleting the entire Objective 3.3, with specific comments under the 3.3.1.</i></p>	Objective 3.3 has been deleted.

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
	European Union	<p>Delete Objective 3.3: Assist in addressing the needs of developing countries by leveraging the work of existing international food safety and food related economic development programs.</p> <p>Delete Activity 3.3.1: Establish strategic partnerships with relevant organisations with relevant economic development programs to identify opportunities to support the respective mandates of each.</p>	Objective 3.3 has been deleted.
	Malaysia	<p>3.3.1 Establish strategic partnerships with organizations with relevant economic development programs to identify opportunities to support the respective mandates of each.</p> <p><i>It is imperative that Codex maintains its existence as an independent standard-setting body. Codex should also be mindful of the differences in the mission, priorities and procedures with regard to inclusiveness and transparency of the various international development organizations from that of Codex.</i></p>	Objective 3.3 has been deleted.
	Costa Rica	<p>3.3.1. Estamos de acuerdo con la nueva redacción de la actividad 3.3.1.</p> <p>Sin embargo, sugerimos que se reincorpore sin el ejemplo, la segunda que se encontraba anteriormente, la cua es la siguiente:</p> <p><i>Cooperar con las iniciativas regionales de inocuidad de los alimentos para el fortalecimiento de capacidades para apoyar la recopilación de datos útiles para la elaboración de normas Codex.</i></p>	Objective 3.3 has been deleted.
<p><u>Strategic Goal 4:</u> Implement effective and efficient work management systems and practices.</p>			

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>[Objective 4.1: Strive for an effective efficient, transparent, and consensus based standard setting process for the timely adoption of standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Activities:</u> <p>[4.1.1 Periodically review the work processes and procedures used by the CAC and its subsidiary bodies to ensure impediments to standard-setting work are identified and addressed.]</p> <p>4.1.2 Assess benefits and, where cost effective, implement new information technologies to improve, Codex communication, work flow, and management of activities.</p> <p>4.1.3 Assess benefits and, where cost effective, implement new information technologies to improve member participation in committees and working groups.</p> <p>4.1.4 Ensure timely distribution of <u>Committee documents</u> and compiled country comments to Members.</p> <p>4.1.5 Increase the scheduling of Work Group meetings in conjunction with Committee meetings.</p> <p>***Note: A revised 4.1.1 is being proposed as it combines and addresses the activities of the previous 4.1.1 (2 options) and 4.1.2.***</p>	35 CAC	- There was general agreement with objective 4.1. It was proposed to add that the standard-setting process should be “applicable”.	
	European Union	Objective 4.1: Ensure an effective, efficient, transparent, and flexible and consensus based standard setting process for the timely adoption of standards.	Objective 4.1 has been revised. Revisions have been incorporated.
	Malaysia	<p>Objective 4.1: Ensure an effective, efficient, <u>and</u> transparent, and flexible standard setting process for the timely adoption of standards.</p> <p><i>Codex has developed a well structured 8-Step Procedure which allows for adequate flexibility in the setting of standards through the 5/8 accelerated elaboration procedure as well as the possibility of adopting standards at Step 5, with the omission of Steps 6 and 7.</i></p> <p><i>Through the accelerated elaboration procedure, a draft standard can be discussed and finalised within one session of a subsidiary body of the Commission and forwarded for adoption by the earliest Commission. This timeframe is regarded appropriate and should not be further shortened, considering that sufficient time should be allowed for countries to deliberate and have consultations at the national level.</i></p> <p><i>In view of the fact that there is already sufficient ‘flexibility’ in the current procedure for the elaboration of standards, we therefore propose deleting the word ‘flexible’ in Objective 4.1.</i></p>	Objective 4.1 has been revised. Revisions have been incorporated.
	35 CAC	- It was suggested that a mechanism to measure the degree of uptake of Codex standards into national legislation could be added as an activity.	A mechanism measuring the degree of uptake of Codex standards would be an indicator of the usefulness the Codex standards. Such an activity does not fit well into the Strategic Goal 4 but might be more appropriately captured under Objective Goal 1.2. See newly added activity

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
			1.2.3.
	Costa Rica	4.1.1. Agregar lo siguiente: Examen de los procesos de establecimiento de normas del Codex y aplicación de mejoras a fin de asegurar un funcionamiento eficaz y eficiente, así como la aprobación transparente, abierta y oportuna de las normas hasta donde el ámbito del Codex lo permita.	See revised section 4.1.1
	European Union	Delete Activity 4.1.1: Review Codex standards setting processes and implement improvements to ensure efficient and effective operations and timely adoption of standards.	The activity has been modified to reflect review of implementation of Codex standard-setting process rather than amending the current process. See revised section 4.1.1.
	Costa Rica	4.1.2. No se entiende su redacción, se solicita su revisión bajo la luz de lo acordado en el CCGP.	
	Argentina	4.1.2. We are concerned about how the procedures for the adoption of standards would be made more flexible.	Word “flexible” has been removed. See revised section 4.1.2.
	European Union	4.1.2: Explore the reasons for development of flexible processes to address 'roadblocks' in Codex standards setting-procedures.	See the revised two potential options for Activity 4.1.1. Option 2 reflects the need to update the Codex process and procedures to address roadblock. This would not require creating a new decision making process, but rather address the gaps in the current process. See revised 4.1.1 (Option 2)
	Malaysia	4.1.2 Explore development of flexible processes to address roadblocks in Codex standards setting procedures. <i>We propose deleting Activity 4.1.2 in line with our comments under Objective 4.1 above.</i>	Revised options include combining 4.1.1 and 4.1.2
	Malaysia	4.1.3 Assess benefits and, where cost effective, implement new information technologies to improve member participation in committees and work groups, Codex communication, work flow, and management of activities.	This activity does not necessarily require external consultation. The intent of this activity is to ensure Codex is making maximum use of the new information technologies as appropriate (e.g. web based consultation mechanisms).

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>Malaysia regards that much has been achieved since the initiation of the current Codex Strategic Plan (2008-2013) to improve member participation and the overall workings of Codex.</i></p> <p><i>We do not see the need to conduct a cost-benefit analysis as Codex may need to engage external consultants in view of the technicalities of the work. This will of course incur cost.</i></p>	
	United States	<p>4.1.4 Ensure timely distribution of Committee documents and compiled country comments to Members.</p> <p><i>Rationale: Timely distribution of Committee documents is equally important.</i></p>	Revision has been incorporated. See revised section 4.1.4
	Costa Rica	4.1.4. Se apoya su redacción.	
	Argentina	<p>4.1.4. We believe it fundamental to establish that Codex documents should be made available at least 2 months before the sessions, since not doing so affects primarily developing countries, which have limited resources to respond to Codex demands. We believe that there are certain issues that should be ensured.</p>	Agreed. Rule VII.7 states that documents should be circulated at least 2 months prior to the session at which they are to be discussed. This rule will continue to apply for all Codex meetings.
	Costa Rica	<p>4.1.5. Costa Rica no está de acuerdo con el aumento de las reuniones los grupos de trabajo físico, solicitamos que se propicie el uso de nuevas tecnologías y que se minimicen las reuniones de grupos de trabajo presenciales.</p> <p>Costa Rica solicita vehementemente que se incluya una nueva actividad que establezca:</p> <p><i>Implementar iniciativas que mejoren la distribución oportuna de los documentos del Codex en los idiomas oficiales.</i></p>	<p>See new activity 4.1.4</p> <p>Additionally, Rule VII.7 states that documents should be circulated at least 2 months prior to the session at which they are to be discussed. This rule will continue to apply for all Codex meetings.</p>
<u>Objective 4.2:</u> Enhance capacity to arrive at consensus in standards setting.	35 CAC	- Some delegations were of the opinion that this objective should be deleted as there was already sufficient guidance in the Procedural Manual on	The purpose of this objective and its related activities is to improve ability of the Chairpersons and members to successfully implement the

Draft Plan - Draft REP12/EXEC2 - Appendix II	Member/Organization	Comment	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Activities:</u> 4.2.1 Improve the knowledge and skills of Codex delegates of Codex guidelines respecting consensus building. 4.2.2 Improve the skills of Committee and Working Group Chairs.] 		how to achieve consensus.	guidance in the Procedure manual on achieving consensus.
	35 CAC	- Other delegations were of the view that it should be retained as it was important to improve the skills of committee members and chairpersons on how to achieve consensus.	See above.
	35 CAC	- It was also mentioned that it was important to improve the capacity of Codex to address roadblocks and consensus building in working groups.	Revisions have been incorporated. See revised version of section 4.1.1 and 4.1.2
	Malaysia	<p>Objective 4.2: Enhance capacity to arrive at consensus in standards setting.</p> <p>Malaysia proposes deleting the entire Objective 4.2.</p> <p><i>We do not see the need to have Objective 4.2 in this Strategic Plan as there are already guidelines in the Procedural Manual to facilitate consensus.</i></p>	The purpose of this objective and its related activities is to improve ability of the Chairpersons and members to successfully implement the guidance in the Procedure manual on achieving consensus.
	Malaysia	<p>4.2.1 Improve the knowledge and skills of Codex delegates to ensure that the standards setting process operates effectively and efficiently and is well managed.</p> <p><i>We are of the opinion that this point is already covered under Activity 3.1.3.</i></p>	Focus of activity 4.2.1 is on enhancing skills of Chairpersons and committee members to reach consensus. Meanwhile, activity 3.1.3 focuses more on improving standard setting Procedures.
Malaysia	<p>4.2.2 Improve the skills of Committee and Working Group Chairs.</p> <p><i>We do not see the need to have Objective 4.2 in this Strategic Plan as there are already guidelines for chairpersons in the Procedural Manual.</i></p>	The purpose of this objective and its related activities is to improve ability of the Chairpersons and members to successfully implement the guidance in the Procedure manual on achieving consensus.	