



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEx COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Thirty-fourth Session

Lille, France

2–6 June 2025

CODEx PROCEDURAL MANUAL – PROPOSED UPDATE TO THE GUIDE TO THE PROCEDURE FOR THE AMENDMENTS AND REVISION OF CODEx STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS (Prepared by the Codex Secretariat)

I. BACKGROUND

1. CX/CP 21/32/5,² presented to CCGP32³ (2021), outlined an ongoing discussion related to amendments and revisions of Codex texts. Priorities defined in the document and by Members during the discussions included: clearer definitions for revisions, amendments and corrections; clarity of workflows; transparency of updates with documentation; version numbering; and a traceable history.
2. Based upon the discussion and agreement by CCGP32, CX/CAC 22/45/2⁴ was prepared for the Codex Alimentarius Commission's 45th session (CAC45) (2022). It recommended amendments to relevant paragraphs in Section 2.1 Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts, in particular Part 7 (Guide to the procedure for the amendment and revision of Codex standards and related texts), and confirmed there was not a clear delineation between amendment and revision, that Codex did not always follow FAO publishing standards with regards to the terminology describing, or practice in publishing updates to Codex texts, and that clear criteria for dealing with future changes to Codex standards should be discussed by CCGP.
3. On request from CAC45,⁵ the Codex Secretariat prepared CX/GP 23/33/5⁶ for CCGP33 (2023) which proposed updated definitions for correction, amendment, new edition (formerly revision), ways to align publishing practices with FAO, WHO and other standard-setting bodies such as ISO, a versioning system that promoted transparency, and examples of proposed formats to identify consistently when corrections and substantive modifications had been made to Codex texts. The document also included further proposals for updates to several paragraphs in Section 2.1, in particular Part 7.
4. At CCGP33,⁷ Members discussed, reviewed and modified the proposed edits to the relevant paragraphs in Section 2.1 (paragraphs 8, 12, and Part 7).
5. CCGP33 noted that other paragraphs of the *Codex Procedural Manual* may need to be reviewed for consistency; agreed that additional time was needed to review the proposed revisions in depth; requested the

¹ This Rev1 version reflects the correct paragraph numbers in line with the 30th edition of the Procedural Manual.

² CX/CP 21/32/5 [fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-32%252FWFD%252Fgp32_05e.pdf](https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-32%252FWFD%252Fgp32_05e.pdf)

³ REP21/GP https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-32%252FReport%252FFINAL%252FREP21_GPe.pdf

⁴ CX/CAC 22/45/2, Part 2 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-701-45%252Fcac45_02e.pdf

⁵ REP22/CAC, paragraph 44

⁶ CX/GP 23/33/5 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-33%252Fgp33_05e.pdf

⁷ REP23/GP, paragraphs 37-69 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-33%252FFinal%252520Report%252520CCGP33%252FREP23_GPe.pdf

Codex Secretariat to prepare a circular letter (CL 2024/25-GP)⁸ to collect comments on the proposed amendments (see Appendix III to REP23/GP)⁹ for consideration by CCGP34; and agreed to inform other Codex committees of the ongoing work to update parts of Section 2.1.

II. INTRODUCTION

6. This document refines the proposal presented to CCGP33.
7. The objectives of the updated proposal are to provide clarity, address comments from Members provided during CCGP33 and in response to CL 2024/25-GP,^{10,11} and align publication of Codex texts with updated publishing practices at FAO.
8. Proposed changes to the relevant paragraphs in Section 2.1 (paragraphs 8, 12 and Part 7) preserve the substance and spirit of the changes previously discussed, while introducing as few changes as possible to the *Codex Procedural Manual*.

III. PROPOSED UPDATES TO THE GUIDE TO THE PROCEDURE FOR THE AMENDMENT AND REVISION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AND RELATED RATIONALE

9. The following provides an overview of the key issues arising from previous discussions and comments received, and proposes a way forward with regard to updating the relevant paragraphs of Section 2.1 (paragraphs 8, 12 and Part 7) of the *Codex Procedural Manual* as presented in Appendix I.

Process neutrality

10. The updated definitions for correction, amendment, or revision intentionally separate the type of change from the procedure for elaboration of Codex standards and related texts. While the substance rather than the category of a change determines its procedural route, the proposed update aims to provide further clarity in this regard. For example, it clarifies that a correction can be made by the Codex Secretariat who then informs the Commission, whereas amendments and revisions generally follow the procedure for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts. However, the Commission may decide to omit steps of the procedure for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts for amendments it considers to be editorial in nature or consequential to other decisions of the Commission.

Clarification of terminology

11. To ensure consistent understanding and use of change types across Codex texts, it is proposed to have three categories: 1. Correction, 2. Amendment, and 3. Revision (as opposed to edition – see paragraph 25). In response to several comments to CL 2024/25-GP indicating the need for greater clarity and simplification of the definitions in the proposal, the definitions for the three types of changes to Codex standards and related texts have been updated. Where possible, specific wording has been aligned with suggestions made in the comments.
12. **Correction** means fixing any editorial errors in a Codex standard or related text including:
 - incorrect spelling;
 - incorrect use of bold or italics;
 - other incorrect formatting of text;
 - an incorrect transcription, e.g. of a number;
 - an incorrectly numbered or located footnote; and/or
 - errors in translation.
13. A corrigendum, within the updated Codex standard or related text, that identifies the old text, the new text, and the date of correction is required for all corrections in line with FAO publishing practices (see paragraph 18). In the case of incorrect transcription, the corrigendum should include a clear reference to the source of the

⁸ CL 2024/25-GP https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/es/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FCircular%252520Letters%252FCL%2525202024-25%252Fcl24_25e.pdf

⁹ REP23/GP, Appendix III https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-33%252FFinal%2BReport%2BCCGP33%252FREP23_GPe.pdf#page=32

¹⁰ CL 2024/25-GP https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/es/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FCircular%252520Letters%252FCL%2525202024-25%252Fcl24_25e.pdf

¹¹ See Appendix II

correct information, such as in the [Standard for named vegetable oils](#) (CXS 210-1999) where the 2023 corrigendum indicates: “On 1 February 2023, the value for fatty acid C16:1 for pistachio oil (Table 1, column 4, row 7) was corrected to read ND-2.0 (instead of ND-0.2) to align it with the decision of the Forty-second Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in July 2019” (p.2).¹² The corrigendum can be written as a sentence or put into a table format.

14. **Amendment** can cover a range of changes to an existing Codex text, which are clearly more than corrections as described above but impact only a limited number of articles or provisions in a Codex text. The proposal aims to provide a single list of what might be considered an amendment:
 - editorial changes that are not corrections, as defined in paragraph 12;
 - insertion of an explanatory footnote;
 - update of references consequential to the adoption, amendment or revision of Codex standards and other texts of general applicability, including the provisions in the *Codex Procedural Manual*;
 - alignment of provisions, for consistency, to those in similar standards or related texts adopted by the Commission including replacement of content with a reference to another Codex text (a consequential amendment);
 - update of methods of analysis and sampling; and/or
 - any other addition, change or deletion of text or numerical values in one or a limited number of articles in a Codex standard or related text.
15. As indicated in paragraph 10, it is the substance rather than the category of a change that determines the procedural route. Amendments under category i.-v. will normally not require a project document, whereas amendments under category vi. would normally require a project document.
16. The inclusion of an explanation for the amendment, within the updated Codex standard or related text, is required in line with publishing practices. See the 2024 amendment explanation in the [Standard for table olives](#) (CXS 66-1981): “Following decisions taken at the Forty-seventh Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in December 2024, amendments were made in Section 4 Food additives” (p.2).¹³
17. **Revision** means any change in scope of a Codex standard or related text, or other modification other than those covered under correction, as defined in paragraph 12, or amendment, as defined in paragraph 14.
18. The inclusion of an explanation for the revision, within the updated Codex standard or related text, is required in line with publishing practices. See the 2024 revision explanation in the [Standard for olive oils and olive-pomace oils](#) (CXS 33-1981): “Following decisions taken at the Forty-seventh Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in December 2024, revisions were made in Sections 3, 7.2, 8 and in Appendix I” (p.2).¹⁴

Publishing and version control alignment

19. The Codex Alimentarius Commission is the executive organ of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme (Codex). Codex publications are co-published by FAO and WHO, with FAO as lead publisher. Since FAO is the lead publisher, all Codex standards and related texts must adhere to FAO publishing guidelines. FAO’s Open Access Policy requires that all Codex materials must be made available through FAO’s institutional repository.
20. In following FAO publishing policies, Codex texts that are amended or revised will receive a new copyright date (corrected texts will not). This contributes to greater transparency as the adoption and publication dates of each amended or revised version of a text will accumulate on the copyright page, meaning every version of the text that is published will list the history of the text up to the current version. The dates of historic amendments and revisions will also be listed on the copyright page.

¹² *Standard for named vegetable oils* (CXS 210-1999), p.2 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCXS%2B210-1999%252FCXS_210e.pdf

¹³ *Standard for table olives* (CXS 66-1981), p.2 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCXS%2B66-1981%252FCXS_066e.pdf

¹⁴ *Standard for olive oils and olive-pomace oils* (CXS 33-1981), p. 2 https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCXS%2B33-1981%252FCXS_033e.pdf

21. The FAO Publications Taxonomy, which was formalized in July 2024, classifies Codex texts as normative documents. Normative documents are negotiated texts and therefore go through a fast-track publication process. This fast-track process means Codex texts are not burdened with a waiting period for quality control review – speeding up the publication process. This also means Codex has an element of autonomy when it comes to versioning the texts including no restrictions on the number of times a text is corrected, amended or revised.
22. The benefits of publishing in the FAO Publications Repository include:
 - consistent versioning and improved traceability;
 - consolidation of all modifications for each Codex text on the “preview page” (the FAO Knowledge Repository record) where any updates – corrections, amendments and revisions can be recorded and maintained;
 - rich metadata options, making the texts more easily located by online searches;
 - a single access URL for each standard regardless of the number of modifications made to it; and
 - access to metrics such as access and downloads for each text.

Returning to “revision” (from previously proposed “new edition”)

23. In 2023, it was proposed to use the terminology new edition for modifications to the entire text. However, within the FAO publications system, a new edition requires the creation of a new record which changes the link to the text within the repository. The intention is that editions should be published concurrently with one another, not replace the old version with the latest one.
24. Discussions at CCGP33 highlighted that publishing new editions of Codex texts was not ideal as two versions of a standard cannot be published concurrently, and standards published in different places (requiring updated links within the FAO Knowledge Repository) will lead to confusion over versioning.
25. In the context of the updates to FAO publishing practices, along with further discussions with the FAO publications branch, the current proposal returns to the word “revision” for Codex texts. This avoids the parameters of new editions being placed on these publications, acknowledges the specific publishing needs of Codex texts, and eliminates any retroactive assignment of first edition to the texts, which was a complicated aspect of the proposal made to CCGP33.

Practical implementation of version transparency

26. As is currently practiced, a simple statement in each amended or revised standard notes the date and summarizes the amendment(s) and/or description of the revision. The statement will shift to the copyright page when texts are published to the FAO Knowledge Repository. This approach supports transparency for users and maintains fidelity to the publication history of each standard.

Alignment throughout the Codex Procedural Manual

27. A review of related keywords – such as correction, amend and amendment, and revise and revision, determined that use of these common terms in in other contexts in the *Codex Procedural Manual* would not conflict with the uses proposed in this document. In a few cases, specific to modification of existing Codex texts, it may be necessary to replace, for example, the word “revision” with “amendment or revision”, for clarity.
28. During CCGP33 it was discussed that the word modification (or modify) would be used as an umbrella term for “correction, amendment or revision”. However, in light of comments to CL 2024/25-GP, it has become evident that using more specific terminology, even when wordy, is clearer. Also, it is rare that correction, amendment and revision can be generally referred to together, as their application is different. This has been reflected in the proposals for Section 2.1.

Fidelity to the original text of the Codex Procedural Manual

29. The proposed edits to the paragraphs in Section 2.1 as presented in Appendix I have been adapted from the discussion at CCGP33 and modified based on the comments received and by the updates to the proposal, as described in this document. Where possible, the original text has been preserved in the spirit of maintaining fidelity to the intent, structure, and terminology of the existing *Codex Procedural Manual*.

IV. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED UPDATES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

30. The updated proposal seeks to:

- respond to actionable comments from Members in response to CL 2024/25-GP;¹⁵
- retain the original text, as much as possible;
- clarify differentiations between and refine the definitions for correction, amendment, and revision;
- return to the use of revision rather than new edition; and
- clarify the benefits and process of FAO publishing processes.

31. Appendix I contains the proposed edits to paragraphs in Section 2.1 Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts of the 30th edition of the *Codex Procedural Manual* in tracked changes, based on the proposals described above.

32. Appendix II lists comments from Members and Observers in response to CL 2024/25-GP.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

33. CCGP34 is invited to consider the proposed updates to the paragraphs in Section 2.1 as presented in Appendix I.

¹⁵ Comments pertaining to content the scope of this document, such as suggestions for revisions to additional paragraphs, were noted by the Codex Secretariat but have not been addressed directly.

Appendix I

Proposed updates to the *Codex Procedural Manual* in Section 2.1 Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts

The proposed updates to paragraphs 8, 12 and Part 7 of Section 2.1, below, have been made using the text in the 30th edition of the *Codex Procedural Manual*. Bolded text is proposed to be added – any bold that appears in the published version of the *Codex Procedural Manual* has been removed to more clearly demonstrate proposed new content. Struck through content is proposed to be removed. The updates are based on discussions at CCGP33¹⁶ and subsequent comments.

2.1 Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts**Introduction**

Paragraph 8. It will be for the Commission itself to keep under review the **amendment and** revision of Codex standards. The procedure for **amendment or** 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 ~~the Codex committee~~ **the Codex committee subsidiary body concerned, or the Codex Secretariat or Member of the Commission where the subsidiary body concerned is abolished or dissolved or has been adjourned sine die** 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, **as further outlined in Part 7 Guide to the procedure for the correction, amendment and revision of Codex standards and related texts.**

Part 2 Critical review

Proposals to undertake new work or to **amend** or revise a standard

Paragraph 12. Prior to approval for development, each proposal for new work or **amendment or** revision (**as appropriate, see Part 7**) of a standard shall be accompanied by a project document, prepared by the Committee or Member proposing new work or **amendment or** revision of a standard detailing: ... [no changes proposed for the content of the project document]

Part 7 Guide to the procedure for the **correction**, amendment and revision of Codex standards and related texts

Paragraph 24. The procedure for amending or revising a Codex standard is laid down in paragraph 8 of **the introduction to** Section 2.1: Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts. This guide provides more detailed guidance on the existing procedure for the amendment and revision of Codex standards and related texts.

~~25. When the Commission has decided to amend or revise a standard, the unrevised standard will remain the applicable Codex standard until the amendment to the standard or the revised standard has been adopted by the Commission.~~¹⁷

Paragraph 25. For the purpose of this guide, **correction of a Codex standard or related text means fixing any editorial errors including incorrect spelling, incorrect bold or italics, other incorrect formatting of text, an incorrect transcription, an incorrectly numbered or located footnote, and/or errors in translation. A corrigendum for all corrections should be included in the standard**

Paragraph 26 **For the purpose of this guide, the a**Amendment **of a Codex standard or related text** means: any addition, change or deletion of text or numerical values in a Codex standard or related text, may be editorial or substantive, and concerns one or a limited number of articles in the Codex text. In particular, ~~amendments of an editorial nature may include but are not limited to:~~ a) correction of an error;

- **editorial changes that are not corrections, as defined in paragraph 25;**
- insertion of an explanatory footnote; ~~and e)~~
- updating of references consequential to the adoption, amendment or revision of Codex standards and other texts of general applicability, including the provisions in the *Codex Procedural Manual*;

¹⁶ REP23/GP, Appendix III https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?Ink=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-716-33%252FFinal%252520Report%252520CCGP33%252FREP23_GPe.pdf

¹⁷ See paragraph 30 for the proposed new location and updated content of this paragraph.

- **alignment of provisions, for consistency, to those in similar standards or related texts adopted by the Commission including replacement of content with a reference to another Codex text (a consequential amendment);**
- **updating of methods of analysis and sampling; and/or**
- **any other addition, change or deletion of text or numerical values in one or a limited number of articles.**

An explanation for the amendment should be included in the standard.

~~27. Finalization or updating of methods of analysis and sampling as well as alignment of provisions, for consistency, to those in similar standards or related texts adopted by the Commission may be handled by the Commission in the same manner as amendments of an editorial nature, as far as the procedure described in this guide is concerned.¹⁸~~

Paragraph 27. **For the purpose of this guide, revision means any changes to of a Codex standard or related text means a change to the scope , or changes other than those covered under “correction”, as defined in paragraph 25, or “amendment”, as defined above in paragraph 26. An explanation for the revision should be included in the standard.**

Paragraph 28. The Commission has the final authority to determine whether a proposal made constitutes an amendment or a revision., and **in the case of an amendment, the procedure by which it is addressed.**~~whether an amendment proposed is of an editorial or substantive nature~~ **Corrections, as described in paragraph 25, are the responsibility of the Codex Secretariat.**

Paragraph 29. **When the Commission has decided to amend or revise a standard, the unamended or unrevised standard will remain the applicable Codex standard until the amendment to the standard or the revised standard has been adopted by the Commission.**

Paragraph 30. Proposals for the amendment or revision of Codex standards and related texts should be submitted to the Commission by the subsidiary body concerned., ~~by the Codex Secretariat, or a Member of the Commission w~~**Where the subsidiary body concerned is not in existenceabolished, dissolved or has been adjourned sine die, the proposal for an amendment or revision should be submitted to the Commission by the Codex Secretariat or a Member of the Commission.** In the latter case, proposals should be received by the Codex Secretariat in good time (not less than three months) before the session of the Commission at which they are to be considered. The proposal should be accompanied by a project document (see Part 2 of the elaboration procedures) unless the Executive Committee **recommends and/or** the Commission decides otherwise. ~~However, if the amendment proposed is of an editorial nature, the preparation of a project document is not required.~~

Paragraph 31. Taking into account the outcome of the ongoing critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, the Commission decides whether the amendment or revision of a standard is necessary. If the Commission decides in the affirmative, one of the following courses of action will be taken:

- a. In the case of an amendment of an editorial nature, it will be open to the Commission to adopt the amendment at Step 8 of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures).
- b. In the case of an amendment proposed and agreed upon by a subsidiary body, it will also be open to the Commission to adopt the amendment at Step ~~5~~**8** of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures).
- c. In other cases, the Commission will approve the proposal as new work and the approved new work will be referred for consideration to the appropriate subsidiary body, if such body is still in existence. If such body is not in existence, the Commission will determine how best to deal with the new work.

Paragraph 32. ~~Where Codex subsidiary bodies have been abolished, or dissolved, or Codex committees have been adjourned sine die, the Codex Secretariat keeps under review all Codex standards and related texts elaborated by these bodies and determines the need for any corrections or amendments, in particular those arising from decisions of the Commission.~~

- **If the need for corrections is identified, then the Codex Secretariat should make the corrections.**
- If the need for amendments of an editorial **or consequential** nature is identified, then the Codex Secretariat should prepare proposed amendments for consideration and adoption by the Commission.
- If the need for **any other** amendments ~~of a substantive nature~~ is identified, the Codex Secretariat, in cooperation with the ~~national~~**host** secretariat of the adjourned committee, if applicable, should prepare

¹⁸ The content of this paragraph has been absorbed into other paragraphs within Part 7.

a working paper containing the reasons for proposing amendments and the wording of such amendments as appropriate, and request comments from Members of the Commission: a) on the need to proceed with such an amendment and b) on the proposed amendment itself.

- If the majority of the replies received from Members of the Commission is affirmative on both the need to amend the standard and the suitability of the proposed wording for the amendment or an alternative proposed wording, the proposal should be submitted to the Commission for consideration and adoption. -
- In cases where replies do not appear to offer an uncontroversial solution then the Commission should be informed accordingly, and it would be for the Commission to determine how best to proceed.

Appendix II

Original language only

COMMENTS IN REPLY TO CL 2024/25-GP

Comments by Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, European Union, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Senegal, Thailand, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia and ICUMSA

GENERAL COMMENTS

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
Chile Agradece la invitacion a participar en este trabajo. Chile no tiene comentarios adicionales.	Chile
Se considera útil que la Secretaría del Codex anuncie con antelación cuándo determina que es necesario una corrección a una norma, para que los miembros tengan acceso temprano a la corrección y al corrigendum, permitiéndoles indicar en sus comentarios si consideran que la propuesta eventualmente podría entenderse como una enmienda o como una nueva edición; esta comunicación debería ocurrir antes de la adopción de la norma por parte de la Secretaría para dar a los miembros la oportunidad de expresar sus opiniones adecuadamente.	Colombia
Costa Rica considera que la propuesta de redacción del Manual de Procedimiento en su versión 28 correspondiente a la Sección 2 sobre Elaboración de normas del Codex y textos afines, es más clara, dado que se estructura mejor y su contenido es más comprensible para un lector que no esté familiarizado con el tema.	Costa Rica
Al respecto, el país se permite indicar que después de la revisión de los artículos 24 al 32 del Manual de Procedimiento del Codex 28. ^a , los textos descritos son bastante claros y adecuados para esta parte del documento y, por tanto, no considera que otros fragmentos del texto de la Parte 7 deban revisarse y/o simplificarse.	Ecuador
Egypt appreciates the work which done in the revision of PM especially section 2 (Elaboration of Codex standards and related texts , part 7)	Egypt
The Member States of the European Union (MSEU) support the new approach suggested by the Codex Secretariat to improve the way Codex standards are revised. The MSEU notably welcome the work done and considers that Section 2 Elaboration of Codex standards and related texts, Part 7 on Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts does indeed need further updating. The MSEU would like to propose changes in the Annex below and in addition would like to raise the following observations:	European Union

<p>Malaysia appreciates CCGP work on this and supports the important updates particularly on the hierarchy and clarity of modification type - correction, amendment and new edition.</p> <p>Our comments are as reflected in specific parts below.</p> <p>It would be helpful for Members and Observers guidance if the Codex Secretariat can produce an illustration or summary of the type of modifications and the possible step process e.g. in table form to facilitate understanding</p>	Malaysia
<p>The proposals put forward in the document are sound and supported for potential application as they capture the intended spirit</p>	Uganda
<p>The United States appreciates the efforts of the Codex Secretariat in this initiative and welcomes the opportunity for further review, consideration and consultation before making any final decisions or recommending adoption by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. It is important that the procedures be clear and not result in delays or disruptions in the work. In addition to each Member Country reviewing the text, the United States believes that each committee should also review the proposals in light of its current ways of working.</p> <p>The United States has provided comments below to each bullet point but would like to seek clarification on a concern regarding adjourned committees. Specifically, the proposed changes could affect a precedent that the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) has been following pertaining to the addition of food additives (or revision of maximum use levels) in commodity standards that were generated by a committee that is now <i>sine die</i>.</p> <p>An example would be commodity standards that were put together by the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products (CCMMP), which is a committee that is now <i>sine die</i>. Many of the corresponding commodity standards have been aligned with the General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA), and thus now contain a general reference to the GSFA (rather than specific list of additives).</p> <p>In cases where a new additive that was not included in the original commodity standard is proposed to be added to the GSFA in a food category that would include the commodity standard, CCFA has taken the position (with support from the Codex Secretariat) that CCFA has the authority to permit the use of the new additive in commodity standards for which the originating committee is <i>sine die</i>. For cases where there is still an active commodity committee, we always make a request of the commodity committee before making a change.</p> <p>Would the proposed changes call in to question the practice that CCFA has been following pertaining to the new use of additives in commodity standards for which the originating commodity committee is <i>sine die</i>?</p>	USA
<p>Document seems appropriate.</p>	ICUMSA
The appropriateness and clarity of the revisions	
<p>Con respecto a la idoneidad, también considera que la propuesta actual contiene ajustes de forma que lo ameritan. No obstante, en la Parte 2 del Examen crítico correspondiente a: “Seguimiento de los avances realizados en la elaboración de normas”, Costa Rica ve con preocupación la modificación que se presenta en la nueva versión del Manual de Procedimiento, párrafo 18 como se indica a continuación:</p> <p>1. El Manual de Procedimiento versión 27, párrafo 7 indica: “El proceso de examen crítico debe garantizar también que la</p>	Costa Rica

<p>elaboración de las normas progresa con arreglo al calendario previsto y que los proyectos de normas presentados a la Comisión para su adopción se han examinado como es debido en el Comité y son satisfactorios tanto en el plano técnico como en el jurídico.”.</p> <p>2. El Manual de Procedimiento versión 28, párrafo 18 indica: “El proceso de examen crítico deberá garantizar también que la elaboración de las normas progresa con arreglo al calendario previsto y que los proyectos de normas presentados a la Comisión para su adopción se han examinado debidamente en el Comité”.</p> <p>Como se observa, se ha eliminado la frase “y son satisfactorios tanto en el plano técnico como en el jurídico”.</p> <p>Por lo expuesto; Costa Rica propone mantener la redacción del párrafo en su versión original.</p> <p>Justificación: Costa Rica considera que no existe un acuerdo previo para modificar este párrafo, ni forma parte del debate y conclusiones del CCGP33.</p> <p>Aunado a lo anterior, Costa Rica considera que los textos que se desarrollan en el Codex se respaldan en procedimientos que pueden tener implicaciones legales significativas en el comercio internacional de alimentos y en la armonización de regulaciones de sus países miembros, por ello, el mantener los términos "técnico" y "jurídico" puede brindar más claridad, cumplimiento y coherencia en el proceso.</p>	
<p>Indonesia is of the view that the definitions of “correction,” “amendment,” and “new edition” in the proposed draft of the Guide to the Procedure of Modification are very clear and well-defined and will facilitate implementation at both the committee and commission levels when deciding on changes to a Codex text.</p> <p>However, Indonesia has concerns regarding the use of the term “new edition,” as it implies changes to the entire section of the Codex PM, whereas the term “revision” has been used until now.</p>	Indonesia
<p>We believe that the revisions are appropriate and relevant to the objectives of this work, which is to clarify the types of modifications that can be made to Codex texts, the process for making those modifications, and to improve the traceability of those modifications.</p> <p>As discussed at CCGP33, some paragraphs remain unclear and should be further clarified.</p>	Japan
<p>The revisions are generally clear, and appropriate given the discussions had at CCGP33 including those on the hierarchy of modification types proposed for publications.</p>	New Zealand
<p>United Arab Emirates deems the revisions made by CCGP33 clear and appropriate</p>	United Arab Emirates
<p>The United States believes the proposed revisions to the text generally provide the necessary clarity under the new FAO publishing guidelines that Codex Texts are now required to follow. The United States highlighted a concern regarding adjourned committees in our General Comments in reply to this Circular Letter.</p>	USA
Whether there are any other parts of the text of Part 7 that would benefit from revision for clarity	
<p>Costa Rica considera que el texto actual de la parte 7, es claro y no requiere revisión ni simplificación.</p>	Costa Rica

We have no particular concerns at this time.	Japan
See suggestions below	New Zealand
<p>CONSIDERAMOS QUE DEBERÍA DECIR:</p> <p>Párrafo 25. A efectos de la presente Guía: Corrección: Hace referencia a errores de forma, tales como faltas de ortografía, negritas o cursivas incorrectas, otro formato incorrecto del texto, una transcripción incorrecta, una nota a pie de página incorrectamente numerada o situada, o errores en la traducción, errores o ambigüedades introducidos inadvertidamente. Todas las correcciones deben ir acompañadas de un corrigendum en el que se detallan los cambios realizados. Las correcciones no son para actualizar información que se ha convertido en desactualizada desde su publicación, en ese caso correspondería a enmienda. Enmienda: Cualquier modificación que no afecte al alcance ni a la aplicación. En particular, las enmiendas abordan: • errores técnicos (se sugiere retirarlo porque sería una corrección) Todas las enmiendas deben ir acompañadas de una explicación sobre los cambios introducidos en el texto, la cual se incluirá en la norma. No se publicarán más de dos enmiendas modificando el texto Codex vigente. La elaboración de una tercera enmienda deberá originar una nueva edición del texto Codex.</p> <p>Párrafo 26. Corresponde a la Comisión, en última instancia, determinar si una modificación propuesta, por el órgano auxiliar interesado o miembro de la Comisión (en caso no exista el órgano auxiliar), constituye una enmienda o una nueva edición. Las correcciones, tal como se describen en el párrafo 25, serán responsabilidad de la Secretaría del Codex.</p> <p>Párrafo 29. La Comisión, teniendo en cuenta los resultados del examen crítico efectuado por el Comité Ejecutivo, decidirá si es o no necesaria la propuesta de enmienda o nueva edición de una norma. Si la Comisión decide en sentido afirmativo, se podrá adoptar una de las siguientes medidas: a) Cuando se trate de una enmienda o nueva edición, aceptada por un órgano auxiliar y propuesta a la Comisión, la Comisión podrá también discrecionalmente adoptar la modificación en el trámite 8 del procedimiento uniforme (véase la Parte 3 del procedimiento de elaboración).</p>	Peru
There are no other parts that need revisions.	United Arab Emirates
The United States has not identified other parts of the text of Part 7 that require further revision for clarity beyond what is highlighted in the General Comments.	USA
Whether Part 7 could be further simplified	
Indonesia considers the current text to be adequately clear, and any further simplification could lead to potential misinterpretations during implementation.	Indonesia
As a result of the discussions at CCGP33, Part 7 was improved to be easier to understand throughout and to meet the objectives of the work. We believe that further simplification should be kept to a minimum necessary for clarity.	Japan

Fine as is	New Zealand
Due to the importance of this part 7, United Arab Emirates suggests that the 7 paragraphs are enough and should not be simplified more to avoid any understanding alteration	United Arab Emirates
The United States believes that Part 7 needs to be explicitly clear in the distinctions regarding modifications, revisions, new editions, etc. and for this reason the text does not need to be simplified further.	USA
Section 2 Elaboration of Codex standards and related texts, Introduction, paragraph 8	
Como país no se tiene observaciones al párrafo 8; consideramos que la Comisión del Codex tiene la potestad de tomar las mejores decisiones apegadas al Manual de Procedimiento del Codex; sin embargo, de existir modificaciones al párrafo de la referencia se apoyará la decisión mayoritaria.	Ecuador
We think the second sentence in Paragraph 8 is too long and a little confusing. Refer our suggestions to address below:	New Zealand
CONSIDERAMOS QUE DEBERÍA DECIR: Introducción Párrafo 8. Quedará a discreción de la Comisión decidir si debe tenerse en estudio la modificación de las normas del Codex. El procedimiento para una modificación será, mutatis mutandis, el establecido para la elaboración de las normas del Codex. La Comisión podrá decidir la omisión de los trámites del procedimiento cuando, a su juicio, una modificación propuesta por el órgano auxiliar interesado o por la Secretaría del Codex o por un miembro de la Comisión (solamente en el caso que el órgano auxiliar correspondiente ya no esté en funciones o haya sido aplazado sine die); se ajuste a la orientación pertinente expuesta en la Guía sobre el procedimiento de corrección, enmienda y nuevas ediciones de las normas y textos afines del Codex (Parte 7).	Peru
Ajouter "amendement" Il appartient à la Commission elle-même d'entreprendre la révision ou l'amendement éventuel... Justification : Le paragraphe traite à la fois des procédures de révision et d'amendement. Il faudra prévoir un nouveau paragraphe sur les procédures d'amendement.	Senegal
The updated version of paragraph 8 is satisfying	United Arab Emirates
The United States agrees with the changes to paragraph 8 that indicate that "modification" will now be the term used when Codex standards undergo what was previously referred to as a "revision."	USA
Section 2 Elaboration of Codex standards and related texts, Part 2. Critical Review, paragraph 12	
El país considera que el párrafo 12 se encuentra bien estructurado, por tanto, no se tiene observaciones; sin embargo, de existir modificaciones al párrafo de la referencia se apoyará la decisión mayoritaria	Ecuador

No	New Zealand
<p>CONSIDERAMOS QUE DEBERÍA DECIR:</p> <p>Parte 2. Examen crítico</p> <p>Propuestas de emprender nuevos trabajos o de modificar una norma</p> <p>Párrafo 12. Antes de ser aprobada para su elaboración, cada propuesta de nuevo trabajo o modificación (véase la Parte 7) de una norma es objeto de un documento de proyecto preparado por el Comité o por el miembro que propone emprender nuevos trabajos o la modificación de una norma, especificando:</p>	Peru
The updated version of paragraph 12 is satisfying	United Arab Emirates
The United States agrees with the changes to paragraph 12 that indicate that “modification” will now be the term used when Codex standards undergo what was previously referred to as a “revision.”	USA
Are there other texts of the PM that would need to be updated in light of the proposed updates to Section 2?	
Al respecto, el país considera que no hay otras partes del texto del Manual de procedimiento que requieran ser actualizadas; sin embargo, de existir modificaciones se apoyará la decisión mayoritaria.	Ecuador
<p>Consequential amendments of the other texts of the PM would be necessary in order to align current terminology in the 28th edition (amendments/revisions) with the new one (corrections/amendments/new editions) when adopted. In particular, it is regularly referred to “revision” as a generic term in the PM, which should be updated as “modification” where appropriate, notably in the following paragraphs (not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2, paragraph 10: "Taking into account Section 2: Criteria for the establishment of work priorities, the strategic plan shall state broad priorities against which individual proposals for standards (and MODIFICATION of standards) can be evaluated during the critical review process. • Section 2, paragraph 13: The decision to undertake new work or to MODIFY standards shall be taken by the Commission taking into account a critical review conducted by the Executive Committee. • Section 2, paragraph 14: The critical review includes: a) examination of proposals for development/MODIFICATION of standards [...] • Section 2, paragraph 15: The decision to undertake new work or MODIFICATION of individual maximum residue limits for pesticides or veterinary drugs, or the maintenance of the General Standard for Food Additives (CXS 192-1995) [...] • ... • Section 3, paragraph 8(f): the review and, as necessary, MODIFICATION of existing standards and related texts • Section 3, paragraph 39(b): for consistency, an additional bullet point (v.) should be considered reflecting the need for the description of amendments and justification for new editions, according to the new publishing rules, that correction must be listed in a corrigendum. • ... 	European Union

The MSEU would welcome the preparation of an exhaustive list of all consequential modifications that would be necessary following the implementation of the new terminology.	
After the proposed updates are completed, it might be necessary to review if the terminology related to modifications used in other texts of the PM should be updated or not. However, as it is expected that a lot of workloads are required, careful consideration should be given to whether the work is really necessary.	Japan
Term 'amendment/revision' should be replaced with 'modification' accordingly throughout the Procedural Manual e.g. Rule VIII, Para 3.	Malaysia
Section 1 – Basic texts and definitions – should it include the modification types?	New Zealand
In general, Thailand does not object to the use of the term "modification" or the proposed definitions for "correction," "amendment," and "new edition." We particularly commend the clarification regarding responsibility for working within these procedures as it will greatly enhance effective implementation. However, we would like to draw attention to two observations. Firstly, the current text does not explicitly address the Codex Committee Working by Correspondence. Lastly, the explanation for "new edition" in paragraph 25 appears to focus solely on subsequent editions. This leaves the concept of "first edition" unclear. So, we would like to suggest clarifying the procedures for handling "first edition", particularly in the context of proposing new work to address this ambiguity.	Thailand
Since there are no other parts that are directly related to section, so United Arab Emirates has no more proposed updates to any other sections.	United Arab Emirates
No, no es necesario modificar ninguna otra parte del texto del Manual de Procedimiento.	Uruguay

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts	
<p>Párrafo 8. Quedará a discreción de la Comisión decidir si debe tenerse en estudio la modificación de las normas del Codex. El procedimiento para una modificación será, <i>mutatis mutandis</i>, el establecido para la elaboración de las normas del Codex. La Comisión podrá decidir la omisión de <u>alguno de los trámites</u> del procedimiento cuando, a su juicio, una modificación propuesta por el órgano auxiliar interesado o por la Secretaría del Codex o por un miembro de la Comisión cuando el órgano auxiliar interesado ya no esté en funciones o haya sido aplazado <i>sine die</i>, se ajuste a la orientación pertinente expuesta en la Guía sobre el procedimiento de corrección <u>modificación (corrección, enmienda y nuevas ediciones ediciones)</u> de las normas y textos afines del Codex (Parte 7).</p> <p>Se agrega la palabra "modificación" en el título de la Guía para ser coherentes con el título que figura en la parte 7 y porque es la palabra más general que se ha acordado emplear para describir todos los tipos de cambios que pueden sufrir las normas del Codex</p>	Uruguay
<p>Paragraph 8. It is suggested that the phrase "mutatis mutandis" be replaced with simpler phrase or word to enhance clarity. Additionally, the conditions under which steps may be omitted could benefit from more precise language to avoid ambiguity.</p>	Iran
<p>Paragraph 8. Malaysia can agree on the proposed amendment as Part 7 will be referred to guide Commission on the decision. We note that the whole change would positively enable faster adoption of modification to Codex text. Similarly, Codex members and observers should be mindful of the change and Codex should adhere to its core values of inclusiveness and transparency.</p>	Malaysia
<p>Paragraph 8. It will be for the Commission itself to keep under review the modification of Codex standards. The procedure for modification should, <i>mutatis mutandis</i>, be that laid down for the elaboration of Codex standards. The Commission may decide to omit steps of that procedure where, in its opinion, a modification proposed by <u>1. the subsidiary body concerned, or 2. the Codex Secretariat or 3. a Member of the Commission where the subsidiary body concerned is not in existence or has been adjourned <i>sine die</i>.</u> This is stipulated, is in line with relevant guidance outlined in Part 7 - Guide to the procedure for the correction, amendment and new editions of Codex standards and related texts <u>Guide to the procedure for the correction, amendment and new editions of Codex standards and related texts</u>.</p>	New Zealand
<p>Paragraph 8. It will be for the Commission itself to keep under review the modification of Codex standards <u>standards or related texts</u>. The procedure for modification should, <i>mutatis mutandis</i>, be that laid down for the elaboration of Codex standards. The Commission may decide to omit steps of that procedure where, in its opinion, a modification proposed by the subsidiary body concerned, or the Codex Secretariat or <u>a Member of the Commission where the subsidiary body concerned is not in existence</u> abolished or has been adjourned <i>sine die</i>, is in line with relevant guidance outlined in Part 7 - Guide to the procedure for the correction <u>modification (corrections, amendment amendments and new editions editions)</u> of Codex standards and related texts.</p> <p>It is proposed to replace the terms "not in existence" by "abolished" for consistency with the terms used in Section 5 of the PM (also in paragraph 29 below).</p>	European Union
<p>Paragraphe 8. Il appartient à la Commission elle-même d'entreprendre la modification éventuelle des «normes Codex». La Procédure de modification devrait être la même, Paragraph 8. It is for the Commission itself to undertake any amendment of "Codex standards". The Procedure for amendment should be the same, <i>mutatis mutandis</i> mutatis mutandis, que celle fixée pour l'élaboration des normes Codex. La Commission peut décider d'omettre des étapes de la Procédure quand, à son avis, la modification proposée par l'organe</p>	Zambia

<p>subsidaire concerné, ou par le secrétariat du Codex ou un membre de la Commission lorsque l'organe subsidiaire n'existe pas ou a été ajourné, as that established for the elaboration of Codex standards. The Commission may decide to omit steps in the Procedure when, in its opinion, the amendment proposed by the subsidiary body concerned, or by the Codex Secretariat or a member of the Commission where the subsidiary body does not exist or has been adjourned. <i>sine die</i> <i>sine die</i>, est conforme aux orientations pertinentes définies dans la partie 7 – Guide concernant la procédure en matière de corrections, d'amendements et de nouvelles éditions des normes Codex et textes apparentés., is in accordance with the relevant guidance set out in Part 7 - Guide to Procedures for Corrections, Amendments and New Editions of Codex Standards and Related Texts.</p> <p>Zambia would like to thank Codex Secretariat for the work that is being done on the Procedure manual. Zambia hence supports this work on procedure for development of Codex standards and related texts as it will guide the standard development process.</p>	
<p>Párrafo 12.</p> <p>a) el objeto y el ámbito de aplicación de la norma; b) su pertinencia y oportunidad; c) las principales cuestiones que se deben tratar; d) la evaluación con respecto a los Criterios para el establecimiento de las prioridades de los trabajos establecidos en la Sección 2; e) la pertinencia con respecto a los objetivos estratégicos del Codex; f) información sobre la relación entre la propuesta y otros documentos del Codex vigentes, así como otros trabajos en curso iv; g) la determinación de la necesidad y la disponibilidad de asesoramiento científico de expertos; h) la determinación de todo tipo de necesidad de aportaciones técnicas a la norma por parte de organizaciones externas, a fin de poder programar iv Los países podrían solicitar la asistencia de la Secretaría del Codex para proporcionar información sobre otros trabajos en curso del Codex. estas contribuciones; i) el calendario propuesto para la realización de los nuevos trabajos, comprendida la fecha de inicio, la fecha propuesta para la adopción en el trámite 5 y la fecha propuesta para la adopción por parte de la Comisión. Normalmente el plazo de elaboración de una norma no debería superar los cinco años.</p> <p>iv Los países podrían solicitar la asistencia de la Secretaría del Codex para proporcionar información sobre otros trabajos en curso del Codex</p>	Uruguay
<p>Paragraph 12. To improve clarity, it would be helpful to specify the components of project document</p>	Iran
<p>Paragraph 12. Prior to approval for development, each proposal for new work or as appropriate modification (see when in line with the guidance outlined in Part 7) <u>modification consisting of a new edition of a standard shall be accompanied by a project document, prepared by the Committee or Member proposing new work or modification of a standard detailing:</u></p>	European Union
<p>Part 7. Guide to the procedure for the modification (corrections, amendments and new editions) of Codex standards and related texts</p> <p>It is suggested that the definitions of section 7 be stated more simply. Using more straightforward language can increase understanding, especially for those who may not be familiar with the terminology. In addition, the inclusion of practical examples for each type of modification (corrections and amendments) makes their application clearer and more understandable</p>	Iran

<p>Paragraph 24. The procedure for modification of Codex standards and related texts is laid down in paragraph 8 of the introduction of Section 2: <u>Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts</u>. This guide provides more detailed guidance on the procedure for modifying Codex standards and related texts, which includes are corrections, amendments and new editions.</p> <p>Under paragraph 25 modifications are divided into correction, amendment or new edition only. As such the word 'includes' in the text could create confusion and it should be replaced with 'are'.</p>	Malaysia
<p>Corrección: Hace referencia a errores de forma, tales como faltas de ortografía, negritas o cursivas incorrectas, otro formato incorrecto del texto, una transcripción incorrecta, una nota a pie de página incorrectamente numerada o situada, o errores en la traducción. Todas las correcciones deben ir acompañadas de un <i>corrigendum</i>, en el que se detallen los cambios realizados, <u>que se incluirá en la norma</u>.</p>	Uruguay
<p>Correction: Malaysia has no objections, corrections to Codex text should be made aware to Codex members and observers. Errors in language translation could introduce substantial change to a Codex text. As such it is important to alert members and observers of corrections made, to avoid unintended circumstances.</p>	Malaysia
<p>Correction: Apply <u>Applies</u> to editorial errors including incorrect spelling, incorrect bold or italics, other incorrect formatting of text, an incorrect transcription, an incorrectly numbered or located footnote, or errors in language translation. A corrigendum itemizing the changes made is required for all corrections and <u>shall be</u> included in the standard.</p>	New Zealand
<p>Correction: With regard to the definition of corrections, the MSEU would welcome clarification on what is covered by the terms "incorrect transcription".</p>	European Union
<p>Correction: Adding the phrase " Any modification that applies to " to the beginning of the definition for more clarity and to harmonize with other definitions in this part.</p>	Saudi Arabia
<p>Correction: Adding the phrase " Any modification that applies to " to the beginning of the definition for more clarity and to harmonize with other definitions in this part.</p>	Saudi Arabia
<p>Amendment: Any <u>Applies to any</u> modification that does not impact the scope or application. In particular, amendments address:</p>	New Zealand
<p><u>inadvertent or editorial technical</u> errors or incorrectly reported numbers;</p>	USA
<p>partial re-writes or partial deletions of sections when there is no new data or information introduced;</p>	Saudi Arabia

Adding the word “rewording” as the following: partial re-writes, rewording, or partial deletions of sections when there is no new data or information introduced;	
explanatory footnotes; Adding the phrase “ Adding or rewriting explanatory footnotes when there is no information introduced” instead of” explanatory footnotes” In order to reach clarity	Saudi Arabia
replacement of content with a reference to another Codex text when there is no new data or information introduced. With regard to the last point of the definition of an amendment, the MSEU would like to receive clarification on whether what is covered corresponds to the replacement of an existing reference to a Codex standard or related text in the initial version of the considered text by another reference or whether it concerns the replacement of content of any kind by a reference to a Codex standard or related text.	European Union
An explanation of the changes made to the text is required for all amendments and included in the standard. Malaysia can agree to the approach of middle category of change i.e. amendment and the current draft description where change has been made to remove the word ‘but are not limited to’ from earlier version.	Malaysia
An explanation of the changes made to the text is required for all amendments and <u>shall be</u> included in the standard.	New Zealand
New edition: Any <u>Applies to any</u> modification, regardless of the length, not covered by a correction or amendment, including:	New Zealand
New edition: Malaysia has no objection. We note with the new categorisation, many of Codex Committee’s work would fall under new edition and some Codex standards could have new edition on yearly basis.	Malaysia
A justification for the new edition is required for all new editions and included in the standard. Malaysia has no objection. We note with the new categorisation, many of Codex Committee’s work would fall under new edition and some Codex standards could have new edition on yearly basis.	Malaysia
A justification for the new edition is required for all new editions and <u>shall be</u> included in the standard.	New Zealand
Paragraph 26. Malaysia is of the view that Members and the corresponding Codex Committees should also be made known of the corrections made to a standard through appropriate mechanism e.g. information paper for the Commission.	Malaysia

<p>Paragraph 26. The Commission has the final authority to determine whether a proposed modification constitutes <u>a correction, an amendment or a new edition</u>. Corrections, as described in paragraph 25 will 25, can be <u>proposed by the responsibility of the Codex Secretariat</u> Secretariat to the Commission for adoption, where the subsidiary body concerned is active, is not in existence or has been adjourned sine die.</p> <p>The 2nd sentence of paragraph 26 may be inconsistent with paragraph 8, which indicates that the Commission itself will keep under review the modification. Even if the corrections are minor, as described in paragraph 25, the proposals should be submitted to the Commission under the responsibility of the Codex Secretariat for adoption. This is also an opportunity to inform Members and Observers that corrections will be made to some Codex texts.</p>	Japan
<p>Paragraph 26. The MSEU can support the principle of not reporting to the Commission editorial corrections made by the Codex secretariat. However, we would also be in favour of finding a way of informing Members of corrections made by the Codex secretariat as they occur. A dedicated page on the Codex website could be created for this purpose.</p>	European Union
<p>Paragraph 27. When the Commission has decided to amend or develop a new edition of a Codex standard or related texttext or <u>develop a new edition</u>, the existing text will remain the applicable Codex text until the amendment or the new edition has been adopted by the Commission.</p>	European Union
<p>Paragraph 28. Malaysia notes from CCGP33 report that a project document would not always be required for amendments or new edition proposals. In this case, further clarification would be beneficial.</p>	Malaysia
<p>Paragraph 28. Proposals for amendments or new editions of Codex standards and related texts should be submitted to the Commission by the subsidiary body concerned. Where the subsidiary body concerned is not in existence or has been adjourned <i>sine die</i>, the proposal for an amendment or new edition should be submitted to the Commission by the Secretariat or a Member of the Commission. In the latter case, proposals should be received by the Secretariat in good time (not less than three months) before the session of the Commission at which they are to be considered. The proposal proposal, as appropriate, should be accompanied by a project document (see Part 2 of the elaboration procedures) unless the Executive Committee or the Commission decides otherwise procedures).</p> <p>As discussed extensively at CCGP33, the meaning of the last sentence is unclear and it may be interpreted to mean that a project document was required for any modification. To be consistent with current practices and the 1st sentence of paragraph 12, we suggest that this sentence should be replaced with "The proposal, as appropriate, should be accompanied by a project document."</p>	Japan
<p>Paragraph 28. The United States would like clarity on what would be the possible conditions for "deciding otherwise."</p>	USA
<p>Paragraph 28. Proposals for amendments or new editions of Codex standards and related texts should be submitted to the Commission by the subsidiary body concerned. <u>Proposals for amendments should not be accompanied by a project document (see Part 2: Critical review) unless the Commission decides otherwise. Proposals for new editions should be accompanied by a project document unless the Commission decides otherwise.</u> Where the subsidiary body concerned is not in existence or has been abolished, dissolved or adjourned sine die, the proposal proposals for an amendment amendments or new edition editions should be submitted to the</p>	European Union

<p>Commission by the Codex Secretariat or a Member of the Commission. In the latter case, Such proposals should be received by the Secretariat prepared and made available in good time (not less than three months) before the session of the Commission at which they are to be considered. (from para 30 revised) The proposal-Codex Secretariat should be accompanied-keep under review all Codex standards and related texts elaborated by abolished, dissolved or adjourned sine die subsidiary bodies. If the need for an amendment is identified, in particular those arising from decisions of the Commission, the Codex secretariat should prepare a project-working document (see Part 2-containing the reasons for proposing an amendment and the wording of such amendment as appropriate, and request comments from Members of the elaboration procedures) unless-Commission: a) on the Executive Committee or need to proceed with such an amendment and b) on the proposed amendment itself. The replies received from Members should be submitted for consideration to the Commission decides otherwise along with the proposed amendment.</p> <p>There were extensive discussions during CCGP33 on whether a project document would always be needed for an amendment or for a new edition of a Codex standard. In the new wording of paragraphs 28 and 29, no clear distinction is made regarding the procedure applicable to amendments and new editions in this matter. This could call into question the relevance of developing these two distinct categories of modification. We consider it is necessary to accentuate the difference between the two, especially given the lesser scope of amendments compared to new editions.</p> <p>We propose that project documents be only needed for new editions and not for amendments unless the Commission decides otherwise (see revisions in the annexe below).</p> <p>We also consider that the implication of the Executive Committee in that matter, through the critical review process, is to advise the Commission, which shall take the final decision. It is therefore proposed to suppress the mention of the Executive Committee in that paragraph.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 29. Taking into account the outcome of the ongoing critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, the Commission decides whether the proposed amendment or new edition of a standard is necessary. If the Commission decides in the affirmative, <u>the Commission will take</u> one of the following courses of action will be taken<u>action</u>:</p> <p>We suggest adding some text to clarify that the Commission has the final authority for modifications and to ensure consistency with current practices.</p>	Japan
<p>Paragraph 29. Taking into account the outcome of the ongoing critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, the Commission decides whether the-a proposed amendment or new edition of a standard is necessary. If the Commission decides in the affirmative, one of the following courses of action will be taken:</p> <p>In the 28th edition, two paragraphs specify the conditions where certain steps of the procedure can be omitted when amending or revising Codex standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 8 (introduction): “[...] 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.” - Paragraph 31: Editorial amendments: can be adopted at Step 8 Amendment agreed by a committee: can be adopted at Step 5 Other cases: approved as new work, step process to be followed. 	European Union

<p>Against this background, we understand that new editions, which mainly correspond to “revisions” in the current edition of the PM, are not primarily intended to benefit from omission of steps. Proposals are made in that sense in the Annex.</p> <p>The possibility to reconvene committees that have been adjourned sine die to undertake new work should also be stated more explicitly. The use of modern tools/virtual meetings facilitates such reactivation.</p>	
<p>a) Cuando se trate de una modificación (enmienda o nueva edición) aceptada por un órgano auxiliar y propuesta a la Comisión, la Comisión podrá también discrecionalmente también adoptar la modificación en el trámite 8-5 o 5/8 del procedimiento uniforme (véase la Parte 3 del procedimiento de elaboración).</p> <p>Es preferible mantener la misma forma de expresión de los pasos del procedimiento de elaboración de normas que figuran en los proyectos de normas que provienen de los comités. En los informes de los comités, se puede sugerir a la Comisión la aprobación en trámite 5 o en trámite 5/8, dándole libertad de elección. Si un proyecto de norma ingresara en trámite 8 a la Comisión, en caso de no aprobación, no queda claro en que trámite quedaría la norma. Por otra parte, el impacto de las modificaciones en las normas puede ser muy variable, ya que si bien las enmiendas tendrían un alcance más limitado, las nuevas ediciones podrían tener cambios muy grandes respecto a la versión anterior de la norma y requerirían mantener las dos opciones de aprobación.</p>	Uruguay
<p>a) In the case of a modification (amendment or new edition) agreed upon by a subsidiary body, and proposed proposed to the Commission, it will also be open to the Commission to adopt the modification at Step 8 of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures).</p> <p>Further guidance or examples of amendment or new edition for which the Commission may consider adoption at Step 8 might be helpful for Members to better understand the condition applicable for paragraph 29(a).</p>	Malaysia
<p>a) In the case of a modification (amendment or new edition) amendment or new edition agreed upon by a subsidiary body, and proposed to the Commission Commission for adoption, it will also be open to the Commission to may adopt the modification at Step 8 <u>with omission of any other steps</u> of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures).</p>	Japan
<p>a) In the case of a modification (amendment or new edition) amendment or new edition agreed upon by a subsidiary body, and proposed to the Commission proposed to the Commission, <u>an amendment</u> it will also be open to the Commission to adopt the modification <u>amendment</u> at Step 8 of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures).</p>	European Union
<p>b) In other cases, the Commission will approve the proposal as new work <u>at Step 1 of the uniform procedure (see Part 3 of the elaboration procedures)</u> and the approved new work will be referred for consideration to the appropriate subsidiary body, if such body is still in existence. If such body is not in existence, the Commission will determine how best to deal with the new work.</p>	Japan
<p>b) In other cases, the Commission will approve the proposal as new work and the approved new work will be referred for consideration to the appropriate subsidiary body, if such body is still in existence. If such body is not in existence, the Commission will determine how best to deal with the new work.</p> <p>The United States would like to have examples of options, which could include: find another committee that could handle the work, new work could be submitted to the CAC, work by correspondence, or set up a task force.</p>	USA

<p>b) In other cases the case of <u>a new edition</u>, the Commission will approve the proposal as new work and the approved new work will be referred for consideration to the appropriate subsidiary body, if such body is still in existence <u>including by reconvening committees that have been adjourned sine die</u>. If such body is not in existence <u>abolished</u>, the Commission will determine how best to deal with the new work.</p>	European Union
<p>Paragraph 30. Where Codex subsidiary bodies have been abolished, dissolved, or adjourned sine die, the Secretariat keeps under review all Codex standards and related texts elaborated by these bodies and determines the need for any corrections, amendments or new editions, in particular those arising from decisions of the Commission.</p>	European Union
<p>Paragraph 30. Regarding the management of Codex standards developed by inactive committees a better distinction between amendments and new editions should be made.</p> <p>Paragraph 32 in the current 28th edition of the PM deals with amendments of substantive nature, which mainly correspond to regular amendments (i.e. not corrections or new editions) in the new terminology.</p> <p>For new editions, we believe that the responsibility of their development primarily lies with Members. A project document should be required and the proposal should follow the step process. This does not prevent the Codex Secretariat to bring to the attention of Members the need to issue new editions of standards developed by inactive committees.</p> <p>A simplified redaction of this paragraph is proposed. The responsibility of corrections is already covered in paragraph 26 and does not need to be restated. It is also suggested to move this paragraph up before paragraph 29 so as to better reflect the chronological order of the steps involved.</p>	European Union
<p>If the need for corrections is identified, then the Secretariat makcan propose <u>esthe corrections</u> to the Commission for adoption. the corrections.</p> <p>To be consistent with the paragraph 26.</p>	Japan
<p>If the need for corrections is identified, then the Secretariat makes the corrections.</p>	European Union
<p>If the need for a modification (amendment amendment or new edition) <u>modification</u> is identified, the Codex Secretariat, in cooperation with the host secretariat of the adjourned committee if applicable, should prepare a working paper containing the reasons for proposing a modification and the wording of such modifications as appropriate, and request comments from Members of the Commission: a) on the need to proceed with such a modification and b) on the proposed modification itself.</p> <p>Para 30 - Sometimes corrections, amendments and new editions are mentioned as is, on the other part were referred to as modification (corrections, amendments and new editions). Proposed to be consistent on the terms used, modification could be used when all 3 categories applied, otherwise the specific category could be used.</p>	Malaysia
<p>If the need for a modification (amendment amendment or new edition) <u>modification</u> is identified, the Codex Secretariat, in cooperation with the host secretariat of the adjourned committee if applicable, should prepare a working paper containing the reasons for proposing a modification and the wording of such modifications as appropriate, and request comments from Members of the Commission: a) on the need to proceed with such a modification and b) on the proposed modification itself.</p>	Japan

If the need for a modification (amendment or new edition) is identified, the Codex Secretariat, in cooperation with the host secretariat of the adjourned committee if applicable, should prepare a working paper containing the reasons for proposing a modification and the wording of such modifications as appropriate, and request comments from Members of the Commission: a) on the need to proceed with such a modification and b) on the proposed modification itself.	European Union
If the majority of the replies received from Members of the Commission is affirmative on both the need to modify the standard, and the suitability of the proposed wording for the modification or an alternative proposed wording, the proposal should be submitted to the Commission for consideration and adoption.	European Union
In cases where replies do not appear to offer an uncontroversial solution then the Commission should be informed accordingly, and it would be for the Commission to determine how best to proceed.	European Union