

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

E

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

Agenda item 3.3

CX/EXEC 26/90/3 Add.2
May 2026

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Ninetieth Session
WHO headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland
29 June – 3 July 2026

CRITICAL REVIEW - PART III
(standards for adoption and monitoring of work progress – CCRVDF, CCFA)

Note: For general information about the critical review as well as the critical review for CCSCH8 and CCFH55, please see CX/EXEC 26/90/3. For the critical review for CCFO29 and CCMAS45, please see CX/EXEC 26/90/3 Add.1. For the critical review for CCFL49 and CCFFP37, please see CX/EXEC 26/90/3 Add.3. For the critical review for other committees with standards having fulfilled endorsement requirements, please see CX/EXEC 26/90/3 Add.4.

Structure of appendices

1. The work of the different committees is addressed in separate appendices.
2. The current structure of the appendices for each committee is as follows:
 - A. General information on the committee and session
 - B. Status of work items (Overview) with explanatory notes as relevant from the Codex Secretariat and Chairperson's comments on specific work items
 - C. Chairperson's comments on the overall work of the committee in light of the purpose of the critical review

List of appendices

- Appendix 1: Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods, 28th session (CCRVDF28)
- Appendix 2: Codex Committee on Food Additives, 56th session (CCFA56)

Appendix 1

A. General information on the committee and session

Committee	Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF)		
Host	The United States of America	Chairperson	Brandi Robinson
Session reported on	CCRVDF28	23 – 27 March 2026	
Next session	CCRVDF29	TBC	
Report	REP26/RVDF28		

B. Status of work items (Overview)

Existing work item(s) for decision by the Commission (adoption, revocation, discontinuation)					
Topic	Job number	Target year	Recommendation of the committee	Reference	Explanatory notes (if any)
1. Maximum residue limits (MRLs) extrapolated for camelids: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ivermectin – milk Tetracyclines (chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, and tetracycline) – muscle, liver, kidney, milk 	-	-	Adoption at Step 5/8	REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 64(i)(a-e) and Appendix III	<p>Oxytetracycline was included in the priority list of veterinary drugs submitted by CCRVDF27 (2024) for approval by CAC47 (2024), and chlortetracycline and tetracycline had not been included and therefore did not receive CAC approval. CCRVDF28 (2025) agreed that sufficient scientific justification and relevant precedent decisions, as documented in CXM2 where the three compounds are listed together with identical MRLs, supported establishing group MRLs for the group of tetracyclines comprising chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, and tetracycline. On this basis, CCRVDF28 agreed to proceed with extrapolation and establish a group MRL for tetracyclines (chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, and tetracycline). This decision was taken without technical reservations expressed by Codex Members.</p> <p>The European Union, however, expressed concern about the procedure followed and stated that extrapolating tetracycline and chlortetracycline without inclusion in the priority list breaches established CCRVDF procedures and should not set a precedent, as adherence to the <i>Codex Procedural Manual</i> is essential to maintain trust and confidence in the Committee's work.</p> <p>The Codex Secretariat indicated that, as long as the rationale supporting this decision was well documented in the report, CCRVDF could consider including these compounds on an</p>

Existing work item(s) for decision by the Commission (adoption, revocation, discontinuation)					
					exceptional basis, thereby enabling CAC to make an informed decision when considering the adoption of these extrapolated MRLs.
2. Guidelines on recommended risk-based actions to address the detection of residues of a veterinary drug in food caused by unavoidable and unintentional carryover of veterinary drugs in animal feed, where there is no applicable Codex MRL	N19-2024	2027	Adoption at Step 5/8	REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 134 and Appendix VI	-
3. Action levels for nicarbazin and lasalocid in chicken eggs	-	-	Adoption at Step 5/8	REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 137 and Appendix VII	-
4. Editorial amendments to the <i>Maximum residue limits and risk management recommendations for residues of veterinary drugs in foods</i> (CXM 2) to harmonise the names of tetracyclines and cypermethrins	-	-	Adoption	REP26/RVDF28 paragraphs 64(ii), 162 and Appendix IV	The editorial amendments aim to ensure consistent use of compound names that encompass related chemicals—such as “tetracyclines” and “cypermethrins”—throughout CXM 2, reflecting that MRLs have been established and extrapolated for these chemicals as groups of compounds, unless otherwise specified for specific species or tissues.
5. <u>Editorial amendments to Annex A of the <i>Risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF in the Codex Procedural Manual</i></u> • Revised template for information recommended for consideration in the priority list by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (inclusion of two entries to	-	-	Adoption	REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 170(ii-iii) and Appendix IX	<p>The amendments reflect CCRVDF’s current approach to MRL risk management, particularly for compounds identified for parallel review and extrapolation. As the data requirements for parallel review align with those for JECFA evaluation, no separate template is needed. The existing template was instead updated to indicate whether a compound is proposed for parallel review and, additionally, whether it has pesticide uses, supporting future harmonization of MRLs for dual-use compounds.</p> <p>The data and information required for extrapolation, however, are less extensive than those required for JECFA evaluation and also include specific elements not covered by the current template</p>

Existing work item(s) for decision by the Commission (adoption, revocation, discontinuation)					
(i) identify if the nomination is for a parallel review and (ii) indicate if the compound has dual-use as a pesticide) (Parts I and IV of the Priority List) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of a new nomination template to address nominations of compounds for extrapolation of MRLs to one or more species(Part V of the Priority List) 					including remedial actions to further support the editorial amendments to CXM2 as described in point 4 to avoid procedural situations as described in point 1. This supports the development of a separate, streamlined template for nominating compounds for extrapolation.
Chairperson's comments on specific work items(s) from the above in light of the purpose of the critical review <u>1. Maximum residue limits (MRLs) extrapolated for camelids</u> When considering the extrapolated MRLs for oxytetracycline, the electronic working group (EWG) noted that CCRVDF had treated the tetracyclines as a group since the establishment of MRLs. Following discussion and advice from the Codex Secretariat, CCRVDF28 agreed to extrapolate the MRLs for the tetracyclines group rather than extrapolate MRLs for only oxytetracycline. The European Union raised concerns that extrapolating compounds which had not been specifically listed for approval by CAC should not be considered to set precedent. In order to avoid similar issues in the future, CCRVDF28 included a question in the new proposed template for extrapolations which would note whether compounds were part of a group of MRLs. When considering the extrapolated MRLs for ivermectin, the working group noted that the criteria for milk extrapolation had not been considered within the discussion. CCRVDF considered the milk extrapolation criteria and determined that the conditions had been met to allow extrapolation of the ivermectin milk MRL to camelids. Procedure was followed for the extrapolation although the discussion took place in the Committee session instead of within the EWG.					
Secretariat's comments <u>MRLs for tetracyclines</u> All items submitted for adoption by CAC49 were agreed upon by consensus, with no technical reservations expressed by Codex Members. The European Union, however, raised concerns about the procedure used to establish extrapolated MRLs for tetracyclines (see point 1), specifically highlighting a procedural rather than a technical concern. Codex procedures are there to ensure a consistent, transparent process in which Members can trust. Any deviation or exception from the procedures must be justified, documented and widely supported by Members. In this case, there was an oversight in the establishment of the priority list whereby nomination of oxytetracycline alone was nominated for the priority list, despite its usual consideration as part of the tetracyclines group (chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, and tetracycline). In considering the proposed extrapolation of the MRLs for oxytetracycline to camelids, CCRVDF also considered the extrapolation of the MRLs for chlortetracycline and tetracycline based on the report of the EWG, which indicated that the existing MRLs for oxytetracycline were established as part of a group of tetracyclines which also included chlortetracycline and tetracycline, a group acceptable daily intake (ADI) was established covering chlortetracycline, oxytetracycline, and tetracycline, the marker residue was defined as the sum of these three compounds; and that chlortetracycline and tetracycline also met the extrapolation criteria. In addition to the scientific basis, factors of timeliness were also highlighted including that the fact that Codex had not to date established any MRLs for residues of					

Existing work item(s) for decision by the Commission (adoption, revocation, discontinuation)

veterinary drugs in camelids. Furthermore, CXM2 already includes MRLs for the tetracycline group derived both from JECFA evaluations and from extrapolation, reflecting prior CCRVDF decisions and their subsequent adoption by CAC on group MRLs for tetracyclines.

On this basis, CCRVDF agreed that sufficient rationale existed to extend the extrapolated MRL for oxytetracycline to the entire tetracycline group; accordingly, CCRVDF agreed to recommend that CAC directly adopt the proposed extrapolated MRLs for chlortetracycline, and tetracycline as well as, oxytetracycline.

In this situation a clear case was made for proceeding with direct adoption, which if CAC supports would encompass their approval of this work. In this case, it is clear in hindsight that upon the nomination of oxytetracycline to the priority list, clarification should have been sought on whether chlortetracycline and tetracycline should also have been included. This would have prevented the current situation arising. CCRVDF agreed to take remedial action, to avoid such situations in the future, and has recommended editorial amendments to CXM2 to ensure consistent use of compound(s) names and to Annex A of the *Risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF* to add specific provisions in the new template for compound nominations for extrapolation to indicate whether a compound is a single veterinary drug or a group of compounds.

Extrapolated MRLs for camelids

This is the first time CCRVDF has submitted MRLs for camelid tissues for adoption by CAC49 based on extrapolation procedures as set out in Annex C of the *Risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF* in the *Procedural Manual*, which were revised in 2024 to include additional provisions to allow extrapolation of MRLs to camelids.

Action levels

This is the first time CCRVDF has submitted action levels for adoption by CAC49 to address very low residues of veterinary drugs in foods resulting from the unavoidable and unintended carryover of veterinary drugs in feed to non-target animals based on the procedures as set out in Annex D of the *Risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF* in the *Procedural Manual* adopted by CAC47 in 2024. To support their consistent application by competent authorities, accompanying guidelines have been developed to address situations where no Codex MRL is available or where established Codex action levels are exceeded which is also submitted for adoption by CAC49.

General considerations

The extrapolation of MRLs to camelid tissues, together with the development of action levels and associated implementation guidelines, demonstrate CCRVDF's ability to respond in a timely manner to emerging trade and food safety challenges. These advances also reflect the development of innovative, risk-based management approaches as set out in the *Risk analysis principles applied by CCRVDF* while continuing to ensure consumer health protection.

Existing work item(s) for information by the Commission (information, monitoring)**Monitoring**

Topic	Job number	Target year	Status (Step)	On track for completion?	Reference	Explanatory notes (if any)
3. MRLs for fumagillin dicyclohexylamine (DCH) in fish fillet and honey	-	-	7	Yes	REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 37(i-ii) and Appendix II	The MRLs were retained at Step 7, pending JECFA's re-evaluation, taking into account issues and concerns raised by Members and Observers at CCRVDF27 and reiterated at CCRVDF28, including the concern from

						Canada and the United States of America, and related supplementary information.
Information						
Topic		Reference		Explanatory notes (if any)		
4. Criteria for extrapolation of Codex MRLs to edible offal tissues other than liver and kidney		REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 95(iv)(a-f) and Appendix V		A pilot study will be undertaken to evaluate the proposed criteria and, as necessary, recommend further refinements. It will also assess the potential use and naming of the extrapolated values, the need for associated implementation guidance, and how this work may affect ongoing efforts to harmonize MRLs for dual-use compounds with the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR).		
5. Coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF (see Agenda Item 7)		REP26/RVDF28 paragraph 150(iii-iv)		A virtual session of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF Electronic Working Group on Dual-Use Compounds for the establishment of harmonized MRLs for pesticide and veterinary drug uses took place on 28-29 April 2026. The outcomes of the virtual meeting of the Joint EWG will be considered by a virtual joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF under planning for early 2027. It is expected that the Joint EWG will propose an amendment to its ToR and a draft provisional agenda for the joint virtual session of CCPR and CCRVDF endorsement by CAC49. This matter will be considered under Agenda item 7 of CAC49.		
Chairperson’s comments on specific issues for monitoring and information in light of the purpose of the critical review						
4. Criteria for extrapolation of Codex MRLs to edible offal tissues other than liver and kidney						
CCRVDF28 advanced the discussion on extrapolation of Codex MRLs to edible offal tissues other than liver and kidney. The Committee has not reached consensus on whether the extrapolated values should be considered extrapolated MRLs or new type of standard. CCRVDF28 agreed to conduct a pilot with the proposed criteria to better inform discussions on how extrapolated values could be used. The proposed criteria will ensure that extrapolated values are protective of public health, however, it remains unclear whether data are available which could confirm the extrapolated values would be consistent with residues found when following good veterinary practices (GVP).						
5. Coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF						
One Member raised a new proposal for CCRVDF to extrapolate pesticide MRLs to the veterinary drug MRL database where no veterinary drug MRLs had been established for compounds used as both a veterinary drug and a pesticide. The Member was encouraged to raise the proposal in the virtual working group meeting which took place in April 2026, but the issue was not raised during the virtual working group meeting.						

C. Chairperson's comments on the overall work of the committee in light of the purpose of the critical review

CCRVDF28 continued to explore innovative mechanisms to address the need for MRLs in other species and tissues. The Committee advanced the first extrapolated MRLs for camelid tissues, addressing a need expressed by Members for many years; advanced the discussion on utilizing extrapolation to address residues in

edible offal tissues other than liver and kidney; and developed a full priority list for evaluation by JECFA which will support new Codex MRLs for additional veterinary drugs.

Timeliness of comments and limited participation in working groups between sessions continues to be a challenge. Some of the more challenging discussions which took place in CCRVDF28 could have been avoided had comments been raised in the working groups or in response to the circular letters. Late substantive comments in CRDs or on the plenary floor require much more discussion to allow Members sufficient time to consider alternative approaches and outcomes. The effectiveness of CCRVDF could be improved by better utilizing the time between sessions in electronic working groups to fully discuss each topic and to prepare recommendations based on input from a greater number of Members.

Appendix 2

A. General information on the committee and session

Committee	Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA)		
Host	China	Chairperson	Dr Yongxiang Fan
Session reported on	CCFA56	13 – 17 April 2026	
Next session	CCFA57	12 - 16 April 2027	
Report	REP26/FA		

B. Status of work items (Overview)

Existing work item(s) for decision by the Commission (adoption, revocation, discontinuation)							
Topic	Job number	Target year	Recommendation of the committee	Status of endorsement (where applicable)	Scientific advice (Available, on track, delayed, or N/A)	Reference	Explanatory notes (if any)
1. Draft standard for bakers' yeast	N13-2024	2027	Adoption at Step 5/8	Endorsement of the food labelling provisions was forwarded to CCFL49.	N/A	REP26/FA, paragraph 156(i), Appendix XII	This is the first commodity standard fully elaborated by CCFA in which food additive provisions were developed, endorsed, and aligned with the GSFA concurrently. CCFL49 has endorsed the food labelling provisions, and the standard is now ready for adoption by CAC49.
2. Draft Specifications for the identity and purity of food additives for inclusion in the <i>List of Codex specifications for food additives</i> (CXA 6)	-	-	Adoption at Step 5/8	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 51(i), Appendix III	-

3. Draft revision of the <i>Class names and the International Numbering System for food additives</i> (CXG 36-1989)	-	-	Adoption at Step 5/8	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 133(i), Appendix X	-
4. Draft food-additive provisions of the <i>General standard for food additives</i> (GSFA, CXS 192-1995) and revisions to adopted provisions	-	-	Adoption	-	Available	REP26/FA, paragraph 120(i), Appendix VI Part D	-
5. Insertion of Note 643 associated with the provisions for carotenoid-related food additives in FC 06.8.1 Revision of the food additive provision for the use of paprika extract (INS 160c(ii)) in FC 06.8.1 Correction of Note 667 associated with tartrazine (INS 102) in FC 06.8.1	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 13, 15, 17, Appendix VI Part A	-
6. Revised food additive provisions of the GSFA in relation to the endorsement of one CCASIA standard, one CCNE standards, three CCSCH standards	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 56, 62, 64, Appendix VI Part B	CCFA56 carried out endorsement and alignment simultaneously for these standards, improving efficiency and helping to avoid inconsistencies between the GSFA and commodity standards.
7. Revised food additive provisions of the GSFA in relation to the alignment of three CCAFRICA standards, two CCLAC standards, two CCNASWAP standards and one CCPFV standard Revised food additive provision for STEVIOL GLYCOSIDES in FC 08.2	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 88(ii), (iii) Appendix VI Part C	-
8. Consequential amendments to the GSFA concerning the change from nisin (INS 234) to nisin A (INS 234(i))	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 133(iii) Appendix VI Part E	-

9. Revision to the GSFA to accompany the adoption of the draft standard for bakers' yeast	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 156 Appendix VI Part F	CCFA56 carried out endorsement and alignment simultaneously for this standard.
10. Revised food additive sections of three CCAFRICA standards, two CCNASWP standards, one CCCPC Standard	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 88(i), Appendix V Part A	-
11. Revision to the food additive provisions in the <i>Standard for canned raspberries</i> (CXS 60-1981) and the <i>Standard for canned strawberries</i> (CXS 62-1981)	-	-	Adoption	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 94a, Appendix V Part B	-
12. Specified food additive provisions of the GSFA (CXS 192-1995)	-	-	Revocation	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 120(ii), Appendix VII	-
13. Specified draft food additive provisions of the GSFA (CXS 192-1995)	-	-	Discontinuation	-	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 120(iii), Appendix VIII	-

Chairperson's comments on specific work items(s) from the above in light of the purpose of the critical review

The Chairperson wishes to express sincere appreciation to Members and Observers for their constructive engagement and collaborative spirit throughout CCFA56, and to the Codex Secretariat, the JECFA Secretariats, working group Chairs, interpreters and the Host Secretariat for their valuable support in delivering a productive session.

Beyond advancing a substantial body of GSFA and related standards work, CCFA56 marked important progress in strengthening how food additive provisions are developed and managed across the Codex system. CCFA56 agreed on working practices to support earlier and more structured engagement between CCFA, commodity committees and regional coordinating committees, promoting greater consistency, reducing duplication and facilitating smoother incorporation, endorsement and alignment processes.

CCFA56 also advanced discussion on the future work of CCFA and reaffirmed the GSFA as the core focus of its work. In this context, CCFA56 identified food categories and Notes in the GSFA as priority areas for future attention, while maintaining consideration of other relevant and emerging issues through existing work mechanisms. This approach supports effective prioritization, promotes efficient use of Codex resources, and helps ensure the continued relevance and responsiveness of Codex work.

Monitoring						
Topic	Job number	Target year	Status (Step)	On track for completion?	Reference	Explanatory notes (if any)

14.New proposed draft food additive provisions of the GSFA at Step 3 and Step 2	-	CCFA57	2/3	-	REP26/FA, paragraph 120(iv) and Appendix IX	Standing item on the agenda of CCFA.
---	---	--------	-----	---	---	--------------------------------------

For information		
Topic	Reference	Explanatory notes (if any)
15.Priority List of substances proposed for evaluation by JECFA	REP26/FA, paragraph 146(i) and Appendix XI	Standing item on the agenda of CCFA. CCFA56 raised a general question to JECFA regarding the need to include information on microbial production strains in the specifications for additives and processing aids derived from microorganisms, noting that such information is an essential element for product characterization and safety, and should be readily accessible to competent authorities and operators.
16.The mapping of food categories in the GSFA to the FoodEX2 database	REP26/FA, paragraph 41 and Appendix XIII	The mapping was developed to support dietary exposure assessment by JECFA. CCFA56 agreed to publish the GSFA FoodEX2 mapping document as an information document, noting that these had been already used for the dietary exposure assessment conducted by JECFA at its 100th meeting.
17.Working practices for the incorporation and endorsement of food additive provisions for commodity and regional committees	REP26/FA, paragraph 169 and Appendix XIV	CCFA56 discussed the timing of implementation, the use of two alternative routes for GSFA amendments, and the implications for existing endorsement and alignment work, noting a shift from a retrospective approach to a more integrated and concurrent process. This new approach requires earlier, more proactive, and closer engagement between GSFA experts and other Codex committees, making effective use of expertise and strengthened collaboration essential to prevent future misalignment and ensure smooth implementation.
18.Future work for CCFA	REP26/FA, paragraph 194	CCFA56 discussed the future work for CCFA and agreed to maintain the GSFA as the core focus of work, noting that the future work would continue to be pursued within existing procedures and CCFA work mechanisms. CCFA56 further agreed to explore issues related to food categories, Notes in the GSFA, and potential amendments to the existing Circular Letter entitled Request for proposals for new and/or revision of food additive provisions of the GSFA, for further consideration. In addition, based on support for work on secondary additives, a discussion paper will be prepared for consideration at the next session.
19.The discussion paper on the development of a guideline for the conduct of food safety assessment of cell culture media	REP26/FA, paragraph 182	CCFA56 noted broad recognition of its importance but divergent views on whether it was timely to initiate new work. Supporters emphasized the need for proactive Codex guidance to ensure harmonized approaches and avoid future trade and regulatory inconsistencies, while others

components used in the production of cell-based foods		<p>considered the work premature given limited trade, evolving technologies, and the need for further technical clarity and scientific advice.</p> <p>CCFA56 agreed to continue discussions through an EWG to further refine the scope, identify needs for scientific advice, and review existing regulatory approaches, rather than advancing the new work proposal at this stage.</p>
<p>Chairperson's comments on specific issues for monitoring and information in light of the purpose of the critical review</p> <p>CCFA56 continued to strengthen forward-looking planning and monitoring mechanisms to support efficient and responsive management of its work programme. Progress on ongoing GSFA provisions and the Priority List for JECFA evaluation reflected continued alignment between standard development and scientific advice, while recognizing the importance of prioritization and the availability of expert resources.</p> <p>CCFA56 welcomed work supporting exposure assessment and implementation, including the publication of the GSFA–FoodEX2 mapping document as an information resource. CCFA56 also agreed on working practices to strengthen engagement with commodity and regional coordinating committees and support more coherent development and maintenance of food additive provisions across Codex.</p> <p>In discussing future work, CCFA56 reaffirmed the GSFA as its core focus and identified food categories and Notes as priority areas for future attention, while maintaining openness to relevant emerging issues. This approach aims to support efficient use of Codex resources and maintain the continued relevance of CCFA's work.</p>		

C. Chairperson's comments on the overall work of the committee in light of the purpose of the critical review

<p>CCFA56 demonstrated the value of combining technical discussion with improved working methods to support timely and effective delivery of outcomes. Extensive use of electronic working groups, physical working groups and in-session discussions enabled broad participation while maintaining momentum on complex technical matters. Side events held alongside the session further supported knowledge exchange, encouraged informal dialogue and created additional opportunities to discuss emerging issues and future directions in an interactive setting.</p> <p>A notable outcome of the session was the advancement of more integrated approaches for the development and maintenance of food additive provisions across Codex. Through agreed working practices and strengthened engagement planning between CCFA, commodity committees and coordinating committees, CCFA56 promoted earlier dialogue, clearer allocation of responsibilities and more proactive identification of issues related to food categories, technological justification and GSFA pathways. This experience may provide useful lessons for other Codex subsidiary bodies in improving coherence, preventing future misalignment and making more efficient use of Codex resources.</p> <p>Looking ahead, CCFA reaffirmed the GSFA as its central focus to maintain relevance and responsiveness.</p>
