

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION **E**



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

REP15/EXEC

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

38th Session, CIGG

Geneva, Switzerland, 6-11 July 2015

**REPORT OF THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

WHO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland, 30 June-3 July 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
Introduction	1
Opening	2 - 3
Adoption of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1)	4
Critical Review for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Agenda Item 2)	
(a) Draft Standards and Related Texts submitted to the Commission for Adoption	5 - 19
(b) Monitoring of Standards Development	20 - 22
(c) Proposals for the Elaboration of New Standards and Related Texts	23 - 32
Codex Work Management and Functioning of the Executive Committee (Agenda Item 3)	33 - 55
Revitalization of FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees (Agenda Item 4)	56 - 67
Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019: General Implementation Status (Agenda Item 5)	68 - 70
Financial and Budgetary Matters (Agenda Item 6)	
(a) Codex	71 - 77
(b) FAO/WHO Scientific Support to Codex	78 - 82
(c) Sustainability of scientific support to Codex	83 - 99
Relations between the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other International Organizations : Applications from International Non-governmental Organizations for Observer Status in Codex (Agenda Item 7)	100 - 102
Matters arising from FAO and WHO (Agenda Item 8)	
(a) Scientific Advice to Codex and Members	103 - 109
(b) Capacity Building Activities of FAO and WHO	
(c) FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex	111 - 126
Draft Provisional Agenda of the 39 th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Agenda Item 9)	127 - 129
Other Business and Future Work (Agenda Item 10)	130 - 134
Update on the Codex Communication Strategy	

APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix I List of Participants	21
Appendix II Generic Provisional Agenda of RCCs	27

INTRODUCTION

1. The Seventieth Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC) was held at WHO Headquarters, Geneva, from 30 June to 3 July 2015. The Session was chaired by Mrs Awilo Ochieng Pernet (Switzerland), Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. A complete list of participants is attached as Appendix I to this report.

OPENING

2. The Session was opened by Dr Keiji Fukuda WHO Assistant Director-General for Health Security. He highlighted the following important matters before CCEXEC:
 - The need for the FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees to strike a good balance between their work on regional standard setting and their contribution to bringing global priorities and regional perspectives to Codex.
 - The critical importance of Member States' support to enable the work of the expert committees that provide the critical scientific foundation for Codex work.
 - On-going discussions on Codex work management including the role of CCEXEC.
 - Discussions on the new Codex Trust Fund successor initiative to be launched in 2016.
3. Dr Renata Clarke, Head, Food Safety and Quality Unit, FAO and the Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission also welcomed the Members.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)¹

4. The Executive Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda and deleted agenda item 8b as it was intended for discussion at the Commission.

CRITICAL REVIEW FOR THE ELABORATION OF CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS (Agenda Item 2)²

Draft Standards and Related Texts Submitted to the Commission for Adoption (Agenda Item 2(a))³

Part I – Proposed Draft and Draft Standards and Related Texts at Steps 8, 5/8 or 5 Accelerated

5. The Executive Committee noted that the standard development process had been duly followed for all texts submitted to the Commission for adoption. Therefore, CCEXEC recommended the consideration for the adoption by the Commission of all the texts as proposed and endorsed by the relevant committees, with the exception of those listed below for which it made the following comments and recommendations.

Draft Standard for Ginseng Products (CCPFV)⁴

6. The Executive Committee recommended the consideration for the adoption by the Commission of the draft Standard without the sampling plan noting that the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) had not endorsed the sampling plan, which should be further developed by the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV).

Draft Regional Standard for Non-Fermented Soybean Products (CCASIA)⁵

7. The Executive Committee recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of the draft regional Standard as endorsed by the Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and CCMAS. Noting that the food labelling provisions needed to be endorsed by the Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL), CCEXEC supported that the draft Standard be adopted subject to the endorsement by the Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL).

¹ CX/EXEC 15/70/1 Rev.1

² CRD5 (Comments of CCFO Chairperson, Host Country)

³ CX/EXEC 15/70/2, CAC38/CRD2 (Correction to the GSFA provisios forwarded for adoption and discontinuation)

⁴ REP 15/PFV, Appendix IV

⁵ REP 15/ASIA, Appendix IV

Principles for the Use of Sampling and Testing in International Food Trade – Explanatory notes (CCMAS)⁶

8. The Secretariat informed CCEXEC that CCMAS, when finalizing the integration of the explanatory notes into the *Principles for the Use of Sampling and Testing in International Food Trade*, had inserted a footnote (footnote 2) to a CCMAS *Information Document on practical examples on the selection of appropriate sampling (under development)*, but at the same time had requested advice from the Committee on General Principles (CCGP) on whether there would be legal implications in having such a reference.⁷ CCGP in turn had referred this matter to the legal offices of WHO and FAO.⁸ The legal advice from FAO and WHO was that it was not appropriate to reference *Information Documents*, as such texts were not adopted texts of Codex. In view of this advice, the Secretariat proposed that CCEXEC recommend to the Commission the removal of the footnote.
9. It was also clarified that this advice from the legal office was not restricted to the work currently under discussion, but also extended to referencing *Information Documents* in other Codex texts and that the development of *Information Documents* should be in line with the *Guidance on Information Documents* as developed by the CCGP. The Representative of WHO legal office further clarified that any information essential to a standard or other Codex texts should rather be integrated into such text than contained in an information document.
10. With this clarification, CCEXEC recommended that the Commission consider removing footnote 2, noting that the document was ready for adoption.

Draft MLs for DON in cereal-based foods for infants and young children; in flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley; and in cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) for further processing including sampling plans and performance criteria for methods of analysis (CCCF)⁹

11. The Executive Committee recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of the draft MLs subject to the endorsement of the sampling plan and performance criteria for methods of analysis by CCMAS.

Food Additive Provisions of the *General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA)*¹⁰

12. The Codex Secretariat drew the attention of CCEXEC to CAC38/CRD2, which pointed out some inaccuracies in the list of food additive provisions submitted by CCFA for adoption. The Executive Committee recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of the food additives provisions with the corrections proposed by the Codex Secretariat.

Proposed Standard for Non-Centrifugated Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice (CCS)¹¹

13. A number of Members noted that there were technical provisions in the standard that remained unsolved. These Members proposed that a physical meeting be convened to solve the outstanding issues as in their view it would be difficult to deal with such provisions by correspondence.
14. Noting that the standard development process had been duly followed, CCEXEC recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of the draft standard at Step 8 subject to endorsement of the food labelling and methods of analysis and sampling provisions by the relevant committees. The Executive Committee further agreed that, if consensus could not be reached on the final adoption of the standard, consideration should be given to the possibility of convening a physical meeting of the Committee on Sugars (CCS).

Draft MRLs for Bovine Somatotropins (bSTs)

15. The Executive Committee noted that the draft MRLs for bSTs were included in CX/EXEC 15/70/2 for information only. The Codex Secretariat clarified that there was no guidance in the Procedural Manual on how to deal with draft standards held at Step 8. Noting that the draft MRLs had not been considered for Critical Review in previous sessions, the Codex Secretariat had continued this practice for the current session.

⁶ REP 15/MAS, Appendix IV

⁷ REP15-MAS para. 77

⁸ REP15/GP para. 28

⁹ REP 15/CF, Appendix VI

¹⁰ REP 15/FA, Appendix VII Parts A-E

¹¹ CL 2015/16-CS

Part II – Proposed Draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 5

16. The Executive Committee noted that the standard development process had been duly followed for all texts submitted to the Commission for adoption at Step 5. Therefore, CCEXEC recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of all the texts as proposed, with the exception of those listed below for which it made the following comments and recommendations.

General Standard for Processed Cheese (CCMMP)¹²

17. Some Members were of the view that the standard was not ready to be adopted at Step 5 as several fundamental issues, including scope, composition, food additives, methods of analysis etc. remained to be solved. These Members were of the opinion that there was little chance to reach consensus on these issues and that work should therefore be discontinued.
18. Other Members were of the opinion that considerable progress had been made and that the mandate given by the Commission to the Committee on Milk and Milk Products (CCMMP) to re-examine the standard with a new approach had been followed. It was also noted that CCMMP, when working by correspondence, had made efforts to ensure transparency and the maximum participation by all Codex Members and that there was interest among Members to continue this work. Agreement had been reached on a number of issues, e.g. to narrow the scope of the standard, use of gelatine, while other issues, e.g. minimum content of cheese, use of starches and stabilizers, needed further discussion. In view of these positive developments, these Members supported the advancement of the proposed draft Standard in the Step process noting that the outstanding issues could be addressed in future discussions.
19. The Executive Committee recalled that technical issues were not in the purview of the Critical Review but noted that the standard development process had been duly followed while recognising that there were some issues still to be resolved. Therefore, CCEXEC recommended the consideration for adoption by the Commission of the proposed draft Standard at Step 5 and recommended that the Commission give clear instructions to CCMMP on how to progress towards the adoption of the standard to Step 8 within the timeframe for completion (2016) agreed by CAC37, including considering the possibility to convene a physical working group.

Monitoring of Standards Development (Agenda Item 2(b))

¹³

20. The Executive Committee noted that overall the work of the Committees was progressing according to their respective schedules.
21. Some Committees have work that has gone beyond the original schedule, The Executive Committee noted that recommendations to Committees should not be prescriptive but rather be constructive and request information on when and how the issues could be solved in the relevant committee or to revise schedules to make them more realistic. Therefore, CCEXEC recommended to:
- **CCPFV:** to indicate when the work would be completed on: (i) Proposed draft Annex on Canned Pineapples and (ii) Proposed draft Annexes on Quick Frozen Vegetables (including methods of analysis for quick frozen vegetables) in order to complete the review of the remaining standards for processed fruits and vegetables.
 - **CCFL:** to indicate when the work would be completed on the Revision of the *Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods: Organic Aquaculture*.
 - **CCCF:** to revise the schedule for completion of work on the Proposed draft maximum levels for lead in the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (GSCTFF) and encourage countries to timely submit data to GEM Food.
 - **CCPR:** to revise the schedule for the completion of work on the revision of the *Classification of Food and Feed* taking into account the remaining/new commodity groups.
22. The Executive Committee further agreed to recommend to:
- **All Committees:** to consider the need to develop an approach for the management of their work similar to that used by CCFH (while recognising the differences in topics, working procedures, etc. among various committees); and

¹² CL 2015/15-MMP, Annex1 and Annex 2

¹³ CX/EXEC 15/70/3, CX/EXEC 15/70/3 Add.1

- **CAC38:** to approve discontinuation of work on (i) Proposed draft Regional Standard for Ayrar; and (ii) Annex on statistical and mathematical considerations to the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria Related to Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997)*, as proposed by CCEURO and CCFH respectively.

Proposals for the Elaboration of New Standards and Related Texts (Agenda Item 2(c))¹⁴

23. The Executive Committee, recognising that the criteria for the critical review had been met, supported the approval of all items proposed as new work, with the exception of those listed below, for which it made specific comments and recommendations.

Definition on Biofortification (CCNFSDU)¹⁵

24. The Codex Secretariat clarified that the key issue of concern with the work was how the definition would be used in Codex.
25. The Executive Committee was informed that the purpose and scope of the work had been extensively discussed in CCNFSDU, also through consideration of previously presented discussion papers. It was noted that stand-alone definitions could be developed but that they should be eventually used in Codex texts.
26. Noting the clarification provided, CCEXEC supported the approval of new work while requesting CCNSFDU to clarify how the definition will be used and where it would be best placed.

Regional Standard for Dried Meat (CCAFRICA)¹⁶

27. The Executive Committee noted several issues and gaps in the project document.
28. Two Members noted that not approving the work at this session of the Commission would postpone the work by two years and that Members of the African region were already prepared to start developing the standard. Therefore, they proposed that CCEXEC support the approval of the new work and request CCAFRICA to provide all the missing information and clarifications.
29. Other Members noted that the purpose of the critical review was to ensure the adequacy of the new work and that addressing the gaps would help CCAFRICA to better define the work and therefore facilitate its progress.
30. Therefore, CCEXEC agreed to recommend that CCAFRICA revise the project document and clarify the outstanding issues for consideration by CCEXEC.
31. The Codex Secretariat clarified that, according to the Procedural Manual, any Member of the Commission could submit a proposal to the Commission and therefore it could be possible for a Member from the region working with other countries to revise the project document and have it submitted to next session of CCEXEC and CAC.

Standard for Quinoa (Bolivia)

32. The Executive Committee supported approval by the Commission of new work on an international standard for Quinoa and recommended reactivation of the Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes (CCCPL) which was currently adjourned *sine die*.

CODEX WORK MANAGEMENT AND FUNCTIONING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Agenda Item 3)¹⁷

33. The Secretary explained the background to the working documents and CCEXEC agreed to begin their discussions with general comments.
34. Members highlighted the need for a strategically forward-looking and empowered CAC that was able to identify and address substantive emerging issues and challenges. They underlined the need for strategic governance in the Codex system that included discussions on the executive role of CCEXEC and how it should best support CAC. Members also highlighted the importance of core values such as consensus building and to adopt a flexible approach in addressing cross-cutting topics that involved multiple committees and to link the work to the Strategic Plan

¹⁴ CX/EXEC 15/70/4, CX/EXEC 15/70/4 Add.1, CRD 6 (Comments of Cameroon)

¹⁵ REP 15/NFSDU, Appendix VII

¹⁶ REP 15/AFRICA, Appendix II

¹⁷ CX/CAC 15/38/9, CX/CAC 15/38/9 Add.1 (Status of Implementation of the Recommendations related to Codex of the 2002 Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation), CX/CAC 15/38/9 Add.2 (Comments of Australia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, India, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Uruguay, ICBA, IFAH), CX/CAC 15/38/9 Add.3 (Comments of EU, Jordan, ICGMA)

35. One Member stated that it was important to clearly define the roles of the Secretariat, FAO and WHO and recognize the unique nature of Codex and the level of autonomy it was enjoying. He expressed a concern that no formal recommendation or opinion had been forwarded to the CCEXEC by CCGP and that the document contained some data that still relied on assessments from 2002. He also noted that a different approach for this work, with more involvement of Codex Members would have been welcome.
36. Several Members recommended setting up a sub-Committee of CCEXEC tasked with developing specific proposals for what CCEXEC wanted to achieve.
37. In response to these general comments, the Secretary reminded Members that Codex was still at the start of the whole review process. He stated that the themes in the document were intended to stimulate debate, and that working now to address the recommendations would help the CAC to narrow options to those areas of common interest.
38. The Representative of WHO recalled the decisions taken by Executive Committee at its 69th Session regarding the 2-phase approach that CCEXEC had adopted. He noted that in practical terms the review process was still at a preliminary phase-zero and that the path agreed upon would provide all Codex Members with ample opportunities later on to guide or contribute to the process. What was important now was to indicate to the parent organizations and the Secretariat the themes to be included in or excluded from the phase-1 internal review, which should start shortly.
39. The Representative of FAO identified convergence between the priorities being expressed by the committee and the initial recommendations contained in the paper. She encouraged Members to identify the urgent priorities in line with their strategic vision and then to set those as the basis for the initial internal review by the Secretariat.
40. The Chair invited Members to focus their discussions on the six key areas that had emerged in the preliminary discussions. These were:
 - Strategic governance
 - Responsiveness to emerging issues
 - Consensus
 - Cross collaboration amongst Codex committees
 - Effectiveness and representativeness of CCEXEC
 - Efficiency of CCEXEC and CAC
41. The Chair indicated that a possible approach for the discussion could be to more clearly define the six key areas identified and then align them to the proposals indicated in the paper (together with any new proposals that may emerge).
42. Members underlined the need to maintain clear links between the proposals and the Strategic Plan and to identify proposals that also addressed core issues. They also sought clarity regarding the role of the Members in a process identified as “internally-led”.
43. One Member reiterated the concern that the work should first be properly examined by the CCGP and that if Members felt the topics went beyond the mandate of that committee, then ownership by Members of the work could be guaranteed by establishing a Working Group or sub-committee to complete the task.
44. The Secretary, whilst regretting that the CCGP had been unable to explore the paper more deeply due to the late submission of the document, welcomed the six key areas identified by Members as they captured the intentions and vision of how the process should move forward. He recalled the advice from the Director of the FAO Office of Evaluation to “consider proceeding in two sequential steps to assess the needs” and also reminded Members of the decision taken by CCEXEC69¹⁸ that “the Secretariat-led internal review will be initiated in a form to be decided”.
45. The Secretary also clarified that an external (phase-2) review meant an evaluation from “outside the Codex system” (i.e. a process led by the FAO Office of Evaluation) and also stressed that the contribution of the CCEXEC was as important as that of Members in deciding the form of the phase-1 internal-led review.
46. The Executive Committee Members then raised the following points under each of the six key areas:

¹⁸ REP14/EXEC (para 69-74)

Strategic governance

- Strengthen the focus of CAC sessions and the leadership role of the Commission: how to be more proactive for example with regards new technologies, innovation, or emerging pathogens, etc..
- Strengthen effectiveness and representativeness of the CCEXEC.
- Examine how many committees should be operational at the same time – can the reporting to CCEXEC and CAC be improved?
- Identify the partnerships that can be developed with the private sector or civil society.
- Codex should be more visible.
- Strategic role of the Commission to report to the World Health Assembly and FAO Conference.
- Relationship with FAO and WHO.

Responsiveness to emerging issues

- The global environment in which Codex is operating has changed and demands efficient responsiveness e.g. new pathogens, rapid advances in industry and new products.
- There should be a more structured, long term way to identify and address emerging issues already on the horizon: e.g. AMR, environmental issues, climate change, new ways of managing environmental impact of agriculture.
- There are examples of how Codex reacted in a swift way: melamine in dairy products. This was a spontaneous process.
- The Commission agenda could be refocused in cooperation with the parent bodies to address emerging issues.
- It is important to identify emerging issues but also to define priorities among them. Furthermore it is essential that Codex work is continued in accordance with established Codex priorities. .
- New technologies can address emerging issues in food trade e.g. food authenticity test for food fraud.
- When there are challenges in setting priorities there could be a way of fast tracking urgent issues.
- Regional coordinating committees could play a role in this process and their revitalisation is important. There could be cooperation between coordinating committees.
- Capacity building and raising awareness about Codex is essential.
- The One Health aspect is important for consumer health.

Consensus

- Sometimes emerging issues and technical innovations have been the ones dividing the Commission.
- All efforts should be made to achieve consensus.
- Need to think whether consensus is the leading principle or can be out aside in certain cases. Consensus is necessary for standards to be credible and exceptions can undermine the credibility of Codex itself.
- What more could be done to improve consensus building in Codex? Noting that lots of work has been done on a definition for consensus in the past but no decision was reached on this.
- Codex should focus on areas where practical progress can be made.
- Training and cooperation between chairs can help to build consensus.
- Voting is very rare because of the Codex rules and values. If we stay within the Codex mandate then generally we are successful. We need to maintain our focus on our values in the strategic plan and the procedures in the procedural manual and changing the rules would undermine the incentives for achieving consensus.
- If science is the basis for taking decisions we should not have problems. For the few cases that we had problems there is no need to change the rules.

- It is not acceptable if the same subjects are discussed for years and no consensus is reached. We should explore why we didn't reach consensus. What are the conditions to take forward a subject with success? There should be a clear forum for mentioning our concerns for the very few topics where there are problems.
- There is no alternative to consensus. We should look at it within specific committees and not as an abstract concept.
- The adoption of international standards in the sister organizations (OIE, IPPC) is based on a 2/3 majority.
- Most of the multilateral organizations have the same challenge. Fortunately there are not too many cases in Codex decisions where consensus was not reached. Consensus is something that should be built and can be built if we follow our basic rules.
- There are more common elements among Codex Members than divergent ones.
- Try to keep the decision procedures as democratic as possible.
- Consensus is the pillar of Codex. There is a separation between risk assessment and risk management. Nobody disputes the importance and quality of science but the complexity of the risk manager task is higher.
- Consensus is important but in some cases difficult to reach. Consensus demands a large majority – if there is a vote than there should be a large majority.

Cross Collaboration amongst Codex committees

- There was a proposal on joint work for CCFL and CCNFSDU in the context of the implementation of the Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. As we look forward there may be more cross cutting issues. We need to look into how we can consider these.
- Fundamentally the rules do not prevent cooperation subject to Commission approval.
- Fresh thinking is needed about what sort of cooperation might be useful: joint sessions, joint working groups etc. We should not be constrained by current ways of working.
- There is room for improvement: reducing the number of commodity committees would free up more resources for work in general committees.
- Regional committees could cooperate – the meeting of coordinators is a first step.
- We should not re-examine the committee structure, which has already been done.
- It is important for committees to work together and the mechanism should be defined.

Effectiveness and representativeness of CCEXEC

- Codex needs an executive function: a smaller group to monitor and prepare strategies.
- We need to have the discussion on what the executive function should do and then compare to the current situation and then decide what changes or adjustments need to be made.
- There should be greater clarity about the relation between CAC and CCEXEC and their respective agendas.
- The standards management function is difficult to fulfil in a restricted committee. There may be a more appropriate way.
- The Executive Committee needs to have functions that it can actually fulfil.
- The problem is that the CCEXEC is presently not used as a decision body. In the mandate it says it replaces the commission when the commission doesn't meet but that is not realized. It can be called to meet at any time and should have the possibility to decide.
- Representativeness: FAO and WHO have different geographical regions which ones should be followed by Codex?
- Having an executive organ could speed up discussions. The representativeness of the current situation is quite appropriate.
- We need to define the roles of the different Members as well as the advisors.

- We need to reduce redundancy with the CAC agenda – this could make the work more efficient.
- Any reduction of the membership might reduce transparency and inclusiveness of the CCEXEC
- All the Committee chairs could be invited to CCEXEC. .

Efficiency of the CCEXEC and CAC

- Greater clarity on the role of the CCEXEC would make the Commission more efficient
 - What level should there be in CAC discussions on technical issues?
 - The Codex process is very heavy but also probably the most transparent and inclusive of all standard setting bodies.
 - Increasing visibility of Codex is important. Make maximum use of achievements.
 - New communication technology is not used to the fullest in Codex. There are pilot projects for EWGs but more is needed also to ensure multi-language support, which would be in line with the strategic plan.
 - The bureau of the Commission could consist of a Chair elected by the Commission and one vice-Chair elected by each regional coordinating committee. This would address the issue that some regions have not been represented in the bureau for long periods of time.
 - If we give an executive function to the CCEXEC we may be able to return to biennial sessions of the Commission.
 - Visibility of Codex is important. Codex should have its own logo, symbol and budget to raise awareness.
 - There should be specific clearly defined roles for the bureau.
47. Following identification and discussion of the six key areas, an attempt was made by the Secretariat to link these to the 18 proposals contained in the paper. However it was recognized that while the proposals had inspired the debate and some of them might appear in different form in the subsequent process, it was observed that it would be premature to continue this effort at present as it might limit further discussions.
48. The Chairperson briefly summarized the discussion. She expressed appreciation for the rich debate on the key areas, which had not yet been prioritized, and noted that some of them were inter-related.
49. The Secretariat invited Members to consider what their recommendations to CAC should be on how to move forward and reiterated that the form of the phase-1 internal Secretariat-led review was still to be decided.
50. In the limited time available for comments, one Member underlined the need for a well-defined outcome that included a clear focus on Strategic Priority 4 and with further input from Members. Specifically, and in the interest of promoting strong membership involvement, various mechanisms were suggested including the establishment of a sub-committee of the CCEXEC or a working group of CAC or of CCGP to review the discussions and documents available.
51. The Representative of WHO, speaking on behalf of WHO and FAO, recalled the progress made so far and invited Members to consider how best to design the steps that now needed to be taken. He reminded Members that it was the prerogative of the parent organizations to conduct evaluations and that the input from Members in the process was essential to set priorities for an evaluation in order to use resources most effectively.
52. He noted that the information in the paper gathered so far had been a desk study to stimulate discussions and not an evidence-based evaluation. As such it was a preliminary “snap-shot” of the situation as perceived by the Secretariat with inputs from FAO and WHO. Once the Secretariat-led internal review (phase 1) was started there would be requests to Members for inputs. This work could then be consolidated into a new evidence-based paper, which would be far more beneficial and could also contain relevant proposals from the paper.
53. Once this paper had been prepared, Members could then have a full discussion in one year’s time with better scoping and better use of resources. This approach would guarantee that all Members had ownership and control of the product and the process.
54. In response, Members made the following comments:
- It was important for Members to be involved in the process and that transparency be guaranteed.
 - It was proposed that CCEXEC recommend that CCGP examine this item.

- Referring to the intervention by the Representative of WHO it was noted that Members had not been given a full opportunity to comment on the proposed process. A new document should be prepared followed by fresh negotiations.

Conclusion

55. The Executive Committee:

- Noted the document CX/CAC 15/38/9 and the 18 proposals it put forward as well as the informal discussions at CCGP and comments made by Codex Members and Observers in writing. It recognized the constructive discussions that had taken place to identify common denominators in six key areas that could contribute to the basis for an internal Secretariat-led evaluation (phase 1¹⁹) of Codex work management:
 - strategic governance
 - responsiveness to emerging issues
 - consensus
 - cross collaboration amongst Codex committees
 - effectiveness and representativeness of CCEXEC
 - efficiency of CCEXEC and CAC
- Noted the elements that had been identified under the above headings (see para. 40) that could aid definition of key areas to be addressed in the internal (phase 1) evaluation.
- Noted that no attempt had yet been made to prioritize these key areas nor to link them to the proposals made in the paper.
- Agreed to forward the six key areas to the Commission to guide their discussions on further defining the process.
- Noted that ample opportunity would be provided to Codex Members to inform the Secretariat-led internal review process.

REVITALISATION OF FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 4)²⁰

56. The Codex Secretariat introduced the document, jointly prepared with FAO and WHO, and recalled that the six FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees (RCCs), which had met between September 2014 and May 2015, had generally supported the revitalization process to make RCCs more strategic forward thinking fora on food safety and quality issues related to the region. The Secretariat explained that the document contained an analysis of the discussion of the RCCs on the four proposals, namely (i) RCCs as improved food safety and quality fora: aligning the agendas of RCCs; (ii) Platform for information sharing on food control systems and roles and responsibilities in food safety; (iii) Identification of needs and priorities in regions (persistent and emerging food safety/quality issues); and (iv) Regional Strategic planning and specific recommendations on these proposals on the next step for the RCCs revitalization. It was also noted that it was timely to agree on the next steps so that these decisions would be taken into account in the preparation of the next round of RCCs (2016-2017), starting in September 2016.
57. The Representative of FAO sought to explain the envisaged role of the RCCs in the identification and analysis of emerging food safety issues given the importance placed on this matter during the discussions on Agenda Item 3. She noted that FAO and WHO had been responding to demands from several sub-regions for training and capacity development in food safety early warning and foresight. These activities embraced the One Health Approach and emphasised the importance of integrated surveillance. She added that the strengthened capacities of increasing numbers of countries creates an invaluable opportunity to use the RCCs to share intelligence and to identify emerging food safety issues thus enhancing the ability of Codex to proactively deal with these. This would of course be an evolving function of the RCC.
58. The Representative of WHO underlined the more strategic role that RCCs could play in discussing food safety issues in the region, by filling the gaps left by the discontinuation of the global and regional food safety regulators' fora organized in the 1990s.

¹⁹ REP14/EXEC para 74

²⁰ CX/CAC 15/38/10; CX/CAC 15/38/10 Add.1

General discussion

59. The Executive Committee considered the recommendations in para. 22 of the document and made the following comments and decisions.
60. Members welcomed the proposals of revitalisation, noting that it had been well received and supported by the coordinating committees.
61. With regard to the proposal on collection of information, it was noted that coordinators had difficulties in obtaining information because countries did not understand the benefit of providing and sharing such information; a platform could facilitate the provision and sharing of information in a structured and systematic way; it was important not to increase the burden for countries to provide information especially since they are required to provide information for other purposes outside of Codex; generic information on national food control systems was available on the websites of many countries; countries might be more interested in providing and getting information on how they were approaching a particular subject, e.g. surveillance.
62. Members supported the generic agenda, which would contribute in making the work of coordinating committees more homogeneous. They noted that the agenda needed to have a certain flexibility to allow the inclusion of specific items to respond to the needs of the region.
63. The Codex Secretariat clarified that:
- Item 4 “Food safety and quality situation in the countries of the region” was an analysis, to be prepared by FAO and WHO, of the information submitted by countries through the platform.
 - Item 6, whose title was amended to read “Use of Codex standards in the region” was an analysis, prepared by the Codex Secretariat, of the information submitted by countries through the platform.
 - A new item “Codex work relevant to the region” to be prepared by the Regional Coordinators needed to be added to the generic agenda.
64. The Representative of FAO explained that management of Item 4 in the generic agenda of the RCCs would most likely evolve as the relevant foresight techniques to support identification of medium to long term emerging issues developed. For the upcoming round of RCCs FAO and WHO would rely on more ad hoc ways of collecting and analysing information on the food safety situation.
65. The Representative of WHO clarified that the idea of developing a database to collect information was to replace the current system of circular letters, and in developing elements for such a database it was important to build on existing information and avoid duplication as well as avoiding placing an additional burden on countries to respond to additional questionnaires. She also noted that information exchange and sharing of best practices could be facilitated through the INFOSAN platform, which was providing such features also at regional level.
66. The Representative of FAO stated that FAO and WHO shared the frustration of Members about the futile collection of information. She underlined that what was proposed is a rethinking about what information would be of interest to Codex Members and to the parent organizations and also consideration of how information input could be facilitated.

Conclusion

67. The Executive Committee:
- Supported the initiative of the Codex Secretariat, FAO and WHO to revitalize the coordinating committees.
 - Supported the alignment of the agenda of the RCCs, noting that there should be some flexibility to allow inclusion of specific items to respond to the needs of the region.
 - Endorsed the revised generic agenda (Appendix II), which will be used as a basis for the agendas on the next round (2016-2017) of RCCs sessions.
 - Requested Regional Coordinators to make recommendations on topics for the keynote address on regional issues of priority.
 - Requested FAO and WHO, in collaboration with the Codex Secretariat, to:
 - prepare a prototype of the platform for information sharing, taking into account the availability of existing information;
 - develop a set of questions on food control systems and roles and responsibilities in food safety for testing at the next round (2016-2017) of the coordinating committee sessions;

- prepare an analysis of the information collected for presentation at the next round of the coordinating committee sessions.
- Requested FAO and WHO, in collaboration with the Codex Secretariat and the Regional Coordinators, to:
 - develop a set of questions on needs and priorities in the regions;
 - prepare an analysis of the information collected for presentation at the next round of the RCCs sessions.
- Requested coordinating committees to provide initial inputs for the next Codex strategic planning exercise.

CODEX STRATEGIC PLAN 2014-2019 - GENERAL IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (Agenda Item 5)²¹

68. The Secretariat introduced the report on the monitoring of the first year of implementation (2014) of the Codex Strategic Plan, based on 53 out of the 61 outcome indicators.
69. The Executive Committee noted that an annual querying of Codex subsidiary bodies on 12 Strategic Plan activities using a template developed by the Secretariat was not optimal, as it took away valuable meeting time from other agenda items. It was therefore concluded that the template might be used again at the end of the current Strategic Plan, to determine whether changes in the activities had occurred. It was further noted that none of the outcome indicators were intended to cause an excessive burden to the Secretariat or to the Codex subsidiary bodies.

Conclusion

70. The Executive Committee recommended to the Commission to request the Secretariat to:
- Modify the indicators listed in paras 13 and 14 of CX/CAC 15/38/12 in order to make them more easily measurable.
 - Present a Status Report on the 2015 implementation of the Strategic Plan at the next session. The report should focus on providing an analysis on Codex progress towards achieving the Strategic goals of the plan, and provide less mechanical reporting on outcome indicators.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGETARY MATTERS (Agenda Item 6)

Codex (Agenda Item 6(a))²²

71. The Secretary introduced the paper and highlighted the key figures and analysis contained in it. He stressed that it was the intention of the Secretariat to improve the breakdown of expenditure in the annex for the next biennium to further improve transparency and allow realistic budget planning based on a business plan.
72. The following comments were made:
- The transparent manner in which the budget was presented was appreciated;
 - The projected savings should be utilized in a useful way before the end of 2015 to avoid them being no longer available to the Codex Secretariat.
 - The decisions for the level of professional grades lay with the Director General of FAO.
 - It should be ensured that the Codex budget remained protected (“ring-fenced”) in the FAO budget.
73. The Secretary confirmed that it was planned to utilize the savings before the end of the year as indicated in 2.4.5 of the document.
74. Following a question of what would happen to unspent funds at the end of the budget cycle it was clarified that they were returned to FAO but not to WHO which had consequences for the percentage share of the WHO contribution.
75. The Representative of FAO reminded Members that FAO and WHO senior management were insisting on more realistic and improved budgeting.

²¹ CX/CAC 15/38/12

²² CX/CAC 15/38/13

76. The Representative of WHO emphasized the importance for the Codex Secretariat to utilize the funds effectively and efficiently and further pointed out that the underspending of the Codex budget without good reasons might trigger a downwards revision of the Codex budget by the parent organizations.

Conclusion

77. The Executive Committee:
- Took note of the report from the Secretariat and expressed appreciation for the continued financial support from FAO and WHO, contributions from Codex Host countries and in-kind contribution of the Governments of Japan and Republic of Korea.
 - Encouraged the Codex Secretariat to adopt a more effective and realistic process when developing the budget.
 - Recommended that CAC seek to ensure that Codex budget continue to be protected within FAO.

FAO/WHO Scientific Support to Codex (Agenda Item 6(b))²³

78. The Representative of WHO stated that WHO Members were always encouraged to provide extra-budgetary contributions to the scientific advice activities of WHO. The Representative also clarified that WHO's Financing Dialogue was calling on WHO Members not to earmark their extra-budgetary contributions, as much as possible, in order to streamline the budgetary and programming processes and avoid conflicts between WHO's organizational priorities and a donor's priorities. He confirmed, however, that WHO Members could in fact continue to earmark contributions to WHO for scientific advice to Codex, since this provision was recognized as a high priority.
79. The Representative of FAO stated, that unlike WHO, most of the funding for the FAO Scientific Advice funding came from the Regular Programme. This funding was protected at a comparable level as it had been over the last few biennia and covered all staff costs and on average about 75% of activity costs. The funding for scientific advice was protected as it is recognized repeatedly by FAO Governing bodies as a critical activity. While FAO was grateful that its funding had been protected it was noted that the level of funding was below what was needed. The Representative of FAO informed CCEXEC that in the scientific advice program FAO/WHO had focused on delivering advice and suspended "routine maintenance". She warned that this approach was no longer viable and hence the need for more sustainable support for scientific advice in Codex.
80. The Committee was informed about the difficulty Members faced in securing contributions to scientific advice activities due to the lack of clear evidence showing the need for additional funding in this area. The Committee noted that increased visibility of Codex activities and clear messages from high-level officers of FAO/WHO could help improve this situation.

Conclusion

81. The Executive Committee:
- Expressed appreciation to FAO and WHO for the scientific support provided.
 - Acknowledged the extra budgetary contributions by Member.
 - Stressed the importance of funding to ensure provision for the scientific advice that is crucial and critical to the setting of standards.
 - Noted with great concerns the funds gaps for scientific advice which might delay the provision of scientific advice to Codex.
 - Requested that Codex Members commit to taking necessary actions for fund raising.
 - Noted that an increased visibility of Codex and clear high-level message from FAO/WHO to Codex Members could contribute to raising funding for scientific advice.
82. Encouraged FAO and WHO to continue supporting and continue funding Codex and related scientific advice activities.

²³ CX/CAC 15/38/14

Sustainability of Scientific Support to Codex (Agenda Item 6(c))

83. The WHO representative in introducing the item recalled the discussion paper CX/CAC 14/37/12 Add.2 from the last session presenting three options and the request by CCEXEC to provide further considerations on these.
84. Regarding Option 1 she recalled that the idea was to have also the scientific advice programme covered by regular budget funds, like the Codex budget. While this might appear to be the ideal situation, this could only be a long term solution, as it required active engagement of Members at the FAO and WHO Governing Bodies.
85. For Option 2 regarding a multi-donor trust fund, she reiterated that the governing bodies of both organizations had again emphasized that private sector funds are not acceptable for normative work. She called on Members to provide information to FAO and WHO if a trust fund, accepting donations from governments and non-private sector entities, would facilitate transfer of funds and she asked for detailed feedback to help the parent organizations in the setting up a trust fund.
86. In reference to Option 3 on a voluntary tax, she recalled that Members had wanted further time to discuss with their capitals and requested feedback.
87. She emphasized that not only financial resources are important but also the in-kind support to the programme through access to scientific expertise. This was also an area that had become critical with increasing difficulties to have access to experts and she called on Members to help identify and support participation of experts in the programme.
88. Focusing then on funding needs for the scientific advice programme using the food safety area as example, she highlighted the need to improve the current scientific advice programme, emphasizing that the current system was no longer sustainable and could not deliver the support needed by the Codex work. She highlighted the key elements of an enhanced FAO/WHO scientific advice programme in food safety, comparing status quo versus an enhanced programme, as well as the implication for additional financial and staff resources.
89. The FAO Representative underlined the urgency of the situation and encouraged Members to pay close attention to the explanations provided in Table 2 of the document explaining how FAO/WHO envisage the strengthened Programme of Scientific Advice,
90. Members recognized the importance of scientific advice and the need to sustain this work which underpins the work of Codex. There was a preference for options 1 or 2 or a combination of these options, but that option 3 was not feasible as it was not only exporters of food who benefited from the work of Codex and such contributions could no longer be considered voluntary and would be difficult to get the political support for such an approach. Members indicated that a Trust Fund would facilitate transfer of funds. It was also pointed out that to secure funding, there was a need for more awareness raising at the political level of the importance of scientific advice and the contribution to the work of Codex. This could be through a formal letter directly to countries from FAO and/or WHO Management to get the high level attention and focus for the need for funding.
91. Members also proposed that FAO and WHO look at accepting or finding mechanisms to receive funds from the private sector, or civil society or other regional or international organizations. These mechanisms were already widely pursued in other organizations. In this regard, the Representative of WHO noted that there needed to be a coherent message at the Codex level and in the decision-making bodies of FAO and WHO on the move towards private sector funding for certain programmes, as it was the same Members who took decisions on the types of funding in FAO and WHO and in Codex.
92. In addition Members expressed their support for and willingness to contribute to in-kind support, and FAO and WHO noted that such support to strengthen the secretariat needs to be a long-term commitment over several years in order to be beneficial to the scientific advice programme.
93. In responding to the comments made by Members, the Representative of FAO re-iterated the urgency of the situation and the need to find immediate as well as long term solutions. A short-term solution could be a Trust-fund project with a 5-6 year duration covering both staffing positions and activities if there are donors who are willing to consider such a commitment. If such a short-medium term solution could be put in place, then there could be time for FAO, WHO and Members to further investigate and advocate for longer-term options such as outlined in CX/CAC 14/37/12 Add.2.
94. The representatives of FAO and WHO challenged Members to make efforts to find ways to improve the situation and make firm commitments, so that these discussions that have been continuing for many years can lead to concrete results i.e. a sustainable scientific advice programme.

Conclusion

95. The Executive Committee thanked FAO and WHO for the document and noted that the issue of sustainability of scientific advice has been discussed for a long time and in view of the gravity of the matter, it was recognized that there was a need to take action urgently. The voluntary contributions from Members for in-kind staff seconded were recognized. However, it was noted that the secondment should be a long term commitment.
96. The Executive Committee noted that FAO and WHO are in the process of developing a new vision for sustainability and scientific excellence for the scientific advice programme. In addition CCEXEC noted the request by FAO and WHO for information from potential donors regarding the challenges these countries face in prioritizing the allocation of resources to the scientific advice programme.
97. The Executive Committee also noted FAO and WHO request to support the participation of national experts in the provision of scientific advice.
98. The Executive Committee noted with concern the backlog for the provision of scientific advice which resulted from lack of funds.
99. In order to address this issue, CCEXEC proposed that new and innovative ways to raise funds should be explored, including raising funds from the private sector, and other international governmental or non-governmental organizations. The possibility of working with international and regional organizations was also mentioned whilst ensuring the integrity of the scientific advice.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: APPLICATIONS FROM INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR OBSERVER STATUS IN CODEX (Agenda Item 7)²⁴

100. The Secretariat introduced the item and said that the Codex Secretariat and the Legal Advisors of FAO and WHO had checked the four applications contained in the working documents and found them complete and receivable. The Executive Committee was also informed that the application of the EAC was for information only, as it was an intergovernmental organization for which no CCEXEC recommendation is required.
101. The Executive Committee recommended that the Directors-General of FAO and WHO approve the following applications:
 - CIDCE (Centre International de Droit Comparé de l'Environnement; International Centre of Comparative Environmental Law)
 - ISC (International Stevia Council)
 - Europatat
 - EAC (East African Community)
102. The Executive Committee noted that the review of existing Observers from non-governmental organizations, as provided for in Section 6 of the Principles Concerning the Participation of International Non-Governmental Organizations in the Work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, had not been implemented for a number of years and requested the Secretariat to do so as soon as possible.

MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda Item 8)

Scientific Advice to Codex and Member States (Agenda Item 8(a))²⁵

Scientific advice to Codex²⁶

103. The Representative of WHO introduced CX/CAC 15/38/16 and reiterated that due to the lack of adequate resources (see Item 6b) FAO and WHO would not be able to address all Codex requests for scientific advice.

Conclusion

104. The Executive Committee noted the information provided and the consequences of inaction in sustaining funding to scientific advice.

²⁴ CX/EXEC 15/70/5; CRD 1 (CIDCE); CRD 2 (ISC); CRD 3 (Europatat); CRD 4 (EAC)

²⁵ CX/CAC 15/38/16, CX/CAC 15/38/16 Add.1

²⁶ CX/CAC 15/38/16

Recent activities on Antimicrobial Resistance²⁷

105. The Representatives of FAO and WHO introduced CX/CAC 15/38/16 Add.1 and recalled recent decisions at FAO and WHO Governing Bodies addressing antimicrobial resistance: the WHO Global Action Plan to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance²⁸, prepared in collaboration with FAO and OIE and a resulting resolution adopted by the 68th World Health Assembly (May 2015); and the FAO Resolution of Antimicrobial Resistance²⁹, adopted by the FAO Conference (June 2015).
106. The Representatives noted that the documents included a specific reference to Codex texts on antimicrobial resistance, i.e *Code of Practice to Minimise and Contain Antimicrobial Resistance* (CAC/RCP 61-2005) and *Guidelines on Risk Analysis of Foodborne Antimicrobial Resistance* (CAC/GL 71-2011) and called on Members to review these texts and take urgent action to mitigate risks of inappropriate antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance. The WHO Global Action Plan calls on WHO Members to develop national action plans on AMR by 2017, and the Codex guidance can play an important role in supporting Members in this.
107. The Representatives further drew CCEXEC's attention to the three recommendations in para. 12.
108. The Codex Secretariat highlighted the different purpose and scope of the two Codex texts on antimicrobial resistance: the Code of Practice which provides countries with a set of measures for the responsible and prudent use of antimicrobials in food-producing animals which was developed and organized by the Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Food (CCRVDF) taking into consideration a parallel text of the OIE; and the Guidelines which provide Members with science-based guidance on processes and methodology for risk analysis and its application to foodborne AMR related to non-human use of antimicrobial agents. The Secretariat noted that it was important that countries provide information on the way they were adopting and using these texts, identify gaps and evaluate the need for their update.

Conclusion

109. The Executive Committee supported the proposal that the Codex Secretariat issue a Circular Letter asking Members to:
- Review the extent to which they are adopting and applying the existing Codex guidance and identify major capacity development gaps and any other challenges they face in adopting and applying these standards.
 - Review the existing Codex texts (CAC/RCP 61-2005 and CAC/GL 77-2011) and evaluate the need for their update, taking into consideration the developments in the area over the past 10 years.
 - Consider the need to request FAO, WHO and OIE to convene expert meetings to review any new scientific evidence related to the AMR in the food chain including risk management options for the containment of AMR in support of any revision of Codex texts.
110. The Executive Committee requested the Codex Secretariat, in collaboration with FAO and WHO, to analyse the replies to the Circular Letter and prepare proposals as appropriate for consideration at the next session of the Commission.

Capacity Building Activities of FAO and WHO (Agenda Item 8(b))³⁰

Deleted (See Agenda Item1)

FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex (Agenda Item 8(c))³¹

111. The Representative of WHO introduced the agenda item, pointing out that it covered several items including the end-of-project evaluation of the current Codex trust fund and the proposal for a successor initiative. In view of the limited time available for CCEXEC, it was agreed to concentrate on providing feedback on the project proposal for the successor initiative contained in CX/CAC 15/38/18-Add.5. Members were assured that a full presentation and discussion on the final project evaluation would take place in the Commission. He also highlighted the rationale behind the decision of FAO/WHO to proceed with both the closedown of the current Codex Trust Fund (CTF1) in parallel with the establishment of the successor initiative to ensure that there was no time gap between the two thereby ensuring continuous support for countries and seamless funding.

²⁷ CX/CAC 15/38/16 Add.1

²⁸ WHA67.25

²⁹ C2015/28 Rev.1

³⁰ CX/CAC 15/38/17, CAC38/CRD4 (Comments of Papua New Guinea)

³¹ CX/CAC 15/38/18, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.1, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.2, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.3, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.4, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.5, CX/CAC 15/38/18 Add.6

112. The Administrator of the Codex Trust Fund gave a presentation highlighting the key elements of the project proposal. The final project evaluation on CTF1 had demonstrated that CTF1 had been important as a catalyst in familiarising countries with the Codex process and highlighting the importance of Codex for their countries. Both the evaluation and the analysis of FAO/WHO called attention to the fact that barriers to full and effective engagement in Codex persisted and that the majority of these barriers were found at national level.
113. Based on this analysis, a new initiative had been designed to take up where CTF1 was leaving off to address these barriers, while at the same time continuing to maintain the gains made in CTF1. In making the shift from focusing on wide participation to going deeper into building capacity in countries to address barriers to effective participation at national level, FAO/WHO were proposing to adopt a development approach. Countries/groups of countries would carry out a self-diagnosis of their capacity for effective participation in Codex to diagnose strengths and weaknesses and use the results of the diagnosis to guide the preparation of individual country or group applications for multi-year support for key activities to address priority barriers.
114. A second channel of support would be through FAO/WHO Codex training and workshops that would be tied to needs identified in country applications and/or key issues identified in the revitalization of regional coordinating committees. This would allow for Codex capacity building to be offered to a wider group of countries than those being supported through the individual application process and allow for a better focus on common barriers to effective engagement in Codex in e.g. sub-regional groups of countries.
115. The results-based framework for CTF2 was presented, as was a timeline for activities that would take place between the CAC38 and CAC39, to close down CTF1 and begin implementation of CTF2.
116. A number of Members commented that the proposal was a logical progression that both built on and moved forward from CTF1. The focus at national level and taking action based on an assessment of needs was welcomed. Members stressed the need to:
- Continue to capture gains made in CTF1.
 - Continue to focus on the public health aspirational goal.
 - Retain some element of support to physical participation.
 - Functionally distinguish between FAO/WHO Codex capacity building as part of their normal programmes and Codex capacity-building supported by CTF2 and avoid duplication.
 - Have clear, objective and transparent criteria for eligibility and go beyond national income criteria alone with clear understanding of what is meant by “countries in transition”.
 - Have strong accountability mechanisms at both country level and for the overall programme.
117. Other issues raised and clarifications sought included:
- Duration of the proposed initiative – is 12 years too long?
 - Need to see how the capacity of developing countries to generate data to support Codex can be supported.
 - Possibility of using Codex expertise available in many countries and capturing this as in-kind support.
 - Information on how CTF2 could support countries in crisis due to war and conflict.
 - Templates and further information are needed on how countries can apply for support.
 - Composition of the Codex Trust Fund Consultative Group and the desirability to include Member countries’ representatives.
 - Role of regional coordinators in monitoring implementation and ensuring accountability.
118. In response to Members’ questions, the WHO and FAO Representatives made the following points:
- At CAC38, FAO/WHO were looking for the endorsement by the Codex Members on the direction and approach that were presented in the Project Proposal as well as country comments that could inform the preparation of a final project document.
 - A country in crisis or in civil unrest could delay its application to CTF2 until the country “feels ready” within the 12-year life of CTF2.
 - All applications would be assessed on the robustness of the impact pathway.

- Donors' commitment to long-term funding would be essential to ensure that countries benefit from CTF2 right through to the end of the 12 year lifespan, and that contracts made with countries for multi-year support could be honoured.
- Country accountability would be ensured through the use best development practices including the establishment of results-based frameworks for project activities and paying in tranches against deliverables. Programme accountability and the possibility to correct the course of CTF2 during its lifespan would be ensured by building in operational and management reviews every 3-4 years, and mid-term and final evaluations carried out by independent external evaluators.
- Support to physical participation could be one of the elements for support but it would have to respond to a specific need and be integrated into a defined impact pathway for a country.
- CTF2 would work with three levels of decision-making prior to granting support to a country or group application: (i) eligibility which defines which countries can apply for what support; (ii) technical review of applications which looks at the quality of applications and identifies which countries are demonstrating their readiness to be supported; (iii) prioritization of funding that allows funding to go to countries that need it most based on additional criteria.
- CTF2 support to Codex capacity-building would be both distinctive from and complementary to FAO/WHO's conventional support to countries. CTF2 support allows for a global and coordinated approach to Codex capacity-building. Complementarity with the regular capacity development programmes of the parent organizations allows FAO/WHO to serve CTF2 better and ensures that there will be no duplication of support to countries.
- There was a possibility of building data collection and/or data generation into an application from a country or group of countries but it should be very focused and aimed at strengthening participation in Codex.
- Templates for self-diagnosis and application forms being developed by FAO/WHO would be shared with stakeholder groups prior to finalisation to ensure that these are usable and meet the needs of countries.
- Guidance and assistance would be provided throughout the application process, and during implementation in countries, by FAO/WHO food safety officers, especially from Regional Offices of FAO and WHO. Additional support will be made available through clinics and help-desks at meetings of the CAC and regional coordinating committees.

Conclusion

119. The Executive Committee expressed gratitude and appreciation to WHO and FAO for building Codex capacity in developing countries and gratitude was also expressed to CTF donors.
120. The Executive Committee expressed appreciation to the WHO and FAO for the information provided regarding the project proposal for CTF2 and Members expressed full support for the CTF2, including its framework and focus.
121. The Executive Committee agreed with the concepts of multi-year funding and tailor-made support. However, it was requested that CTF2 would also assist countries in developing risk analysis capacity so that they could generate data to support the Codex standard setting process.
122. The Executive Committee advised WHO and FAO to ensure that the gains of CTF1 were captured during the implementation of CTF2 and that the participation component would also be included. In this regard, FAO and WHO clarified that participation was also part of CTF2.
123. Members advised WHO and FAO to ensure that their development programmes were built into CTF2. The parent organizations indicated that their capacity building programmes would enable them to serve CTF2 better and would remain complimentary and not duplicate CTF2.
124. Noting the global development goals of CTF2, Members indicated that more emphasis should be put on improving food safety and public health in developing and transition-economy countries.
125. Members also called on FAO and WHO to ensure that the eligibility criteria were developed in a clear and transparent manner. In this regard FAO and WHO clarified that there would be two types of support: (i) annual support to one country; and (ii) multi-annual support to a group of countries.
126. Finally, CCEXEC advised FAO and WHO to also recognize the in-kind contribution, which would be made by Codex Members.

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 39TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (Agenda Item 9)³²

127. The Committee agreed to propose to remove the Agenda Item on “Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019: General Implementation Status” from the Agenda of the Commission. This Agenda Item is currently included in both the Agenda of Executive Committee and the Commission. The Committee was of the opinion that in order to avoid duplication of work and acknowledge the strategic function of CCEXEC, it should only be discussed at CCEXEC and the findings of CCEXEC should be reported to the Commission through the report of the Chairperson.
128. The Executive Committee further agreed with the proposal to delete this Agenda Item (i.e. Draft Provisional Agenda of the CAC) from the Agenda of CCEXEC starting from its next Session because CCEXEC is currently only held one week before the annual session of the Commission and has therefore no opportunity to take into account the conclusions of the Commission.

Conclusion

129. The Executive Committee:
- Took note of the Draft Provisional Agenda for the 39th Session of the Commission and recommended to remove Agenda Item 6 “Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019: General Implementation Status” from the Provisional Agenda.
 - Agreed to delete Agenda Item “Draft Provisional Agenda of the CAC” from the Agenda of CCEXEC.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 10)

Update on the Codex communication strategy³³

130. The Secretariat presented the paper and invited Members to provide comments.
131. The following comments were made:
- The strategy needs to communicate the true benefits that Codex provides to various countries in clear and simple language also reflecting how standard setting benefits exports (in economic terms).
 - As a global governance tool, the strategy should have legal and Commission approval before being implemented.
132. The Representative of WHO noted that communications activities needed to take place within the Secretariat even in the absence of a formal strategy. This document now provided clear planning and focus for this work. He added that discussions on the paper were an opportunity for Members to express their areas of importance so that the Secretariat could incorporate them into the plan as it evolved.
133. The Secretary confirmed that developing a communications strategy would allow the Secretariat to formulate a more focussed idea as to the direction communications should take. Contributions from Members would also be an opportunity to concentrate on priorities and discover what it might be possible to do.
134. The Representative of WHO noted that the definition of “Mission” in the strategy was too narrow. She proposed that advocacy should also be a goal of the strategy, to provide Members with the tools to communicate with their constituents and help them foster understanding regarding the work of Codex including scientific advice as integral part of this work.

Conclusion

135. The Executive Committee:
- Noted the update on the development of the communication strategy.
 - Noted that the strategy should also serve as an advocacy tool.
 - Requested the Secretariat to incorporate the comments made at CCEXEC70 and CAC38 into the strategy.
 - Requested the Secretariat to start implementing the strategy in continued liaison with FAO and WHO.
 - Requested the Secretariat to present an update report on the preliminary outcomes of the strategy to the next Executive Committee and Commission sessions (2016).

³² CX/EXEC 15/70/6

³³ CX/CAC 15/38/22

Appendix I**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

CHAIRPERSONPRÉSIDENT
PRESIDENTE

Mrs Awilo Ochieng Pernet
Chair, Codex Alimentarius Commission
Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO
Division of International Affairs
Bern
Switzerland
Email: awilo.ochieng@blv.admin.ch

VICE-CHAIRPERSONSVICE-PRÉSIDENT
VICEPRESIDENTE

Dr Guilherme Antonio Costa Jr.
Vice Chairperson, Codex Alimentarius Commission
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Espanada dos Ministerios Blocc."D"
Ed. Sede 3 andar-Sala 316
CEP: 70043-900
Brazilia DF
Brazil
E-mail: guilherme.costa@agricultura.gov.br
gguilherme@hotmail.com

Dr Yayoi Tsujiyama
Director for International Affairs
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
100-8950 Tokyo
Japan
Email: yayoi_tsujiyama@nm.maff.go.jp

Mr Mahamadou Sako
Directeur Général Adjoint
Ministère de la santé et de l'hygiène publique
Agence Nationale de la sécurité sanitaire des aliments
Centre commercial, rue 305 Quartier du Fleuve BPE; 2362
Bamako
Mali
Email: scodexmali@yahoo.fr

MEMBERS ELECTED ON A GEOGRAPHIC BASIS:
MEMBRES ÉLUS SUR UNE BASE GÉOGRAPHIQUE:
MIEMBROS ELEGIDOS SOBRE UNA BASE
GEOGRÁFICA:

AFRICA
AFRIQUE
ÁFRICA

Dr Moses Gathura Gichia
Deputy Director of Veterinary Services
Directorate of Veterinary Services
State Department of Livestock
Veterinary Research Laboratories
P.O. Private Bag 00625
Kangemi, Nairobi
Kenya
Phone: +254 73 3557134
E-mail: mosesgichia@gmail.com

Advisors to the Member for Africa

Conseillers du Membre pour l'Afrique
Asesores del Miembro para África

Mr Malose Daniel Matlala
Deputy Director: Inter-Agency Liaison and
Regulatory Nutrition
(National Codex Contact Point: South Africa)
Department of Health
Directorate: Food Control
Private Bag X828, Pretoria 0001
South Africa
Phone: +27-12 395 8789
Fax: +27-12 395 8854
E-mail: cacpas@health.gov.za

Prof Ardjouma Dembele
Directeur du L.A.N.A.D.A.
Ministère de l'Agriculture
04 BP 612
Abidjan 04
Côte d'Ivoire
Phone: + 225 05 959572
Fax: + 225 20 22 7117
E-mail: ardjouma@yahoo.fr

ASIA
ASIE
ASIA

Ms Jing Tian
Associate Professor
China National Center for Food Safety Risk
Assessment
Building 2, No 37 Guangqu Road, Chaoyang District,
100022 Beijing
China
Phone: 8610-52165402
Fax: 8610-52165408
E-mail: tianjing@cfsa.net.cn

Advisors to the Member for Asia

Conseillers du Membre pour l'Asie
Asesores del Miembro para Asia

Ms Shamsinar Abdul Talib
Director
Ministry of Health Malaysia
Food Safety and Quality Division
Level 3, Block E7, Parcel E, Federal
Government Administrative Centre
62590 Putrajaya
Malaysia
E-mail: shamsinar@moh.gov.my

EUROPE
EUROPE
EUROPA

Ms Sophie Charlot
Point de Contact du Codex
Premier Ministre-Secrétariat Général des Affaires
Européennes
68, rue de Bellechasse
75700 Paris
France
Phone: +33 1 44 87 16 03
E-mail: sophie.charlot@sgae.gouv.fr
sgae-codex-fr@sgae.gouv.fr

Advisors to the Member for Europe

Conseillers du Membre pour l'Europe
Asesores del Miembro para Europa

Mrs Sarah Haurert
Chargée de Mission
Ministry of Health
Service de la sécurité alimentaire
Luxembourg
E-mail: sarah.haurert@ms.etat.lu

Mrs Vigdis S. Veum Møllersen
Senior Adviser
Norwegian Food Safety Authority
P.O Box 383
N-2381 Brumunddal
Norway

E-mail:
Vigdis.S.Veum.Mollersen@mattilsynet.no

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

AMÉRIQUE LATINE ET LES CARAÏBES
AMÉRICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE

Dr Linnette Peters
Policy and Programme Director
Veterinary Public Health Division
Ministry of Health
10/16 Grenada Way
Kingston 10
Jamaica

Phone: +876 317 7872
E-mail: petersl@moh.gov.jm

Advisor to the Member for Latin America and the Caribbean

Conseiller du Membre pour l'Amérique Latine et les Caraïbes
Asesore del Miembro para América Latina y el Caribe

Dr Michel Leporati
Executive Secretary
Chilean Food Quality and Safety Agency
Nueva York 17, Piso 4, Santiago, Chile
Chile

Phone: (56-2)27979900
E-mail: michel.leporati@achipia.gob.cl

NEAR EAST

PROCHE-ORIENT
CERCANO ORIENTE

Mr Mohmed Badi Klibi
Directeur Général-
Ministère de l'industrie, de l'énergie et des mines
Centre Technique de l'Agro Alimentaire
12, rue de l'usine – Charguia 2
2035 Tunis
Tunisia

Phone: +216 71940358
Fax: +216 71941080
E-mail: dg@ctaa.com.tn or
codextunisie@ctaa.com.tn

Advisor to the Member for Near East

Conseiller du Membre pour le Proche-Orient
Asesore del Miembro para Medio-Oriente

Dr Mohammad Hossein Shojaee Aliabadi
Senior Scientific Adviser of Institute of Standard &
Industrial Research of Iran (ISIRI)
Farough Life Sciences Research Laboratory
Director and Laboratory Manager
Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Tel: +0989121591766
E-mail: faroughlab@gmail.com

NORTH AMERICA

AMÉRIQUE DU NORD
AMÉRICA DEL NORTE

Mrs Karen McIntyre
Director General
Health Canada
Food Directorate
251 Sir Frederick Banting Driveway
K1A 0K9 Ottawa
Canada

Tel: 613-957-1820
E-mail: Karen.McIntyre@hc-sc.gc.ca

Advisors to the Member for North America

Conseillers du Membre pour l'Amérique du Nord
Asesores del Miembro para América del Norte

Ms Mary Frances Lowe
U.S. Codex Manager
U.S. Codex Office
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Room 4861 South Bldg.
1400 Independence Ave. S.W.
Washington, DC 20250
USA

Phone: +1 202 205 7740
Fax: +1 202 720 3157
E-mail: MaryFrances.Lowe@fsis.usda.gov

Ms Nancy Ing
Regulatory Policy and Risk Management Specialist
Health Canada
251 Sir Frederick Banting Driveway AL 2204C
K1A0K9 Ottawa
Canada

Phone: +1 613-941-5163
Fax: +1 613-941-3537
E-mail: Nancy.Ing@hc-sc.gc.ca

SOUTH WEST PACIFIC

PACIFIQUE SUD-OUEST
PACÍFICO SUDOCCIDENTAL

Mr Raj Rajasekar
Senior Programme Manager (Codex)
Ministry for Primary Industries
International Policy
Pastorale House 25, The Terrace
P.O. Box 2526
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Phone: +64 4 894 2576
Fax: +64 4 894 2583
E-mail: raj.rajasekar@mpi.govt.nz

Advisors to the Member for South West Pacific

Conseillers du Membre pour le Sud-Ouest
Asesores del Miembro para Sud-Oeste del Pacifico

Mrs Ann Backhouse
Director
Codex International Standards
Department of Agriculture
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

E-mail: ann.backhouse@agriculture.gov.au

Mr Greg Read
First Assistant Secretary
Export Division
Department of Agriculture
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

E-mail: greg.read@agriculture.gov.au

**COORDINATORS:
COORDONNATEURS:
COORDINADORES:**

COORDINATOR FOR AFRICA

Coordonnateur pour l'Afrique
Coordinador para África

Mr Médi MOUNGUI
Représentant permanent adjoint auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de la République du Cameroun
Via Siracusa, 4-6
00161, Rome
Phone: +39 06 4403544
Fax: +39 06 4403644
E-mail: medimoungui@yahoo.fr

COORDINATOR FOR ASIA

Coordonnateur pour l'Asie
Coordinador para Asia

Mr Pisan Pongsapitch
Deputy Secretary General
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Road
Ladyao
Chatuchak
10900 Bangkok
Thailand
Tel: 66-2-5613707
Fax: 66-2-5613712
E-mail: pisanp@yahoo.com or
pisanp@acfs.go.th

COORDINATOR FOR EUROPE

Coordonnateur pour l'Europe
Coordinador para Europa

Mr Martijn Weijtens
CCEURO Chair
Ministry of Economic Affairs
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
Netherlands
Phone: +31 70 3798950
Email: info@codexalimentarius.nl

**COORDINATOR FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE
CARIBBEAN**

Coordonnateur pour l'Amérique Latine et les Caraïbes
Coordinador para América Latina y el Caribe

Sra Carmen Tatiana Cruz Ramírez
Jefe del departamento del Codex
Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio
Dirección de Mejora Regulatoria y Reglamentación
Técnica
San José, Costa Rica,
400 m Oeste de la Contraloría General de la República
en Sabana Sur
Costa Rica
Phone: +506 2596 1495 ext. 263
Fax: +506 291 2015
E-mail: tcruz@meic.go.cr
tatiana.cruzramirez17@gmail.com

COORDINATOR FOR NEAR EAST

Coordonnateur pour le Proche-Orient
Coordinador para el Cercano Oriente

Eng Mariam Eid
Ministry of Agriculture
Agro-Industries Department
Beirut
Lebanon
Phone: +96 11 824100
Fax: +96 11 824100
E-mail: meid@agriculture.gov.lb

**COORDINATOR FOR NORTH AMERICA
AND THE SOUTH WEST PACIFIC**

Coordonnateur pour l'Amérique du nord et le Pacifique
sud-ouest

Coordinador para América del Norte
y el Pacífico Sudoccidental

Dr Vele Pat Ila'ava
Chairman CCNASWP & Regional Coordinator and
Secretary Department of Agriculture & Livestock
P. O. Box 2033 Konedobu, NCD Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea
Phone: +675 321 3302
Fax: +675 321 2236
E-mail: vpilaava100261@gmail.com

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)

Organisation mondiale de la santé (OMS)
Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS)

Mr Keiji Fukuda
Assistant Director-General
World Health Organization (WHO)
Health Security and Environment
20, Avenue Appia
CH-1211 Geneva 27
Phone: +41 22 791 3871
Fax: +41 22 791 4807
Email: fukudak@who.int

Dr Kazuaki Miyagishima
Director
Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses
World Health Organization (WHO)
20, Avenue Appia, CH-1211
Geneva 27
Switzerland
Phone: + 41 22 791 27 73
Fax: +41 22 791 48 07
E-mail: miyagishimak@who.int

Dr Angelika Tritscher
Coordinator
Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses (FOS)
World Health Organization (WHO)
20 Avenue Appia, CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Phone: +41 22 791 3569
Fax: +41 22 791 4807
E-mail: tritschera@who.int

Mrs Catherine Mulholland
 Technical Officer
 Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses (FOS)
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20 Avenue Appia
 CH-1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: +41 22 791 3080
 Fax: +41 22 791 4807
 E-mail: mulhollandc@who.int

Dr Chizuru Nishida
 Coordinator
 Nutrition Policy & Scientific Advice
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20 Avenue Appia
 CH-1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: +41 22 791 3317
 E-mail: nishidac@who.int

Dr Rei Nakagawa
 Technical officer
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 Department of Food Safety and Zoonoses (FOS)
 20 Avenue Appia
 1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: +41 22 791 3640
 Fax: +41 22 791 4807
 Email: nakagawar@who.int

Dr Jong Soo Kim
 Scientist
 Risk Assessment and Management
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20 Avenue Appia
 CH-1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: +41 22 791 3604
 E-mail: kimjo@who.int

WHO LEGAL OFFICE

Bureau juridique de l'OMS
 Oficina Jurídica de la OMS

Mrs Florencia Monica Celasco
 Legal Officer
 Office of the Legal Counsel
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20 Avenue Appia
 1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: 4122791 4006
 Email: celascof@who.int

Mrs Claudia Nannini
 Associate Legal Officer
 Office of the Legal Counsel
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 20 Avenue Appia
 1211 Geneva 27
 Switzerland
 Phone: 41227913680
 Email: nanninic@who.int

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture (FAO)
 Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura (FAO)

Dr Renata Clarke
 Head, Food Safety and Quality Unit
 Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 2010
 E-mail: renata.clarke@fao.org

CODEX SECRETARIAT

Secrétariat du Codex
 Secretaría del Codex

Mr Tom Heilandt
 Secretary of the Codex Alimentarius Commission
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 4384
 E-mail: tom.heilandt@fao.org

Ms Annamaria Bruno
 Senior Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 6254
 E-mail: annamaria.bruno@fao.org

Mr Sebastian Hielm
 Senior Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 4821
 E-mail: sebastian.hielm@fao.org

Ms Gracia Brisco
 Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 2700
 E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

Ms Verna Carolissen-Mackay
 Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Phone: +39 06 5705 5629
 E-mail: verna.carolissen@fao.org

Mr Patrick Sekitoleko
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy

Phone: +39 065705 6626
E-mail: patrick.sekitoleko@fao.org

Mrs Lingping Zhang
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy

Phone: +39 065705 3218
E-mail: lingping.zhang@fao.org

Mr KyoungMo Kang
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy

Phone: +39 065705 4796
E-mail: kyoungmo.kang@fao.org

Ms Takako Yano
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy

Phone: +39 065705 5868
E-mail: takako.yano@gfao.org

Mr David Massey
Consultant
Codex Secretariat
E-mail I: david.massey@fao.org

Dr Yongxiang Fan
Consultant
Codex Secretariat
E-mail: fan.yongxiang@fao.org

Appendix II

Generic Provisional Agenda of RCCs

Item	Subject Matter
1	Adoption of the Agenda
2	Keynote address and discussion on regional issue of priority and common challenge
3	Matters Arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex Committees
4	Food safety and quality situation in the countries of the region
5	Use of Codex standards in the region
6	Monitoring of the implementation of the Codex Strategic Plan
7	Codex work relevant to the region
8	Items related to the development or revision of specific regional standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed draft ... -
9	Nomination of the Coordinator
10	Future work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and prioritization of the need of the regions. • Possible need of regional standards or the relevance of existing regional standards.
11	Other business
12	Date and Place of Next Session
13	Adoption of the Report