

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 6a)

CX/GP 06/23/6 Part-I

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES
Twenty-third Session
Paris, France, 10 – 14 April 2006**

**PROPOSED DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES FOR ELABORATION OF
CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS¹
*Discussion Paper prepared by India***

INTRODUCTION

1. Amendments to the Procedural Manual were considered by the 27th Session of the CAC, 2004². India had proposed some amendments to the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts*³. The Commission adopted some of the proposed amendments with some modifications. The Commission also agreed to refer the other comments made by India to the Committee on General Principles. The Commission had also requested the Committee to consider the possibility of developing a definition of “consensus”.⁴
2. The changes proposed by India - the reference to decisions taken by consensus instead of a two-third majority throughout the text; the need to take into account the situation of developing countries; the scope of the critical review by the Executive Committee and the basis of the decision to entrust work to a Committee other than the one to which it had originally been entrusted - to the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* and the proposed definition of consensus were discussed in the 21st Session, 2004⁵ and 22nd Session, 2005⁶ of the CCGP. The CCGP, at its 22nd Session agreed that the Delegation of India would prepare a discussion paper providing the objectives and rationale for the proposed changes to the Elaboration Procedure for consideration by the next session of the Committee, as a separate Agenda Item.⁶
3. This discussion paper provides the objectives and rationale for the proposed changes to the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* in Section I of the Procedural Manual, 14th Edition and the proposed changes.

BACKGROUND

4. The Joint Evaluation of the Codex Alimentarius and other FAO and WHO Food Standards Work in its Report made several recommendations in November 2002 including on structure and functioning of Codex organization. The recommendations also included some on administrative structures and consensus building and decision making.⁷
5. The Commission, at its 25th (Extraordinary) Session, 2003 agreed that the implementation of the results of the Evaluation should be undertaken expeditiously. It requested the Secretariat to obtain comments from governments and interested international organizations on the report, and to prepare options and strategies for consideration by the 26th Session of the Commission for action in the identified areas⁸.

¹ Procedural Manual, 15th Edition (page 19-30)

² ALINORM 04/27/5

³ CAC/27 LIM. 23 (Comments of India)

⁴ ALINORM 04/27/41 (paras 13, 131)

⁵ ALINORM 05/28/33 (paras 6-10)

⁶ ALINORM 05/28/33A (paras 8-16)

⁷ ALINORM 03/25/3 (Section 4.4.3, 4.4.3.1, 4.4.3.7)

⁸ ALINORM 03/25/5 (para 25)

6. The Commission, in its 26th Session, July 2003 considered the proposals emerging out of the recommendations of the Evaluation and the comments received from member countries on these. It took several decisions including the following⁹:

Proposal 9 on Executive committee: The Commission decided to retain the Executive Committee as a Strategic and Standards Management Body. *The Commission also decided that the Executive Committee shall have the responsibility for critical review of proposals to undertake work and to monitor the progress of standards development.*

Proposal 13 on strategic planning: The Commission decided that Secretariat should work with the Executive Committee in the preparation of strategic planning documents. It noted that the strategic planning process in the Executive Committee should consider the special needs of the developing countries.

Proposals 14 and 15 on critical review of proposals to undertake work and monitoring progress of standards development: The Commission decided to endorse the critical review process, *which should take into account the strategic priorities, standard setting needs of developing countries and risk assessment requirements through scientific expert advice from FAO/WHO, etc*

Proposal 16 on standards management responsibility: The Commission decided that the Executive Committee *will* be the body to undertake the critical review of **new work**.

Proposal 23 on responsibility for the Procedural Review: The Commission decided that the procedural review would be undertaken by the Codex Committee on General Principles, at special sessions and under a limited time-frame.

7. As a follow up of the advice of the Commission, the 19th (Extraordinary) Session of the Codex Committee on General Principles in November 2003 considered the *Draft of the Proposed Amendments to the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts*¹⁰ and forwarded the text of the proposed amendments¹¹ for adoption by the Commission in its 27th Session in June-July 2004.

8. In the 27th Session of the Commission, during the discussion on the *Proposed Amendments to the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts*, the Delegation of India, referring to its written comments¹², proposed some amendments. After some discussion, the Commission adopted some of the proposed amendments with some modifications. The Commission also agreed to refer the other comments made by India to the Committee on General Principles¹³. The Commission also asked the Committee to consider the possibility of developing a definition of “consensus”¹⁴.

9. Accordingly, at the 21st Session of the CCGP, the Delegation of India, referring to its written comments (CRD 2)¹⁵, made several proposals to amend the Elaboration Procedures. The Delegation also proposed a definition of “consensus” for further consideration.

10. The Delegation of Malaysia supported the views of India that the role of the Executive Committee should not extend, in the framework of the Critical Review, to consideration of draft standards and related texts submitted to the Commission by its subsidiary bodies¹⁶.

11. As regards the question of “consensus”, several delegations expressed the view that the establishment of a definition should not be considered for the moment, and that it would be preferable to apply the *Measures to Facilitate Consensus* adopted by the 26th Session of the Commission throughout Codex. Other delegations stressed the need for a definition of “consensus”, or a clear understanding of its meaning for the purposes of Codex, in order to facilitate the decision making process and, in particular, to assist Codex chairs in their task.

12. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson that no new work should be undertaken on a definition of “consensus” at this stage, until more experience had been gained in the application of the *Measures to Facilitate Consensus*. The Committee also agreed that the detailed comments proposed by the

⁹ ALINORM 03/41 (paras 156,157,162-165, 169)

¹⁰ CX/GP 03/19/4-Add.1(Section 4)

¹¹ ALINORM 04/27/33 (Appendix III)

¹² Lim 23 (27th CAC) (Annexure I)

¹³ ALINORM 04/41 (para 13, Appendix II)

¹⁴ ALINORM 04/41 (para 131)

¹⁵ CRD 2 (comment of India) (Annexure II)

¹⁶ Report of the 21st (Extraordinary) Session of the Codex Committee on General Principle (ALINORM 05/28/33 para.8)

Delegation of India on the Elaboration Procedure be considered by the next session of the Committee on General Principles¹⁷.

13. In the 22nd Session, the Delegation of India presented its written comments¹⁸ in CRD 1. The Committee had a general discussion on the proposals of India to introduce several amendments to the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts*, aiming at addressing the following issues:

- the reference to decisions taken by consensus, including a definition of that term;
- the need to take into account the situation of developing countries; and
- the scope of the critical review by the Executive Committee and including the basis of the decision to entrust work to a Committee other than the one to which it had originally been entrusted.

14. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that the Delegation of India would prepare a discussion paper providing the objectives and rationale for the proposed changes to the Elaboration Procedure for consideration by the next session of the Committee, as a separate Agenda Item¹⁹.

15. Subsequently in its 28th Session, July 2005, the Commission noted during the discussion on the proposed amendments to the rules of procedure that the Committee on General Principles had agreed to consider at its next session a discussion paper to be prepared by India on Procedure for Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, as well as the concept of “consensus”.²⁰

16. Accordingly, India has prepared this discussion paper. The objectives and rationale for the proposed changes to the Elaboration Procedure have been presented in the section below. The proposed changes to the Elaboration Procedures are presented in the Annex.

OBJECTIVES AND RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

A. Reference to decisions taken by consensus, including a definition of that term

17. In the process of elaboration of standards, decisions by the Committee or Commission are required to be taken at various stages right from the adoption of the new work proposal to the final adoption by the Commission. In the Elaboration Procedures it is mentioned at two places (Introduction, paragraph 6; and Part 4, paragraph 1) that the decision might be taken on the basis of two thirds majority of votes cast.

18. However, the Procedural Manual, in Rule XI, mentions that “*the Commission shall make every effort to reach agreement on the adoption or amendment of standard by consensus. Decisions to adopt or amend standard may be taken by voting only if such efforts to reach consensus have failed*”. It also provides measure to facilitate “consensus” under the “*Guidelines to the Chairpersons of the Codex Committee Ad-Hoc Intergovernmental task Forces*”.

19. On the application of ‘consensus’ in taking decisions, the Procedural Manual, in its Section II under the heading ‘*Guidelines to Chairpersons of Codex Committees and Ad hoc Intergovernmental Task Forces*’, sub-heading ‘Consensus’ emphasizes that “The chairpersons should always try to arrive at a consensus and should not ask the Committee to proceed to voting if agreement on the Committee’s decision can be secured by consensus.”

20. Therefore, in true application of the Rule XI, the principle of taking decisions after reaching consensus and resorting to voting only when the efforts have failed to reach consensus should be applied at each step of standard development, including the decision making for standards that shall be the subject of accelerated elaboration procedure.

21. It is therefore, essential that the process of elaboration and amendments to Codex Standards and related texts on the basis of consensus or, when all attempts to reach consensus have failed; by two-thirds majority of votes should be applicable to both the Commission and its Committees.

22. However, taking decisions by consensus and application of measures to facilitate consensus would be transparent and meaningful only when the term “consensus” is defined under the Codex Procedural Manual. A definition of the term “consensus” is, therefore, necessary.

23. The definition of “consensus” can essentially be based on the recommendation proposed by the Evaluation Report, but should also ensure that there is no sustained opposition by any important part of the

¹⁷ ALINORM 05/28/33 (para 10)

¹⁸ CRD 1 (22nd CCGP) (Annexure-III)

¹⁹ ALINORM 05/28/33A (para 16)

²⁰ ALINORM 05/28/41 (para 23)

concerned interests to any substantial issues. It should take into consideration the existence of measures for reaching consensus provided in the Procedural Manual. It is understood that application of these measures would ensure absence of any sustained opposition as the conflicting views, if any, would be thoroughly discussed/ deliberated in the Committees and / or CAC for reconciliation.

24. Accordingly, the necessary amendments proposed in this respect are reflected in the amended text, proposed amendments to the *Draft Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* (Annexure-I). The definition of ‘consensus’, which needs to be included in the Procedural Manual under the chapter on *Definitions for the Purposes of the Codex Alimentarius* in Section I is presented in Annexure-II.

B. Need to take into account the situation of developing countries

25. The second proposal, related to the parameters of Critical Review, is to ensure that the perspective and needs of developing countries form an integral part of the decision making for new works and finalization of the standards by the Commission. The CAC at its 26th Session had endorsed ‘processes for standard management, with due regard to the special needs of developing countries’ as one of its priorities²¹. The *WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures* in Articles 10.1 and 10.2 also emphasizes this.

26. In the Elaboration Procedures, the Critical Review of the new work proposal (Codex Procedural Manual, pp. 20-22) includes “*identifying the standard setting needs of developing countries*” as one of its components. To implement this and to make it meaningful and effective, it is necessary that *the process on how to address* the needs is also reflected in the Critical Review. It is therefore proposed that project proposals should also include details on (i) the economic impact on developing countries and (ii) relevant cultural and traditional practices prevailing in developing countries, since without these details, the needs of the developing countries cannot be fully appreciated.

27. Accordingly, the proposed amended text is presented in the Annexure-I.

C. Scope of the Critical Review by the Executive Committee

28. In the Elaboration Procedures, the scope of Critical Review by the Executive Committee also includes (i) provision that allows the Executive Committee to propose that the work be undertaken by a Committee other than the one to which it was originally entrusted (*Monitoring progress of standards development*, paragraph 6), and (ii) critical review of the draft standard at Step 8 (Part 3, Step 8).

29. On the provision relating to proposing transfer of a work from one Committee to another, it is important to recall that the critical review of the related new work proposal had considered the competence and suitability of the Committee which was assigned the work. Therefore, any proposal of transfer of work should be considered only when there are genuine and valid reasons for doing so. It would then be necessary and appropriate, and for democratic and transparent process, that the proposal of transferring work from one Committee to another is made in consultation with, and with recommendation of, the Committee originally entrusted with the work.

30. Critical Review by the Executive Committee of the draft standard at Step 8 is not required, since, during monitoring progress of standard development at Step 5, the critical review has already considered the draft standard on the specified checkpoints. On adoption at Step 5 a standard can not change parameters such as Codex mandate, Commission decisions, format and presentation etc. It is not necessary for the Executive Committee to repeat or duplicate the discussion which will take place in the Commission with wider participation of Member Countries.

31. Therefore, reference to critical review at Step 5 and Step 8 by Executive Committee should be deleted.

32. Accordingly, the proposed amendments of the relevant texts are presented in the Annexure-I.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE

33. The proposed changes to the Elaboration Procedure are presented in the Annexure-I. The portions that are proposed to be added have been shown in ‘**bold**’ and those to be deleted in ‘~~strikethrough~~’ script.

34. The Committee is invited to consider the necessary amendments to the *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* (Annexure-I) and proposed definition for *Consensus* (Annexure-II) for inclusion in the Chapter of *Definitions for the Purposes of the Codex Alimentarius* in Section I of the Procedural Manual.

²¹ ALINORM 03/41, paras 152, 162)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS

[**Note:** Throughout this text the word “Standard” is meant to include any of the recommendations of the Commission intended to be submitted to Governments for acceptance. Except for provisions relating to acceptance, the Procedures apply *mutatis mutandis* to codes of practice and other texts of an advisory nature.]

INTRODUCTION

The full procedure for the elaboration of Codex standards is as follows.

1. The Commission shall implement a unified approach in the area of standards development by taking its decisions, based on a strategic planning process (“standards management”) (See Part 1 of this document).
2. An on-going critical review shall ensure that proposals for new work and draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption continue to meet the strategic priorities of the Commission and can be developed within a reasonable period of time, taking into account the requirements and availability of scientific expert advice (See Part 2 of this document).
3. The Commission decides, taking into account the outcome of the on-going critical review **of proposals for new work** conducted by the Executive Committee that a standard should be elaborated and also which subsidiary body or other body should undertake the work. Decisions to elaborate standards may also be taken by subsidiary bodies of the Commission in accordance with the above-mentioned outcome subject to subsequent approval by the Commission at the earliest possible opportunity. The Secretariat arranges for the preparation of a “proposed draft standard” which is circulated to governments for comments and is then considered in the light of these by the subsidiary body concerned which may present the text to the Commission as a “draft standard”. If the Commission adopts the “draft standard” it is sent to governments for further comments and in the light of these and after further consideration by the subsidiary body concerned, the Commission reconsiders the draft and may adopt it as a “Codex standard”. The procedure is described in Part 3 of this document.

3bis. The elaboration and amendments to Codex standards and related texts by the Commission or any subsidiary body should be on the basis of consensus²² or, when all attempts to reach consensus have failed, by two-thirds majority of votes.

4. The Commission or any subsidiary body, subject to the confirmation of the Commission may decide that the urgency of elaborating a Codex standard is such that an accelerated elaboration procedure should be followed. While taking this decision, all appropriate matters shall be taken into consideration, including the likelihood of new scientific information becoming available in the immediate future. The accelerated elaboration procedure is described in Part 4 of this document.
5. The Commission or the subsidiary body or other body concerned may decide that the draft be returned for further work at any appropriate previous Step in the Procedure. The Commission may also decide that the draft be held at Step 8.
6. The Commission may authorize, on the basis of **consensus²² or two-thirds majority of votes cast when all attempts to reach consensus have failed**, the omission of Steps 6 and 7, where such an omission is recommended by the Codex Committee entrusted with the elaboration of the draft. Recommendations to omit steps shall be notified to Members and interested international organizations as soon as possible after the session of the Codex Committee concerned. When formulating recommendations to omit Steps 6 and 7, Codex Committees shall take all appropriate matters into consideration, including the need for urgency, and the likelihood of new scientific information becoming available in the immediate future. **Codex Committees will also take in to account the technological justification and economic implications that affect trade.**

²² Consensus may be defined as a general agreement, characterised by the absence of any sustained opposition to substantial issues by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties and to reconcile any conflicting arguments (Proposed to be included under Chapter on Definition for the Purposes of the Codex Alimentarius- Annexure-II)

7. The Commission may at any stage in the elaboration of a standard entrust any of the remaining Steps to a Codex Committee or other body different from that to which it was previously entrusted **after prior consultation with the body or committee previously entrusted with the work.**

8. It will be for the Commission itself to keep under review the revision of “Codex standards”. The procedure for revision should, *mutatis mutandis*, be that laid down for the elaboration of Codex standards, except that the Commission may decide to omit any other step or steps of that Procedure where, in its opinion, an amendment proposed by a Codex Committee is either of an editorial nature or of a substantive nature but consequential to provisions in similar standards adopted by the Commission at Step 8.

9. Codex standards are published and governments are invited to notify the Commission’s Secretariat of the status or use of the Codex standard in accordance with their established legal and administrative procedures. They are also sent to international organizations to which competence in the matter has been transferred by their Member States (See Part 5 of this document). Details of notifications are published periodically by the Commission’s Secretariat.

PART 1. STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

1. Taking into account the “*Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities*”, the strategic plan shall state broad priorities against which individual proposals for standards (and revision of standards) can be evaluated during the critical review process.

2. The strategic plan shall cover a six-year period and shall be renewed every two years on a rolling basis.

PART 2. CRITICAL REVIEW

Proposals to Undertake New Work or to Revise a Standard

1. Prior to approval for development, each proposal for new work or revision of a standard, shall be accompanied by a project document, prepared by the Committee or Member proposing new work or revision of a standard, detailing:

- the purposes and the scope of the standard;
- its relevance and timeliness;
- the main aspects to be covered;
- an assessment against the *Criteria for the establishment of work priorities*;
- relevance to the Codex strategic objectives;
- information on the relation between the proposal and other existing Codex documents;
- identification of any requirement for and availability of expert scientific advice;
- identification of any need for technical input to the standard from external bodies so that this can be planned for;
- the proposed time-line for completion of the new work, including the start date, the proposed date for adoption at Step 5, and the proposed date for adoption by the Commission ; the time frame for developing a standard should not normally exceed five years;
- **economic impact on developing countries;**
- **Relevant cultural and/or traditional practices prevailing in the developing countries**

2. The decision to undertake new work or to revise standards shall be taken by the Commission taking into account a critical review conducted by the Executive Committee.

3. The critical review includes:

- examination of proposals for development/revision of standards, taking into account the “*Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities*”, the strategic plan of the Commission and the required supporting work of independent risk assessment **in accordance with the established procedures;**
- **Identification and consideration of the standards setting needs of developing countries, addressing their cultural and traditional practices;**
- **the review should also examine the technical and financial implications of the standards and their use as unjustifiable barriers to trade;**
- advice on establishment and dissolution of committees and task forces, including *ad hoc* cross-committee task forces (in areas where work falls within several committee mandates); and

- preliminary assessment of the need for expert scientific advice and the availability of such advice from FAO, WHO or other relevant expert bodies, and the prioritisation of that advice.

4. The decision to undertake new work or revision of individual maximum residue limits for pesticides or veterinary drugs, or the maintenance of the General Standard on Food Additives, the General Standard on Contaminants and Toxins in Foods, the Food Categorisation System and the International Numbering System, shall follow the procedures established by the Committees concerned and endorsed by the Commission.

Monitoring Progress of Standards Development

5. The Executive Committee shall review the status of development of draft standards against the time frame agreed by the Commission and shall report its findings to the Commission.

6. The Executive Committee may propose an extension of the time frame; cancellation of work; or propose that the work be undertaken by a Committee other than the one to which it was originally entrusted **after prior consultation with the body or committee previously entrusted with the work**, including the establishment of a limited number of ad hoc subsidiary bodies, if appropriate.

7. The critical review process shall ensure that progress in the development of standards is consistent with the envisaged time frame, that draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption have been fully considered at Committee level.

8. Monitoring shall take place against the time line deemed necessary and revisions in the coverage of the standard shall need to be specifically endorsed by the Commission.

This shall therefore include:

- monitoring of progress in developing standards and advising what corrective action should be taken;
- examining proposed standards from Codex committees, before they are submitted to the Commission for adoption:
 - for consistency with the mandate of Codex, the decisions of the Commission, and existing Codex texts,
 - to ensure that the requirements of the endorsement procedure have been fulfilled, where appropriate,
 - for format and presentation, and
 - for linguistic consistency.

PART 3. UNIFORM PROCEDURE FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS

Steps 1, 2 and 3

(1) The Commission decides, taking into account the outcome of the critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, to elaborate a World-wide Codex Standard and also decides which subsidiary body or other body should undertake the work. A decision to elaborate a World-wide Codex Standard may also be taken by subsidiary bodies of the Commission in accordance with the above mentioned outcome, subject to subsequent approval by the Commission at the earliest possible opportunity. In the case of Codex Regional Standards, the Commission shall base its decision on the proposal of the majority of Members belonging to a given region or group of countries submitted at a session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

(2) The Secretariat arranges for the preparation of a proposed draft standard. In the case of Maximum Limits for Residues of Pesticides or Veterinary Drugs, the Secretariat distributes the recommendations for maximum limits, when available from the Joint Meetings of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), or the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). Any other relevant information regarding risk assessment work conducted by FAO and WHO should also be made available.

(3) The proposed draft standard is sent to Members of the Commission and interested international organizations for comment on all aspects including possible implications of the proposed draft standard for their economic interests.

Step 4

The comments received are sent by the Secretariat to the subsidiary body or other body concerned which has the power to consider such comments and to amend the proposed draft standard.

Step 5

The proposed draft standard is submitted through the Secretariat to the Executive Committee—for critical review **of progress of standard development** and to the Commission with a view to its adoption as a draft standard. In taking any decision at this step, the Commission will give due consideration to the outcome of the critical review and any comments that may be submitted by any of its Members regarding the implications which the proposed draft standard or any provisions thereof may have for their economic interests. In the case of Regional Standards, all Members of the Commission may present their comments, take part in the debate and propose amendments, but only the ~~majority~~ **consensus** of the Members of the region or group of countries concerned attending the session can decide to amend or adopt the draft. In taking any decisions at this step, the Members of the region or group of countries concerned will give due consideration to any comments that may be submitted by any of the Members of the Commission regarding the implications which the proposed draft standard or any provisions thereof may have for their economic interests.

Step 6

The draft standard is sent by the Secretariat to all Members and interested international organizations for comment on all aspects, including possible implications of the draft standard for their economic interests.

Step 7

The comments received are sent by the Secretariat to the subsidiary body or other body concerned, which has the power to consider such comments and amend the draft standard.

Step 8

The draft standard is submitted through the Secretariat ~~to the Executive Committee for critical review and~~ to the Commission together with any written proposals received from Members and interested international organizations for amendments at Step 8, with a view to its adoption as a Codex standard. In the case of Regional standards, all Members and interested international organizations may present their comments, take part in the debate and propose amendments but only the majority of Members of the region or group of countries concerned attending the session can decide to amend and adopt the draft.

PART 4. UNIFORM ACCELERATED PROCEDURE FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS

Steps 1, 2 and 3

(1) The Commission, on the basis of *consensus*, *or* two thirds majority of votes cast, **when all attempts to reach consensus have failed**, taking into account the outcome of the critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, shall identify those standards which shall be the subject of an accelerated elaboration process.⁶ The identification of such standards may also be made by subsidiary bodies of the Commission, **on the basis of consensus, or** a two-thirds majority of votes cast when all attempts to reach consensus have failed, subject to confirmation at the earliest opportunity by the Commission.

(..) No changes beyond this point.

Annexure-II

Definitions for the Purposes of the Codex Alimentarius

For the purposes of the Codex Alimentarius:

Consensus means a general agreement, characterised by the absence of any sustained opposition to substantial issues by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties and to reconcile any conflicting arguments.
