

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 5

CRD08

Original Language Only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Thirty-third Session

Bordeaux, France

2-6 October 2023

CODEX PROCEDURAL MANUAL: PROPOSED UPDATE TO THE GUIDE TO THE PROCEDURE FOR THE AMENDMENT AND REVISION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS

(Comments of Kenya, Russian Federation, Uganda, and United Republic of Tanzania)

Kenya

General Comment: Kenya appreciates the work undertaken by the Codex Secretariat in proposing updates to the Codex Procedural Manual and supports the updates with the following proposals for improvement.

Part 2. Critical review

Comment: Kenya proposes that the title should read: Proposals to undertake new work or to revise update new edition of a standard

Rationale: Updating includes correction, amendments, and new editions but para 12 only addresses requirements for new work and new editions while excluding amendments and corrections.

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

Comment: Kenya proposes the following definition of Amendment in para 26: An amendment refers to any change to the standard that updates the existing information where there is no new data introduced.

Rationale: To minimize repetition in the 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th bullet. This further clarifies the difference between an amendment and a new edition.

Comment: Kenya proposes that para 29 be revised to read: The Commission has the final authority in the event of lack of consensus and/or clarity to determine whether a proposal made constitutes an amendment or a revision new edition. , and whether an amendment proposed is of an editorial or substantive nature.

Rationale: Since the guide is clear on the criteria for changes in Codex texts the input of the Commission is required where there is lack of consensus or clarity

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation deeply appreciates the work done by the Codex Secretariat of examining amendments and revisions to Codex texts. This work helped to discover weak points in the existing practice of updating Codex documents and discover some ways to improve the process.

Thus, we agree, that there should be consistency in treating same types of changes across the committees. All updates made to Codex texts should be considered uniformly in all Codex Committees to facilitate work of experts from Codex member countries and the Codex Secretariat on documentation submitted to the Commission. We believe that changes should be classified according to a more specific set of criteria to determine their significance.

According to the proposed new hierarchy, any new data added to Codex texts will be considered as a new edition, triggering the highest type of change in the hierarchy. However we can not clearly understand, according to the proposed new terminology, what exactly will be considered as new data, because this wording is rather abstract. Will the addition of an explanatory information, i.e. examples or clarifications, which do not change the substance, be considered as a new edition? To our mind, this issue is rather important because there is a risk of going into a long step-process adopting a new edition just because of the editorial updates.

The Russian delegation would be grateful if the Codex Secretariat could give some clarifications on this question.

Considering this, we would like to propose the following edition of Paragraph 28:

“New edition applies to any change to a standard made in the spirit of updating the content, and for anything not covered by a correction or amendment, including:

- any new data/provision added to the text, regardless of how small the change, except for the explanatory updates, such as examples or clarifications;...”

Uganda

Comments on:

Proposed updates to the Codex Procedural Manual, section 2 Elaboration of Codex Standards and related texts; Procedures for the elaboration of Codex Standards and related texts (CX/GP23/33/5)

i. Introduction

Position: Uganda supports all the changes made to paragraph 8 of the introduction.

Rationale: The changes align with the proposed categories of changes in Codex texts.

ii. Part 2: Critical review

Position: Uganda supports all the changes made to part 2.

Rationale: The changes align with the proposed categories of changes in Codex texts.

iii. Part 7: Guide to the procedure for the correction, amendment and new editions of Codex standards and related texts

Paragraph 30. Line 6.

Position: Uganda proposes the 6th line to read “The request for a new edition should be accompanied by a project proposal with justifications.

Rationale: Given that the term "document" encompasses a broad spectrum of textual materials, specifying the inclusion of a project proposal alongside justifications enhances clarity and ensures that the process for requesting a new edition is comprehensive and well-defined.

United Republic of Tanzania

Item: Proposed updates to the Codex Procedural Manual, section 2

Comment: To remove an alternative proposal in paragraph 32

Rationale: There only two options i.e amendment or new edition