



**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

Seventy-eighth Session

WHO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland, 10 – 14 February 2020

**REGULAR REVIEW OF CODEX WORK MANAGEMENT 2018-2019:
CRITICAL REVIEW PROCESS**

(Prepared by the Codex Secretariat)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The 76th Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC76) noted the selection of the *Critical Review Function of the Executive Committee* as the topic for the regular review of Codex work management for 2018-2019¹, in line with activity 1.1.2 “Strengthen the critical review process to improve standards monitoring” of the Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019.

1.2 The comments made by Members during CCEXEC76 focused on the need for making the documents more reader-friendly and for drawing the attention of CCEXEC to the critical points where CCEXEC input was needed. These were partly addressed in the first phase of the review² presented at CCEXEC77. Document CX/EXEC 19/77/5 contained a background to the Critical Review and improvements made to its presentation especially also with regards to the visibility of the comments from the Secretariat and Committee chairpersons. Due to time constraints, CCEXEC77 did not discuss this document.

1.3 The present document contains the second phase of the review and is based on the data and Secretariat experience accumulated since the critical review was established in 2005..

1.4 Discussions on the critical review are closely related to discussions on the role of the Executive Committee (see CX/EXEC 20/78/2); the work on operationalization of the statements of principle, the discussions on standards advancement in committees working by correspondence (discussions in the Codex Committee on General Principles/CCGP); the work on implementation of guidance on Electronic Working Groups; and the periodic review of Codex standards (see agenda item 4.2). The discussion on revisions and amendments to Codex standards (Secretariat document for CCGP) is also related as revisions have to go through the Critical Review process as “new work”.

1.5 Taking into account the above, the assessments in this document are just a beginning and more time and discussion will be needed to take decisions on eventual procedural changes or development of more guidance for implementation of the critical review. The outline of this document is as follows:

- Section 2: Coherence between CCEXEC recommendations and CAC decisions
- Section 3: History of three particular cases of discontinuation
- Section 4: Presentation of the Critical Review to CAC
- Section 5: Qualitative review of the Critical Review process
- Section 6: Conclusions
- Section 7: Recommendations

¹ REP19/EXEC1, para 10

² CX/EXEC 19/77/5

2. COHERENCE BETWEEN CCEXEC RECOMMENDATIONS AND CAC DECISIONS

2.1 New work, step 5 and final adoption

Appendix I provides an overview of how often CAC followed the recommendations of CCEXEC under the Critical Review by year including final adoption, adoption at Step 5, and approval of new work.

Since 2005, CAC has followed CCEXEC recommendations in 900 out of 923 cases (97.5%), with an average of 60 decisions per year. This means there were between 0 and 3 divergent decisions per year. CAC did not follow the CCEXEC recommendation in:

- 19 (3.5%) out of the 543 cases for final adoption;
- 2 (1.5%) out of 130 cases for adoption at step 5; and
- 2 (0.08 %) out of 246 cases for approval of new work

2.2 Extension of timeline

CCEXEC and CAC always supported/approved requests for extension of the timeline for work by CAC subsidiary bodies.

2.3 Discontinuation of work

CAC did not always approve CCEXEC recommendations for discontinuation immediately, but eventually CAC always discontinued such work. In Section 3, three such cases are discussed in more detail.

2.4 Revocation of Codex texts

There was only one case of divergence between CCEXEC's recommendation and CAC's decision: CCEXEC65 (2011) recommended to revoke CXS 229-1993 *Analysis of pesticide residues: recommended methods*, but CAC34 (2011) agreed to retain the standard. CAC revoked the standard the following year (2012).

2.5 Numerical Analysis of Divergent CAC Decisions

2.5.1 Appendix II provides an overview of the situations when CAC did not follow CCEXEC's recommendations. The table indicates the type of committee (General Subject, Commodity and Regional Coordinating Committees), the type of recommendation there was disagreement on, and what has happened afterwards.

2.5.2 In 17 of the 23 cases where CAC did not follow CCEXEC's recommendations, CAC adopted the texts at a later session. In one case, work was discontinued in 2019 (non-centrifugated dehydrated sugar cane juice).

2.5.3 The number of divergences is too small to indicate any clear trend for type of committees or types of standards though most concern General Subject committees and numerical standards and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food (CCCF) is "leading" with five cases.

2.6. Divergence between CCEXEC (supported by CAC) and CAC subsidiary bodies

2.6.1 Appendix III provides an overview of the situations when CAC endorsed CCEXEC's decision not to follow the proposal submitted by the relevant CAC subsidiary body.

2.6.2 On seven occasions (average of 0.5 per year), CCEXEC did not follow the Committee's recommendation and CAC endorsed that decision. Six of these concerned approval of new work. Of these seven work items, four were approved in the following years whereas the other three were never re-submitted, and thus never approved.

3. HISTORY OF THREE PARTICULAR CASES OF DISCONTINUATION

The following cases are interesting because in all of them CCEXEC recommended discontinuation several times before CAC took up this suggestion, sometimes years later. All ended with no standards set and a general sense of dissatisfaction on all sides.

3.1 Processed cheese

3.1.1 Timeline

- CCEXEC59 (2007): considered discontinuation but lacked information and asked the Codex Committee on Milk and Milk Products (CCMMP) to provide further information to CCEXEC61
- CCEXEC61 (2008): no discussion
- CCEXEC62 (2009): asked CCMMP to finalise the project by 2010 or discontinue

- CCEXEC64 (2010): recommended discontinuation of the work
- CAC33 (2010): agreed to defer discussion to CAC34
- CAC34 (2011): suspended the decision until the next session
- CAC35 (2012): discontinued the work with reservations from 23 Members. The same session started to collect information on possible new work on the same topic through a Circular Letter and discussions at FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees (RCCs).
- CAC36 (2013): established an EWG to create a new project document, which was presented to CCEXEC69
- CCEXEC69 (2014): “Though this item had been added during the adoption of the Agenda, the Executive Committee considered that it was not in a position to conduct the critical review and agreed to defer consideration of the project document to the Commission.”(REP14/EXEC, para 36)
- CAC37 (2014): established a Physical Working Group (PWG) to prepare a proposed draft
- CCEXEC70 (2015): had a divergence of views on the adoption of the new proposed draft at step 5 but 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.”*
- CAC38 (2015): followed the advice of CCEXEC70
- CCEXEC71 (2016) recommended discontinuation
- CAC39 (2016): agreed to discuss the item at CAC40
- CCEXEC73 (2017): confirmed its recommendation for discontinuation
- CAC40 (2017): discontinued the work with reservations from 26 Members

3.1.2 Reflections

CAC35 seemed to follow the recommendation of CCEXEC64 to discontinue the work, but in reality immediately began to prepare new work. Still 23 Members reserved their position.

During this new work phase, CCEXEC recognized at some point that “technical issues were not in the purview of the Critical Review but noted that the standard development process had been duly followed”. It is difficult to imagine a Critical Review if CCEXEC cannot enter at all into technical questions. For example, the amenability of standardization of a commodity is very difficult to assess without addressing technical issues to a certain degree.

CCEXEC had to recommend discontinuation twice before the work was discontinued – this time with 26 reservations.

Thus, the additional opportunity for multi-year discussions had neither resolved the question on how to standardize the product nor created more consensus on the question of whether the commodity was amenable to standardization.

In this case it is not likely that the reason for failure was related to working by correspondence as several other work methods had already failed before.

3.2 Organic Aquaculture

3.2.1 Timeline

- CCEXEC70 (2015): noted that recommendations to CAC subsidiary bodies should not be prescriptive but rather be constructive and request information on when and how the issues could be solved in the relevant body or to revise schedules to make them more realistic. CCEXEC recommended to the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL) to indicate when the work would be completed.

- CCEXEC71 (2016): discussed the recommendation of CCFL to consider that the work be undertaken by another relevant technical subsidiary body or be discontinued. CCEXEC noted that CCFL had made every effort to progress work, but the highly technical issues that remained were too complex for CCFL to resolve; that there were varying opinions or interpretations of what organic aquaculture entailed; and that assigning this work to another subsidiary body would not necessarily lead to a resolution of the technical issues. CCEXEC supported the CCFL recommendation to discontinue work.
- CAC40 (2016): the Chairperson noted the interest to continue work, but that there were also those in favour of discontinuation and proposed that the Commission postpone the decision on discontinuation awaiting a proposal by interested Members on how and where to take this work forward. This would be considered by CAC41 in 2018. CAC agreed to consider this matter at CAC41 (2018) and that this item would not be on the agenda of CCFL.
- CCEXEC75 (2018): reiterated its recommendation to discontinue the work.
- CAC41 (2018): agreed to discontinue the work and noted it could reconsider such work in future should there be sufficient interest on the part of Members.

3.2.2 Reflections

The failure of organic aquaculture also points to a wider issue. Since CCFL had declared itself as not competent in this case, CAC should at some point consider where and how it can best deal with questions related to organic production. Problems like organic aquaculture or organic produce in general could benefit from new concepts of cross-committee cooperation (see also 5.2.3).

3.3 Non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice (Panela)

3.3.1 Timeline

- CCEXEC65 (2011): recommended approval of new work.
- CCEXEC68 (2013): recommended approval at Step 5.
- CAC36 (2013): adopted at step 5.
- CCEXEC69 (2014): noted that this was the second time that extra time had been requested for completion of the standard and requested Colombia (as Chair) to provide further clarification on the impediments to the progression of the standard and to recommend a realistic forecast for its finalization.
- CAC37 (2014): granted a one year extension.
- CCEXEC70 (2015): 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. Noting that the standard development process had been duly followed, CCEXEC recommended the consideration for adoption by CAC of the draft standard at Step 8. CCEXEC70 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).
- CAC38 (2015): agreed to return the standard to Step 6 for comments. CCS, working by correspondence, would prepare a revised draft standard for adoption at Step 8 at CAC39. If no consensus could be reached on final adoption, consideration should be given either to convening a physical meeting of CCS or to discontinuing work on the standard.
- CCEXEC71 (2016): noted that extension of timeframe had been given for three years and recommended that CCS continue working by correspondence to clarify outstanding issues and (i) if agreement on the scope could not be reached, consideration should be given to discontinuation of work without further discussion; or (ii) if only a few countries expressed interest in this standard (and such interest was limited to a particular region), the standard could be developed as a regional standard.
- CAC39 (2016): endorsed the recommendation of CCEXEC71.
- CCEXEC73 (2017): noted that extension of timeframe had been given for four years and that agreement on the scope of the standard could not be reached. CCEXEC recommended that CAC40 discontinue work.
- CAC40 (2017): Noting the substantial support for continuing the work, the Chairperson proposed that CCS working by correspondence, continue work on developing the standard and report back on progress to CAC41, which would take a decision on discontinuation. The Commission agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson to extend work for one year.

- CCEXEC75 (2018): reiterated its recommendation to discontinue the work and noted that CAC could consider future work in this area should there be sufficient interest on the part of Members and a new work proposal presented.
- CAC41 (2018): agreed to extend the work by correspondence by one year, reporting back to CAC42, and noted the possibility that a physical meeting be held.
- CCEXEC77 (2019): reiterated the conclusion of CCEXEC75 to recommend discontinuation of the work.
- CAC42 (2019): noted that, if the current work was to be discontinued, the Commission could consider future work in this area should there be sufficient interest on the part of Members and a new work proposal presented and
 - i. agreed with the recommendation of CCEXEC77 to discontinue the work on the development of a standard for non-centrifuged dehydrated sugar cane juice and noted that as consequence the CCS would be adjourned *sine die* (see also Agenda Item 18); and
 - ii. acknowledged the interest of Colombia to work with other Members to develop a proposal for new work on this topic that would be subject to Critical Review by CCEXEC prior to further consideration and possible approval by the Commission.

3.3.2 Reflections

This work was organized by correspondence from the start. CCS also had not held sessions in quite some time and hosting was transferred to a new hosting country. While the nature of the commodity held many challenges, the way of working may also have contributed to the failure.

3.4 Overall reflections

3.4.1 During the many years of discussions on processed cheese, organic aquaculture and non-centrifuged sugar cane juice, CAC developed extensive knowledge about the products and the reason why they are difficult to standardize. It seems unsatisfactory that this knowledge could not be captured in a more convenient way than a series of reports to assist countries and help Codex to avoid similar pitfalls in the future and improve the Critical Review.

3.4.2 The often repeated formula of “CAC/CCEXEC could consider future work in this area should there be sufficient interest on the part of Members and a new work proposal presented” is of little help as it neither addresses the issues that may have led to the failure nor does it help the countries (often developing countries) who might wish to present a new document.

4. PRESENTATION OF THE CRITICAL REVIEW TO CAC AND IMPACT

4.1 In the introduction to the CAC agenda items dealing with “Final adoption of Codex texts”, “Adoption of Codex Texts at Step 5”, “Revocation of Codex texts”, “Proposals for New Work” and “Discontinuation of Work”, respectively, reference is made to the Critical Review and CCEXEC’s recommendations to CAC concerning the various topics as contained in the report of the respective CCEXEC session.

4.2 The Critical Review in itself does not have much power as the CCEXEC cannot impose on CAC to take any decision. The impact that the Critical Review currently has depends on to which degree the Chairperson, in cases of conflict, bases his/her ruling on the Critical Review as opposed to the discussions at CAC. In the ruling, the Chairperson will have to balance the opinion of CCEXEC with the opinions of Members and Observers expressed at the Commission session and in written comments. It would also seem appropriate (especially in decisions on discontinuation or new work) that the Chairperson take into account the overall amount of delegations engaging in the topic.

5 QUALITATIVE REVIEW OF THE CRITICAL REVIEW PROCESS³

In this section we look at what is procedurally contained in the critical review and which elements could be improved.

5.1 New work

5.1.1 *Examination of proposals for development/revision of standards, taking into account the “Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities”, the strategic plan of the Commission and the required supporting work of independent risk assessment*

A *Guideline on the Application of the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities (Criteria Applicable to Commodities)* exists, whereas a guideline was never developed for general subjects. Before deciding to do so, it should also be evaluated if the present guideline for commodities has been useful.

³ **NB:** The following are the views of the Secretariat, some of which may go beyond the review.

5.1.2 Identifying the standard setting needs of developing countries

No clear guidance exists for this task. In some cases, the attitude of the CCEXEC for project documents coming from RCCs was in case of doubt to “let it go forward” because this was an expressed need of developing countries and rejecting it would have entailed a delay of two years.

5.1.3 Advice on the need for coordination of work between relevant Codex subsidiary bodies/ advice on establishment and dissolution of committees and task forces, including ad hoc cross-committee task forces (in areas where work falls within several committee mandates)

5.1.3.1 The establishment of an *ad hoc* cross-committee task force is a concept that only appears in this paragraph and was never further elaborated. Introducing a new type of subsidiary body might be more appropriate in the rules of procedure.

5.1.3.2 The important issue of cross-committee cooperation was raised several times in and the creation of cross-committee task forces is only one way to address these issues. Presently, the Secretariat is exploring together with host governments and chairs mechanisms within the current structure that are available to address cross-cutting issues such as synchronization of Codex meetings including joint or adjacent meetings, improved communication between committees (e.g. better matters referred paper, better management of the Codex calendar, etc.). In addition, consideration of joint working groups and how they can report to Committees might be considered. We are presently piloting two EWGs in CCPR and CCRVDF discussing cross-cutting issues in parallel.

5.1.3.3 The creation of a new Codex body (even a time limited task force) should be carefully considered as substantial additional resources in the secretariat, FAO, WHO and members are needed to ensure the proper functioning of these bodies. Better coordination between committees might thus be the preferred way rather than an additional task force. The 2003 Codex Evaluation stated the need to reduce the number of Codex meetings and Codex subsidiary bodies.

5.1.4 Project document

5.1.4.1 In accordance with the Procedural Manual, the project document should contain:

- the purposes and the scope of the standard;
- its relevance and timeliness;
- the main aspects to be covered;
- an assessment against the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities;
- relevance to the Codex strategic objectives;
- information on the relation between the proposal and other existing Codex documents as well as other ongoing work;
- identification of any requirement for and availability of expert scientific advice;
- identification of any need for technical input to the standard from external bodies so that this can be planned for;
- the proposed time-line for completion of the new work, including the start date, the proposed date for adoption at Step 5, and the proposed date for adoption by the Commission; the time frame for developing a standard should not normally exceed five years.

5.1.4.2 At CCEXEC76 it was commented that it could be useful to elaborate in the project document how the project is situated within the overall priorities and what are the expected benefits, i.e. the value to Codex members in terms of health protection and promotion of fair practices in trade. This might allow CCEXEC to understand relative priorities of the proposals received, which could be useful information for Codex committees. It may also allow CCEXEC to assess how important and urgent the new project is given the overall workload of the committee.

5.1.4.3 In addition there could be important information from other fora such as the WTO TBT and SPS committees where either the absence or presence of a Codex standard could lead to discussions. This would also not only concern new work but also standards monitoring and adoption.

5.1.4.4 Overall it could be further examined is whether the current format and elements of the project document have proved useful, if committees need more guidance on developing project documents and to what extent project documents are needed for revisions and amendments. This examination could be done involving all CAC subsidiary bodies.

5.2 Ongoing work

5.2.1 In line with the Procedural Manual, CCEXEC: “*shall review the status of development of draft standards against the time frame agreed by the Commission and shall report its findings to the Commission*”.

As measures, CCEXEC: “*may propose an extension of the time frame; cancellation of work; or propose that the work be undertaken by a Committee other than the one to which it was originally entrusted, including the establishment of a limited number of subsidiary bodies, if appropriate*”. There is some guidance for CCEXEC on how to deal with ongoing work and what to propose to Codex committees or CAC (as decided by CAC29 and also contained in CX/EXEC 19/77/5 Section 3.1.).

5.2.2 The guidance is not very detailed, mainly deals with food safety work and omits for commodity work looking at amenability to standardization, which may surface only after new work has started.

5.2.3 The question whether the subsidiary body or way of working is best suited to complete the work also enters into the monitoring of standards development because problems requiring a different way of working may only surface while work is ongoing. Cross-committee task forces might for example have been better suited to deal with certain issues such as organic aquaculture.

5.2.4 CCEXEC has made a number of recommendations to Codex committees and required them to look at their workload and to justify delays in standards development. As indicated above, it can only be assumed that such recommendations have been followed, but it is difficult to quantify the effect. The question of how to give CCEXEC recommendations’ more weight could be asked in this context as stated in section 4 above.

5.3 Adoption at step 5 or 8

5.3.1 In line with the Procedural Manual, CCEXEC examines proposed standards from Codex committees, before they are submitted to the Commission for adoption:

- for consistency with the mandate of Codex, the decisions of the Commission, and existing Codex texts,
- to ensure that the requirements of the endorsement procedure have been fulfilled, where appropriate,
- for format and presentation, and for linguistic consistency.

5.3.2 While the first two bullets seem reasonable and are routinely done by the CCEXEC, format and linguistic consistency seem to be purely Secretariat duties where informal comments can always be sent to the secretariat but which should not need discussion in the CCEXEC.

5.3.3 For any decision on standards advancement to be made by CAC, but especially for a proposed final adoption, the Critical Review should be able to anticipate issues with adoption by CAC and give possible alternatives. At present this is not happening, e.g. CCEXEC77 did neither anticipate issues with the adoption of MLs for cadmium in cocoa nor the food additive provisions for trisodium citrate in milk.

5.3.4 What is contained in the Critical Review at the moment does not seem to be sufficient to do so (as was felt by CCEXEC members on some occasions).

5.3.5 What seems to be missing is to look at the use of measures to facilitate consensus or statements of principle; the existence of reservations and comments made in writing to final adoption as well as the overall interest of Members in the matter and any relevant discussions in other fora such as WTO. Extending the analysis of the Secretariat, as well as having direct contact of CCEXEC with chairpersons of relevant committees in informal meetings could be useful in this aspect.

5.3.6 During the discussion at CCEXEC64 the standard setting speed was discussed committee by committee and when coming to the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCR/VDF) a Member proposed that CCR/VDF refer to statement 4 of the Statements of Principle concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making Process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account in order to speed up problematic cases. Following a question by a Regional Coordinator, it was clarified by the Secretariat that the Critical Review process could not address the problematic cases in CCR/VDF as the Critical Review at steps 5 and 8 only looked at whether the correct process had been followed, which had been the case.⁴

5.3.7 A similar statement limiting the scope of the Critical Review was made in the context of the discussions on Processed Cheese (see 5.1.2 above). This may point to a certain frustration for Members of the CCEXEC who might believe that additional items should be looked at as part of the Critical Review.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 CCEXEC and CAC – uptake of recommendations and overall usefulness of the Critical Review as a project management tool

⁴ It is interesting to note that during the discussion of ongoing work in CCEXEC75, a procedural question regarding the decision of the CCR/VDF Chair to hold a compound at step 4 led to an in-depth discussion and current work on “operationalization” of the statements of principle.

6.1.1 In sections 2,3 and 4 above, we looked at the interaction between CCEXEC and CAC as well as CCEXEC and CAC subsidiary bodies through the Critical Review and found that overall there was very little disagreement between CAC and CCEXEC. In some quite difficult cases, CCEXEC recommended discontinuation earlier than it was finally approved by CAC. There is no trend over the years in the number of divergent recommendations.

6.1.2 We have noted above that that the Critical Review lacks weight so even if it recommends something, CAC is not bound to implement it.. We also noted in section 4, however, the important role of the Chairperson in deciding how much weight he/she gives to the Critical Review when ruling.

6.1.3 On the positive side, the Critical Review clearly enforces a project structure on the CAC standard setting process allowing for checks at critical points and in particular requires CCEXEC to regularly look at the overall workload and progress of CAC and make recommendations as appropriate. All partners in the process are aware of this function and it can be assumed that this influences their behaviour to avoid having to request extension of deadlines or reply to suggestions of discontinuation.

6.1.4 CCEXEC77 (2018) noted that the Critical Review documents (including comments from Chairpersons) can be used to identify cross-cutting issues where discussion by the CCEXEC might add particular value to the standard-setting process. This is something CCEXEC could pursue further.

6.1.5 In Section 5 we saw that there may be gaps in the description of the critical review in the Procedural manual as to what should be looked at when critically reviewing projects at different stages. Several of these gaps might benefit from further discussion.

6.2 Has the critical review improved or contributed to improving the Codex standard setting process?

6.2.1 To compare the situation before 2005 (no Critical Review) and after, indicators for the process would need to be defined and measured. These could be e.g. speed of standard setting, number of projects successfully concluded. It would still be difficult to isolate the impact of the critical review as at the time of implementing it, other changes were made to Codex (e.g. annual sessions of CAC) which had the goal to improve Codex standard setting work.

6.2.2 The Secretariat last measured the speed of standard setting in a document for CCEXEC63 (2009)⁵ with the result of 4.2 years on average overall and 3.5 years for food safety standards. At the time it had been stated that measuring the speed should be an ongoing monitoring exercise. However with the exception of a follow-up document and discussion at CCEXEC64 (2010)⁶, no regular work was done on this. In the 2017 and 2018 status reports of the Strategic Plan 2014-19, the completion time of standards was checked although this was not an indicator in the plan with the result that the great majority of final texts (i.e. 84%) was adopted within 5 years⁷. The Secretariat is currently working on a tracking system that could generate such figures automatically.

6.2.3 It should be kept in mind that any Indicators have the issue that they tend to oversimplify things which may lead to wrong assumptions and conclusions. There should be a qualitative analysis accompanying those numbers if flagging something critical, in order to have the full picture of the issue.

7. Recommendations

7.1 CCEXEC78 is invited to discuss the above and recommend possible follow-up actions which could include:

- (i) Developing guidelines for the application of the *Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities* for general subjects (as well as review the ones for commodities);
- (ii) Including more relevant criteria for the Critical Review of Step 5 and Step 8 adoption in the procedural manual;
- (iii) Finding a suitable way of capturing the experience from difficult/failed projects in order to improve the process;
- (iv) Considering if the content and format of project documents (for new projects and revisions) is useful to critically review projects;

⁵ ALINORM 10/33/3, paras 98-111

⁶ ALINORM 10/33/3^a, paras 66-114

⁷ http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-702-77%252FWD%252Fex77_04e.pdf

(v) Considering what could be done to improve cross-committee cooperation; and

(vi) Consider advice to chairpersons on how to give more weight to the critical review results in CAC.

7.2 Further information on the questions above and others could be collected through a questionnaire to present and previous members of CCEXEC and to Chairpersons of CAC subsidiary bodies.

Appendix I

Uptake of CCEXEC recommendations (on final adoption, Step 5 and new work) by CAC

Year	CCEXEC recommendation followed	Total	Final adoption (Step 8 or 5/8)	Step 5	New work
2019	Yes	46	26	10	10
	No	3	3	0	0
2018	Yes	34	19	5	10
	No	1	1	0	0
2017	Yes	82	42	8	32
	No	0	0	0	0
2016	Yes	47	31	9	7
	No	3	3	0	0
2015	Yes	60	36	5	19
	No	1	1	0	0
2014	Yes	49	28	3	18
	No	1	1	0	0
2013	Yes	67	46	7	14
	No	3	3	0	0
2012	Yes	48	27	8	13
	No	1	1	0	0
2011	Yes	72	41	7	24
	No	2	2	0	0
2010	Yes	65	38	11	16
	No	0	0	0	0
2009	Yes	58	37	6	15
	No	1	1	0	0
2008	Yes	72	41	7	24
	No	4	2	0	2
2007	Yes	78	47	16	15
	No	0	0	0	0
2006	Yes	58	34	9	15
	No	1	1	0	0
2005	Yes	64	31	19	14
	No	2	0	2	0
In total	Yes	900	524	130	246
	No	23	19	2	2

Appendix II

Analysis on CCEXEC recommendations (on final adoption, step 5 and new work) not followed by CAC

Committee	Topic	Year	Step proposed by CCEXEC	Step agreed by CAC	What happened next?
General Subject Committees					
CCCF	ML for cadmium for chocolates containing or declaring <30% total cocoa solids on a dry matter basis	2019	5/8	5	Currently at Step 5 and sent to CCCF for further discussion
	Maximum levels for lead in jams, jellies and marmalades and for preserved tomatoes (GSCTFF)	2016	5/8	5	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC40 (2017)
	Maximum levels for lead in fruit juices and nectars, ready-to-drink; canned fruits; and canned vegetables	2013	5/8	5	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC38 (2015)
	Maximum level for deoxynivalenol (DON) in cereal-based foods for infants and young children	2013	5/8	5	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC38 (2015)
	Maximum Levels for Melamine in Food (Liquid Infant Formula)	2011	5/8	5	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC35 (2012)
CCFA	Food-additive provision for the use of trisodium citrate in FC 01.1.1	2019	8	6	Returned to CCFA at Step 6 for further consideration
CCFH	Guidelines for the Control of <i>Trichinella</i> spp. in Meat of Suidae	2014	5/8	5	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC38 (2015)
CCFL	General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods: Quantitative Declaration of Ingredients	2005	5	3	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC31 (2008)
CCGP	Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food	2009	5/8	5	Adopted at step 8 by CAC33 (2010)
CCNFSDU	Nutrient Reference Values on Vitamin E for Labelling Purposes in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985)	2016	5/8	5	Adopted at step 8 by CAC40 (2017)
	Nutrient Reference Values (NRVs) for Nutrients Associated with Risk of Diet-Related Non-communicable Diseases (NRV-NCDs) (saturated fatty acids and sodium)	2012	5/8	5	Adopted at step 8 by CAC36 (2013)
CCRVDF	MRLs for Ractopamine	2008	8	Held at step 8	Adopted at step 8 by CAC35 (2012)
	Risk Management Recommendations (RMRs)/Guidance for Veterinary Drugs for which no ADI and MRL has been Recommended by JECFA due to Specific Human Health Concerns	2008	New work	Returned to CCRVDF for further consideration	Approved as new work by CAC35 (2012); some RMRs ⁸ adopted at Step 8 by CAC37 (2014), others by CAC38 (2015) and one by CAC41 (2018).
Commodity Committees					
CCS	Standard for Non-Centrifugated Dehydrated Sugar Cane Juice	2015	8	6	Work discontinued by CAC42 (2019)
		2013	5/8	5	

⁸ RMRs for chloramphenicol, malachite green, carbadox, furazolidone, nitrofurazone, chlorpromazine, stilbenes and olaquinox adopted at Step 8 by CAC37 (2014); RMRs for dimetridazole, ipronidazole, metronidazole and ronidazole adopted at step 8 by CAC38 (2015); and RMR for gentian violet adopted at step 8 by CAC41 (2018).

Committee	Topic	Year	Step proposed by CCEXEC	Step agreed by CAC	What happened next?
CCMMP	Standards for Cheddar (C-1) and Danbo (C-3); Standard for Edam (C-4), Gouda (C-5), Havarti (C-6), Samso (C-7), Emmental (C-9), Tilsiter (C-11), Saint-Paulin (C-13), Provolone (C-15), Cottage Cheese (C-16), Coulommiers (C-18), Cream Cheese (C-31), Camembert (C-33), Brie (C-34); and Standard for Mozzarella	2006	8 and 5/8	Held at step 8	Adopted at step 8 by CAC30 (2007)
CCCPL	Provisions for moisture content and the section on grain size in the standard for quinoa	2018	8	Returned by CAC to Step 6	The provisions for moisture content adopted at step 8 by CAC42 (2019); the section on grain size returned to CCCPL for further consideration by CAC43 (2020)
	Section on grain size in the standard for quinoa	2019	8	Returned by CAC to Step 6	
CCFFV	Standard for Aubergines	2016	5/8	5	Adopted at step 8 by CAC41 (2018)
	Standard for Bitter Cassava	2008	8	Held at Step 8 (labelling section returned to Step 6)	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC33 (2010)
	Standard for Durian	2008	New work	Returned to CCFFV for further consideration	Approved as new work by CAC34 (2011); Adopted at Step 8 by CAC37 (2014)
Regional Coordinating Committees					
CCNE	Regional Code of Practice for Street Vended Foods	2011	5/8	Held at Step 8	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC36 (2013)
CCASIA	Standard for Ginseng Products	2005	5	3	Adopted at Step 8 by CAC32 (2009)

Appendix III

CCEXEC (endorsed by CAC) not following Committee recommendations

Year	Committee	Topic	Step proposed by the relevant Committee	Step recommended by CCEXEC and endorsed by CAC	What happened next?
General Subject Committees					
2006	CCFL	Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods: Annex 2 – Permitted Substances: Table 3	8	6	Adopted at step 8 by CAC30 (2007)
Commodity Committees					
2013	CCFFV	Standard for Ware potatoes	New work	Returned to CCFFV for further consideration	Approved as new work by CAC37 (2014); Adopted at step 5 by CAC41 (2018)
2005	CCFO	Codex Standard for Named Vegetable Oil; Low Linolenic Acid Soyabean Oil; Mid-Oleic Acid Soyabean Oil	New work	Returned to CCFO for further review	Never re-submitted as proposal for new work
2005	CCFO	Codex Standard for Named Vegetable Oils: Palm kernel stearin and Palm kernel olein	New work	Returned to CCFO for further review	Approved as new work by CAC30 (2007); Adopted at step 8 by CAC34 (2011)
Regional Coordinating Committees					
2015	CCAFRICA	New Work on Africa Regional Standard for Dried Meat	New work	Returned to CCAFRICA for further consideration	Approved as new work by CAC39 (2016)
2013	CCNE	Standard for Halal Food	New work	Returned to CCNE for further consideration	New proposals have been submitted to various committees and at the recent CCNE however Codex has not started new work.
2013	CCNE	New work on regional/international standards for frozen and chilled meat	New work	Returned to CCNE for further consideration	Never re-submitted as proposal for new work