



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

Agenda Item 11(b)

CX/CAC 13/36/12 Part 2

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

36th Session, FAO Headquarters

Rome, Italy, 1-5 July 2013

DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION 2014-2019

(Compilation of Comments from Regional Coordinating Committees)

Compilation of Comments from Regional Coordinating Committees¹

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) was established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) in 1963. Today, it has more than 180 Members, and more than 200 inter-governmental and international non-governmental organizations are accredited as observers. The Commission's main work is the development of international food standards², guidelines, and codes of practice to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade. The Commission also promotes the coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations.</p> <p>For food safety, quality and nutrition matters, the Commission establishes its standards using the principles of risk analysis and bases its work on the scientific advice provided by the joint FAO/WHO expert bodies and consultations. With increased globalization, the Commission must also be capable of responding in a timely manner to emerging food safety issues and factors that may impact on food safety and fair practices in the</p>	CCNASWP	The Coordinating Committee generally supported this section.	No Action Required.
	CCEURO	<p>The Committee deleted the reference to “quality” in the second paragraph it was not relevant for risk analysis, and clarified that the Commission acts as risk manager.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: “For food safety, quality and nutrition matters, the Commission, <u>as a risk manager</u>, establishes...”</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee agreed to delete the reference to quality and addition of “risk manager” as this statement focuses on application of risk analysis principles. Therefore, term “quality” has been removed; “risk manager” has been added as suggested.</p> <p>The subcommittee recognized the need to ensure Codex mandate related to food quality and fair practices in food trade is reflected in the introduction of the strategic plan. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to add “Codex standards also address issues related to food quality to ensure fair practices in the food trade” in the Introduction section.</p>
	<p>It was agreed to delete the note referring to the Statements of Principle because the provisions of the Procedural Manual on other factors are always applicable and should not be repeated in the Strategic Plan. A similar note in the section on “Drivers for Change” was also deleted for consistency.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Delete footnote “The consideration of other factors...”</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee recognized the need to ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. After a significant discussion amongst the subcommittee members, consensus was reached amongst all participants that it was necessary to retain the footnotes as it provided the necessary clarification on certain issues. Therefore, the</p>	

¹ This document includes comments received from all regional coordinating committees and reports on the discussions and conclusions of the CCEXEC Subcommittee meeting for drafting of the Codex Strategic Plan 2014-2019.

² The term “standards” is used to cover standards and all related texts.

³ The consideration of other factors in the Codex standard-setting process is governed by the *Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making*

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>food trade such as the effects of shifting populations, climate change and diverse consumer concerns³. Food standards, guidelines and recommendations established by the Commission are recognized as reference points for food under the relevant WTO agreements.</p> <p>The 2014-2019 Strategic Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents the vision, goals, and objectives for the Commission and is supported by a more detailed work plan that includes activities, milestones, and measurable indicators to track progress toward accomplishment of the goals. • Underpins the high priority placed on food safety and quality by FAO and WHO and ensures that the Commission will carry out the responsibilities given to it by FAO and WHO. <p>Informs Members, inter-governmental and international non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders of how the Commission intends to fulfil its mandate and to meet the needs and expectations of its Members during the period 2014-2019.</p>			<p>subcommittee agreed retain but revise the footnotes and added the following statement to the “Introduction” section: “The purpose of this Strategic Plan is to advance the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission during the period 2014-2019. This document does not supersede, extend, or contradict the interpretation of the Codex mandate, standards or provisions of the Procedural Manual adopted or approved by the Commission.” The subcommittee also agreed to replace term “diverse” with “relevant” in Paragraph 2 of the Introduction section.</p>
<p>DRIVERS FOR CHANGE</p> <p>The dynamics of the standard-setting activities undertaken by the Commission have changed dramatically since it was</p>	CCNASWP	<p>The Coordinating Committee recommended that the new section “Drivers for Changes” include food security and that, while acknowledging the role of all countries in the work of Codex, emphasis to the increasing role of developing of</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted CCNASWP’s concern. The term “food security concerns” was added to “Drivers For Change” section.</p> <p>Revised statement: “Changes in the global feed</p>

³ The consideration of other factors in the Codex standard-setting process is governed by 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*.

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>established. Since its establishment, not only has the Codex membership increased significantly but Codex has also seen a more active contribution from all members, more specifically the developing countries which are more actively contributing in the international food standard-setting process. Additionally, the environment in which Codex operates has also evolved. Food and food ingredients continue to be increasingly amongst the most traded commodities internationally. Changes in the global feed and food supply chain system, resource optimization efforts, innovation in food science and technology, climate change and consumer concerns³ represent some of the drivers of change that introduces new food safety and nutrition related challenges. The Commission must adapt to this evolving environment and be capable of proactively responding in a timely manner to emerging food safety, quality and nutrition issues with the aim to protect consumer's health and ensure fair practices in food trade.</p>		countries should remain.	and food supply chain system, resource optimization efforts, food security concerns, innovation in food science and technology..."
	CCASIA	The Coordinating Committee supported to include the notion of the promotion of consumer's health protection in "Drivers for Change", while cautioning that Codex focuses its action on its mandate.	The subcommittee noted the concern and identified that the addition of the new statement in the Introduction section would ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
	CCAFRICA	The Committee noted some concerns with the wording of the section on "Drivers for Change", which could be interpreted as allowing consideration of other aspects such as fair trade in relation to labour conditions or gender issues. It was however recalled that all elements in the Strategic Plan should remain in the framework of the Codex mandate and the Committee agreed to retain the current text.	The subcommittee noted the concern and identified that the addition of the new statement in the Introduction section would ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
<p>STRATEGIC VISION STATEMENT <i>To be the preeminent international food standards-setting body to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade.</i></p>	CCNASWP	The Coordinating Committee generally supported the sections as currently drafted.	No action required.
	CCASIA	The Coordinating Committee generally supported the sections as currently drafted.	No action required.
<p>CODEX CORE VALUES <i>In fulfilling its strategic vision, Codex adheres to core values that include,</i></p>	CCNASWP	The Coordinating Committee generally supported the sections as currently drafted.	No action required.
	CCLAC	The Committee agreed to add a footnote to the core value "consensus building" to make	The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to add a footnote to the core value "consensus

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration • inclusiveness • consensus building • transparency <p>In conducting its work, the Commission strives at ensuring that the concepts of protecting the health of consumers and fair practise in the food trade are consistently followed in the Codex standard-setting process.</p>		reference to the Measures to facilitate consensus as contained in the Procedural Manual.	building”. The following footnote was added: “Consensus should be based on “Measures to facilitate Consensus” included in the Procedural Manual” as suggested by the CCLAC.
<p>STRATEGIC GOALS</p> <p>Strategic Goal 1: Establish international food standards that address current and emerging food issues</p>			
<p><u>Objective 1.1:</u> Establish new and review existing Codex standards, based on priorities of the CAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 Consistently apply decision-making and priority-setting criteria across Committees to ensure that the standards and work areas of highest priority are progressed in a timely manner. 1.1.2 Strengthen the critical review process to improve standards monitoring 	CCEURO	<p><u>Activity 1.1.2 (Work plan):</u> The Committee noted that while the CCEXEC could review its own working processes internally, any proposed amendment to the procedure should be forwarded to the Committee on General Principles (CCGP) and adopted by the Commission. The indicators were grouped in order to retain only two steps: to consider the critical review and to propose changes in a single report to the CCEXEC, following which the CCEXEC could make recommendations and, if required, forward them to the CCGP.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: add <u>CCGP</u>; Measurable Indicators: add 1. <u>Current critical review procedures reviewed, proposed changes, if required, identified, Secretariat report submitted to the CCEXEC on outcomes of the review by July 2015.</u> 2. <u>Recommendations</u></i></p>	<p>The subcommittee identified the need to ensure consistency in the “Responsible Party” section. It was noted that several other parties will play a significant role in implementation of activities and as such it would not be possible to identify all of the different parties that could have a potential role in undertaking the activities. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to only identify the lead party that is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the activity identified in the work plan. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain CCEXEC as the lead for overseeing this activity.</p> <p>The subcommittee was informed that the secretariat report to the CCEXEC on outcomes of the critical review would be ready by April 2014. Therefore, the July 2015 timeline for the report in the “Measurable Indicators”</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<u>considered or adopted by CCEXEC and put forward to the CCGP for consideration.</u>	section was revised to April 2015. The subcommittee noted that the recommendations are adopted by the CAC and not the CCEXEC. CCEXEC could only endorse the recommendations. Therefore, the term “adopted” was revised to “endorsed” in the Measurable Indicators/Output section.
<p><u>Objective 1.2:</u> Proactively identify emerging issues⁴ and member country needs and, where appropriate, develop relevant food standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.1 Develop a process for proactively identifying emerging issues related to food safety, nutrition and fair practices in the food trade. 1.2.2 Develop and revise international and regional standards as needed, in response to needs identified by Members and in response to factors that affect food safety and fair practices in the foods trade. 1.2.3 Develop a mechanism measuring the implementation of Codex standards by member governments. 	CCNASWP	<p>Activity 1.2.3: The Coordinating Committee questioned the relevance of the new Activity 1.2.3 and how it fitted with Objective 1.</p> <p>Work Plan: It was recommended that measures aimed at collecting data and information on the status of implementation of the Strategic Plan leverage existing data collection activities.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed that the activity, as drafted, did not reflect the intent of the activity appropriately. The purpose of this activity was to address concerns raised by some members that Codex needs to measure the relevance of the standards it develops to its members. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain and revise the activity as follows:</p> <p>Activity 1.2.3: Develop a pilot approach to measure the relevance of Codex standards to members.</p> <p>Responsible Party: CCEXEC</p> <p>Timeline: 2016</p> <p>Expected Outcome: Indicators to measure the relevance of Codex standards to members developed.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outputs: 1) A pilot approach implemented.</p>
	CCEURO	Activity 1.2.1: The Committee agreed that Activity 1.2.1 should read “promote consideration of emerging issues” as developing “a process for proactively identifying issues”	The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that the purpose of this activity is to have a systematic approach for identification of emerging issues, rather than creation of a new

⁴ For the purposes of this Strategic Plan, emerging food safety and nutrition issues are interpreted to include scientific and technological innovations, emerging hazards resulting from ongoing investigations or related to extra-ordinary events (e.g. natural disasters, external threats, etc.).

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>would result in focusing on the process, using up time and resources which would be better used to address actual emerging issues. It was noted that, when emerging food safety issues occurred, FAO and WHO or members should bring them to the attention of the relevant committees.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: 1.2.1 Develop a process for proactively identifying Promote consideration of emerging issues related to food safety, nutrition and fair practices in the food trade</i></p> <p>Work Plan: For Activity 1.2.1, a reference to fair practice in food trade was added in the last column to make it consistent with the Activity.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: add CAC; Measurable Indicators: revise #1 to: Annual reports from Committees to CCEXEC/CAC identifying emerging food safety and nutrition issues and fair practices in the food trade.</i></p> <p>Activity 1.2.3: The Committee agreed to delete Activity 1.2.3 as the development of a mechanism measuring the implementation of Codex standards was not the responsibility of Codex, but rather of the WTO SPS or TBT Committees, and recalled that the (revoked) acceptance procedure had never been applied in practice.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: 1.2.3 Develop a mechanism measuring the implementation of Codex</i></p>	<p>process. This would enhance Codex's ability to respond to emerging issues and the needs of member governments in a timely manner. It was also noted that some committees already have measures in place to consider emerging issues. Therefore, the subcommittee revised the activity as follows:</p> <p>Activity 1.2.1 Develop a systematic approach to promote identification of emerging issues related to food safety, nutrition, and fair practices in the food trade.”</p> <p>Responsible Party: All committees</p> <p>Timeline: 2016</p> <p>Expected Outcome: Timely Codex response to emerging issues and to the needs of member governments.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outputs: 1) Committees implement systematic approach for identification of emerging issues. 2) Regular reports on systematic approach and emerging issues made to CCEXEC through the Codex Secretariat.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to revise the activity. See the revised text and the rationale above (CCNASWP Comment on Activity 1.2.3).</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<i>standards by member governments.</i>	
	CCLAC	<p>Activity 1.2.1: Several members were concerned with the explicit mentioning of “nutrition” in this activity, which they saw as going beyond the Commissions’ mandate. They were of the opinion that Codex is already active in nutrition-related topics through the work of the CCNFSU and the CCFL and that it is not clear what new work is intended by mentioning nutrition here and what would change if it was deleted from the activity. Other delegations were of the opinion that as nutrition was an important aspect of Codex work it should be mentioned in this activity. It was also mentioned that it had been highlighted at the Commission session that nutrition should be more prominently included in the Strategic Plan (REP12/CAC, para 138). Because of the continued concern with the prominent mention of nutrition, while recognizing the importance of nutrition for Codex, the Committee decided to reformulate the activity in a way that would avoid mentioning any particular issue and stressing only on the need for proactive identification of issues:</p> <p><i>Conclusion: “1.2.1 Develop a process for proactively identifying emerging issues related to the mandate of Codex.”</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and identified that the addition of the new statement in the Introduction section would ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Therefore, the comments of CCLAC were addressed through the addition of the new text.</p>
		<p>Activity 1.2.3: Some delegations requested clarification of this activity in particular because the implementation of standards was up to Codex members and difficult to measure and because WTO under the SPS agreement already</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to revise the activity. See the revised new text and rationale above (CCNASWP Comment on Activity 1.2.3). Therefore, the comments of CCLAC were addressed by revising the</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>had a monitoring function. Other delegations were of the opinion that the activity should remain as a way to measure effectiveness of Codex standards, as their main objective is that Codex members adopt them in their legislation. It was also mentioned that the SPS Committee had not been effective in this work, as it was not easy to identify when Codex standards were basis of an SPS notification. It was proposed that the activity could be included under strategic goal 3 or an independent strategic goal.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Following an explanation on the structure of the Strategic Plan, the Committee decided to leave the activity unchanged.</i></p>	<p>activity and the corresponding indicators.</p>
	FAO/WHO	<p>Activity 1.2.1: This activity refers to the development of a process to proactively identify emerging issues. Recognising that Codex should be responsive to emerging issues in the food safety, quality and nutrition areas and should indeed promote it, developing a process to do this in a sufficiently robust manner that it is adequate to drive international standard setting is extensive and not limited to Codex. Annual reports from committees as the output does not give any indication of the process to be used or how it could be comparable between committees. If there is a strong desire to retain this working then the first output needs to focus on the process by which this should be done.</p> <p>Activity 1.2.2: In terms of identifying and prioritising the needs of members, it is preferable that this be done in a consistent manner across all committees and thus a process</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed that the Measurable Indicators/Output section needs to be revised to reflect the implementation of a systematic approach for identification of emerging issues. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise the Measurable Indicators/Output section as follows:</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outputs: 1) Committees implement systematic approach for identification of emerging issues. 2) Regular reports on systematic approach and emerging issues made to CCEXEC through the Codex Secretariat.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern. There is no impact on the text of the strategic plan as a result of the comment. Therefore, no action required.</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>for this may need to be considered.</p> <p>Activity 1.2.3: Measuring the implementation of Codex standards by members would be useful information. Attempts in the past have been made to get this information for example through the codex coordinating committees but it is challenging to get this information through reliance on country reporting. A more proactive approach may be needed.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized the complexities with measuring the implementation of Codex standards by members. The subcommittee agreed that it would be more beneficial to have a pilot approach that can measure the relevance of Codex standards to the members, as it would address concerns raised by some Codex members. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Activity 1.2.3 as follows:</p> <p>Activity 1.2.3: Develop a pilot approach to measure the relevance of Codex standards to members.</p>
<p>Objective 1.3: Strengthen coordination and cooperation with other international standards-setting organizations seeking to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3.1 Promote collaboration in standards development in Codex with the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on standards that cover the farm to fork continuum and affect Codex and those organizations, through utilization of consistent methodologies and approaches in their development. 1.3.2 Promote cooperative programs with 	CCNASWP	<p>Objective 1.3 (Work Plan): The Coordinating Committee recommended that the “Responsible Parties” of the Objective 1.3 be thoroughly scrutinised and to consider the role of the Codex Secretariat in liaising and coordinating with international organizations.</p> <p>It was further recommended to consider the inclusion of FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees in the delivery of these activities and to be more precise on the “Responsible Party” for the delivery of each activity.</p>	<p>The subcommittee identified the need to ensure consistency in the “Responsible Party” section and reviewed the entire section as suggested by the regional committee. It was noted that several other parties will play a significant role in the implementation of activities and as such it would not be possible to identify all the different parties that could have a potential role in undertaking of the activities. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to only identify the lead party that is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the activity identified in the work plan and agreed to add a note to the work plan stating that: “The “Responsible Party” section identifies the lead party that is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the activity identified in the work plan. It is recognized that several other parties will play a significant role in the</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>other international governmental and non-governmental standards-setting organizations to identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</p>	CCEURO	<p>Activity 1.3.1: The Committee deleted the phrase “through utilization of consistent methodologies and approaches” which could create confusion with the provisions on cooperation with IGOs specified in the Procedural Manual.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: 1.3.1 Promote collaboration in standards development in Codex with the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on standards that cover the farm to fork continuum and affect Codex and those organizations, through utilization of consistent methodologies and approaches in their development.</i></p> <p>Work Plan: For Activities 1.3.1, the reference to CCEXEC was deleted as amendments to procedures for collaboration with International Governmental Organisations (IGOs) are the responsibility of CCGP.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: CCEXEC; CCGP.</i></p>	<p>implementation of the activity”.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to delete the statement “...through utilization of consistent methodologies and approaches in their development.”</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed that CCGP could provide significant input. However, CCEXEC would be the lead committee responsible for endorsing the mechanisms recommended by CCGP. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain CCEXEC as the lead party; however, the subcommittee agreed to clarify in the work plan that other parties will play a significant role in implementation of the activities.</p>
		<p>Activity 1.3.2: The Committee agreed that it was not the role of other standard-setting organisations to identify the needs for Codex standards, but rather that cooperation should “further the Codex mandate”.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: 1.3.2 Promote cooperative programs with other international governmental and non-governmental standards-setting organizations to further the Codex mandate</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that the intent of this activity is to promote collaboration with other international governmental and non-governmental organizations to support the work of Codex and enhance the awareness of Codex standards. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Activity 1.3.2 as follows:</p> <p>Activity 1.3.2: Promote cooperative programs</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>identify needs for new Codex standards and to promote the use of existing Codex standards.</i></p> <p>Work Plan: For Activities 1.3.2, the reference to CCEXEC was deleted as amendments to procedures for collaboration with International Governmental Organisations (IGOs) are the responsibility of CCGP.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: CCEXEC; CCGP</i></p>	<p>with other international governmental and non-governmental standard-setting organizations to support development of relevant Codex standards and to enhance awareness, understanding and use of Codex standards.</p> <p>Responsible Party: CCEXEC</p> <p>Expected Outcome: Optimized coordination and cooperation with international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, including private standard setting bodies.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outputs: Current collaboration between international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations reviewed and where relevant, procedures updated.</p>
	CCASIA	<p>Objective 1.3: The Coordinating Committee generally supported Strategic Goal 1 and recommended that Objective 1.3 be revised to better highlight the importance of collaboration with inter-governmental standard setting organizations. The Coordinating Committee noted the concerns of some delegations with regard to transparency and inclusiveness of non-governmental standard setting organizations. It also agreed to highlight the importance of collaboration and coordination with international standards-setting organizations rather than to focus on avoiding duplication.</p>	<p>The subcommittee recognized the need to ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.</p> <p>Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to add a new statement after Paragraph 2 in the Introduction section.</p>
	CCLAC	<p>Objective 1.3: One delegation noted that, when taking standards of other international organizations into account as a reference, Codex should make sure that the other organizations</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and revised activity 1.3.2. The revised activity included reference to “non-governmental standard setting organizations” which would include private</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>had working principles for standard setting that are equivalent to those used by Codex in assuring transparency.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: “Objective 1.3 Strengthen coordination and cooperation with other international standards-setting organizations when they have equivalent working procedures for the establishment of standards and practices that guarantee transparency for taking decisions, seeking to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize opportunities.”</i></p> <p>Activity 1.3: Delegation proposed to include a new activity as follows: “1.3.3 Encourage private standard setting bodies to become observers in Codex”. The justification was that it should be made more explicit in the plan that it would be beneficial to it bring these bodies into the Codex process so that problems with private standards can be easier addressed and avoided.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: The Committee agreed not to add a new activity as the inclusion of private standard setting bodies as observers is implicitly covered by the present Activity 1.3.2 but noted that this proposal could be included under the expected outcomes or the indicators for this activity.</i></p>	<p>bodies. The committee also noted that the new sentence added in the Introduction section will ensure that Codex should work within the Codex mandate and provisions of the Procedural Manual. Therefore, the subcommittee accepted regional committee’s conclusion to not add a new activity; however, revised activity 1.3.2 and added the statement after Paragraph 2 in the “Introduction” section to ensure Codex adheres to the provisions of the Procedural Manual to address CCLAC’s comments. The added text addressed CCLAC’s comment of ensuring that Codex will continue to work within its mandate and the provisions of the Procedural Manual. The subcommittee also agreed to add “including private standard setting bodies” to the Expected Outcome section for Activity 1.3.2</p>
<p>Strategic Goal 2: Ensure the application of risk analysis principles in the development of Codex standards.</p>	<p>CCASIA</p>	<p>Objectives 2.1 and 2.3: Delegations were of the opinion that Activities 2.1.2 and 2.3.2 presented overlap rather than redundancies and that maintaining both activities in the plan could contribute to stress the importance of the participation and contribution of developing countries to Strategic Goal 2, given that the activities were aimed at different objectives.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed with the regional committee’s recommendation to retain both activities 2.1.2 and 2.3.2.</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>Therefore, it was suggested to consider amending the text of the activities rather than deleting one of them.</p> <p>The Coordinating Committee generally supported Strategic Goal 2 and recommended to retain both Activities 2.1.2 and 2.3.2 with the relevant amendments of wording as may be required.</p>	
<p><u>Objective 2.1:</u> Ensure consistent use of scientific advice and risk analysis principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1 Use the scientific advice of the joint FAO/WHO expert bodies to the fullest extent possible in food safety and nutrition standards development based on the “<i>Working Principles of Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius</i>”. 2.1.2 Encourage engagement of scientific and technical expertise of member countries and their representatives in the development of Codex standards. 2.1.3 Ensure that all relevant factors are fully considered in exploring risk management measures in the context of Codex standard development. 2.1.4 Communicate the risk management decisions to all interested parties. 	<p>CCNASWP</p> <p>CCEURO</p> <p>CCLAC</p>	<p>Objective 2.1 (Work Plan): The Coordinating Committee recommended to reduce the rigidity of quantitative indicators to measure the achievements/progress of Objective 2.1 and to reflect on the value of adding an additional column to indicate the source of data from which measurable indicators could be drawn.</p> <p>Objective 2.1: The title was amended to refer only to risk analysis principles as they include scientific advice. <i>Conclusion: “Objective 2.1: Ensure consistent use of scientific advice and risk analysis principles.”</i></p> <p>Activity 2.1.2: One delegation noted that while encouraging the engagement of members in this work one should make sure that all had the required level of scientific knowledge required. <i>Conclusion: The Committee agreed to add at the end of the activity the words: “lending greater</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and reviewed all Measurable Indicators/Outputs in the work plan. The subcommittee also agreed to add following generic statement to the work plan: “Codex should leverage the use of existing reports and data collection activities to monitor progress through the “Measurable Indicators”.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern; however, recognized that the objective contained activities that were focused on application of risk analysis principles and encouraging use of scientific advice to the fullest extent possible. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain term “scientific advice”; however, revised the statement as follows: Objective 2.1: “Ensure consistent use of risk analysis principles and scientific advice.”</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized the need to provide greater support to the developing countries. However, it was noted that Objective 2.3 and Objective 3.1 focused on increasing effective participation of developing countries in Codex. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain the Activity</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>support to developing countries”.</i></p> <p>Activity 2.1.3: Several delegations were concerned with the term “all relevant factors” as it was not clear what is meant with this term and that it was important to stay within the mandate of Codex.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Committee agreed to amend Activity 2.1.3 as follows: “Ensure that only legitimate and relevant factors for protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in the food trade are fully considered in exploring risk management options in the context of developing Codex standards.”</i></p> <p>Work Plan: Expected Outcome, the Committee agreed to replace the term “non-science factors” with “all relevant factors” to make the text consistent with the activities.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Expected Outcome: revise “Enhanced identification and documentation <u>consideration</u> of non-science <u>all relevant</u> factors considered by committees during the development of Codex standards.” Measurable Indicator: remove non-science and add relevant.</i></p> <p>Activity 2.1.4 (Work Plan): it was clarified that communication of risk management decisions</p>	<p>2.1.2 as drafted.</p> <p>The subcommittee recognized the need to ensure that no provisions, suggested by the strategic plan, are meant to contradict the rules, procedures and guidelines outlined in the Procedural Manual or go beyond the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to add following statement to the Introduction section: “The purpose of this Strategic Plan is to advance the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission during the period 2014-2019. This document does not supersede, extend, or contradict the interpretation of the Codex mandate, standards or provisions of the Procedural Manual adopted or approved by the Commission.” CCLAC’s comments were addressed with the addition of the new text in the “Introduction” section rather than amending the activity.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concerns and agreed replace the term “non-science factors” with “all relevant factors”. The subcommittee revised the work plan for Activity 2.1.3 as follows:</p> <p>Responsible Party: All committees</p> <p>Expected Outcome: “Enhanced identification, and documentation of all relevant factors considered by committees during the development of Codex standards.”</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognised that the intent of this activity was to</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>was the role of the Commission and the Codex Secretariat.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: All relevant committees; <u>CAC and Codex Secretariat</u></i></p>	<p>ensure risk management recommendations made by all Codex committees are appropriately communicated. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain “All Committees” in the Responsible Party section; however, revised the activity to replace term “risk management decisions” to “risk management recommendations”. This change was reflected in the expected outcome section as well.</p>
	FAO/WHO	<p>Activity 2.1.3: The term 'non-science' is used in the wording of the expected outcome and measurable indicators/outputs of this activity while the activity related to 'relevant factors'. It would be clearer to retain the same terminology throughout. Also other relevant factors are not necessarily all 'non-science' factors.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concerns and agreed replace the term “non-science factors” with “all relevant factors”.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2: Achieve sustainable access to scientific advice. • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1 Encourage FAO and WHO governing bodies to identify the provision of scientific advice as a high priority and allocate sufficient resources for the FAO/WHO expert bodies, in particular JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU. 2.2.2 Encourage continued financial support from Members for the FAO/WHO expert bodies, in particular JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU. 	CCNASWP	<p>Objective 2.2 (Work Plan): It was further recommended to consider changing the measurable indicator of Objective 2.2 with a measure of the increase of the financial resources allocated to the provision of scientific advice.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and revised the Measurable Indicators/Output section for Activity 2.2.1 to reflect allocation of adequate financial resources for the provision of scientific advice.</p>
	CCEURO	<p>Objective 2.2: The Committee replaced the term “expert bodies” with “expert advice” to cover all cases and not only advice from the bodies mentioned in Activities 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Revised text:</i></p> <p><i>“2.2.1 Encourage FAO and WHO governing bodies to identify the provision of scientific advice as a high priority and allocate sufficient resources for the FAO/WHO expert <u>advice</u> bodies, in particular <u>from</u> JECFA,</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and revised the activities as suggested by the regional committee.</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
2.2.3 Explore other appropriate funding sources for FAO/WHO scientific advice.		<i>JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU.</i> “2.2.2 Encourage continued financial support from Members for the FAO/WHO expert <u>advice bodies</u> , in particular <u>from</u> JECFA, JEMRA, JMPR and JEMNU.”	
	CCNEA	Activity 2.2.1 (Work Plan): One delegation remarked that the indicator for 2.2.1, was presently only mentioning the intervention of members in the governing bodies of FAO and WHO (FAO conference and World Health Assembly) and could possibly be improved. Another delegation remarked that FAO and WHO should give priority to the support and capacity building (training and workshops) for the implementation of risk analysis in the region as many countries still lacked the relevant policies.	The subcommittee noted the concerns and agreed to add following indicator for Activity 2.2.1: Measurable Indicators/Outputs: 2) Adequate financial resources allocated to the provision of scientific advice by FAO/WHO.
		Activity 2.3.4: They remarked that the support of data collection should be included in the objective of FAO and WHO.	No action required.
	FAO/WHO	Activity 2.2.2: In terms of the indicators here the information is something that FAO and WHO will have to provide. Thus we would like to be clear on the differences between to two indicators. We assume that 1. relates to financial support. Just to note that GIFSA is one mechanism for providing financial support but not the only one and recent experience has indicated that the mechanism may have to be tailored to meet the donors reporting requirements. Can we assume that "collaborating with FAO and WHO to support expert consultations" refers to support other than	The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized the intent of this activity was to encourage continued financial support from Codex Member Governments for FAO/WHO expert advice. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise the Measurable Indicators/Outputs section as follows: Measurable Indicators/Outputs: Report on the member countries financial contribution to the provision of scientific advice by FAO/WHO.

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>direct financial support such as secondment of staff, hosting of meetings etc.</p> <p>Activity 2.2.3: Indicator 2 refers to expert consultations being funded by alternate measures. Does this refer to everything other than Regular Programme budget? Already some expert meetings are funded by sources other than the regular programme. So it is unclear what this indicator will tell you in it's current wording. Alternative funding or support mechanisms already have to be used but in general they are ad hoc rather that something sustainable.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to delete Indicator 2.</p>
<p>Objective 2.3: Increase scientific input from developing countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1 Encourage developing countries to submit data in response to calls from FAO/WHO expert bodies, through enhanced food safety and nutrition data generation capabilities. 2.3.2 Encourage FAO and WHO to support programs aimed at enhancing the capacity of developing countries to generate, collect and submit data. 2.3.3 Encourage sustained and continuous participation of technical and scientific experts from developing countries in the work of Codex. 	CCNASWP	<p>Objective 2.3: It was recommended to consider networks, including both developed and developing countries and twinning/mentoring programmes, to increase the contribution of experts from developing countries in the provision of scientific advice.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that Activity 2.3.4, as drafted, limited the scope of the networks to just developing countries and does not encourage collaboration between all members. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Activity 2.3.4 to remove term “developing” and “countries” as follows:</p> <p>Activity 2.3.4: Encourage the establishment of networks of members to enhance collaboration in the generation of data that can be submitted for review by expert committees.</p> <p>Expected Outcomes: Enhanced generation and submission of data from developing countries as a result of participation in networks.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outputs: # of countries joining a network 3) # of times input received from developing country by expert committees, as a result from participation in a network.</p>
	CCLAC	Objective 2.3: The Committee discussed	The subcommittee noted the concern and

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>2.3.4 Encourage the establishment of networks of developing member countries to enhance collaboration in the generation of data that can be submitted for review by expert committees.</p>		<p>different ways how to ensure under this objective that there was sufficient funding for FAO/WHO scientific advice to developing countries.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: The Committee agreed to add a new activity to this objective as follows: “2.3.5 Explore other adequate funding sources in addition to those provided by FAO/WHO so that developing countries can obtain scientific advice”. The responsible parties should be all relevant committees, the timeline continuing and the expected outcome: “Explore funding sources that are better and more sustainable for the provision of FAO/WHO scientific advice.”</i></p>	<p>recognized the need to ensure adequate funding for FAO/WHO scientific advice to developing countries. The subcommittee noted that Objective 2.2 focused on achieving sustainable access to scientific advice, and Activity 2.2.3 specifically focused on exploring other appropriate funding sources for FAO/WHO scientific advice. The subcommittee noted that this Objective was applicable to all member countries and not just the developing countries. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to not add a new activity in Objective 2.3 as the intent of the proposed new activity by CCLAC was captured in Objective 2.2: “Achieve sustainable access to scientific advice”.</p>
	<p>CCAFRICA</p>	<p>Objective 2.3: Some delegations pointed out that the obstacles to developing country input were not clearly defined, whether this related to the lack of expertise, infrastructure, and lack of participation or data submission. The Representative of FAO clarified that the main issue on which capacity building was required was data generation.</p> <p>Activity 2.3.3: The Committee stressed the importance of Objective 2.3.3 on ensuring participation of experts from developing countries in the work of Codex.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the comment by CCAFRICA. Given that this comment has no impact on the drafted text of the strategic plan, no action was required.</p>
	<p>FAO/WHO</p>	<p>Activity 2.3.2: The expected outcome text refers to Risk assessments. This should perhaps be broadened to "Risk assessment and scientific advice".</p> <p>Also it is suggested to modify the rest of the</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed that the Expected Outcome should be revised to include scientific advice. The subcommittee also noted the need to have adequate quality data that can be used in risk assessments from developing</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		sentence to indicate that these risk assessments should "increasingly consider and reflect data from developing countries" this is suggested so that the notion is not only to have increased data from developing countries but also data of adequate quality that it can be used in risk assessment.	countries. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise the Expected Outcomes section as follows: Expected Outcomes: Risk assessments and scientific advice take into account increased suitable data provided by developing countries.
		Activity 2.3.4: While the establishment of networks should be promoted measuring the impact codex has on their establishment is challenging as there will also be other drivers. Also we have found networks very useful to disseminate calls for data and experts and promoting the need to provide data but in using these networks the response generally comes from one country or institution. And it is difficult to see too much change that regard as it would require a lot of additional work from the network. So the value of indicator #3 is questionable.	The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed that the Measurable Indicator should be aligned with the Expected Outcome of the activity which was to enhance generation and submission of data from developing countries. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Measurable Indicator 3 as follows: Measurable Indicator: # of times input received from developing country by expert committees, as a result from participation in a network.
Strategic Goal 3: Facilitate the effective participation of all Codex Members.	CCASIA	The Coordinating Committee generally supported Strategic Goal 3.	No action required.
<p><u>Objective 3.1:</u> Increase the effective participation of developing countries in Codex.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1 Encourage member countries to develop sustainable national institutional arrangements to promote effective contribution to the Codex standard setting processes. 	CCNASWP	Activity 3.1.3: The Coordinating Committee recommended to revisit the language of Activity 3.1.3 taking into account the ongoing discussion in FAO and WHO on a possible successor programme of the Codex Trust Fund; to reconsider the order of activities listed under Objective 3.1; and to review the entire timeline.	The subcommittee noted the CCNASWP comment agreed to revise the order of Activity 3.1.3 and Activity 3.1.4. The subcommittee also reviewed the Timeline and agreed to retain the Timelines as drafted, based on the input provided by the Codex Secretariat on the status of a successor initiative for Codex Trust Fund.
	CCEURO	Activity 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 (Work Plan): It was agreed that encouraging member countries to strengthen national structures was addressed to	The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that it is responsibility of all members to strengthen national codex structure.

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>3.1.2 Encourage the use of partnership initiatives to increase effectiveness of participation of developing countries, such as co-hosting of committees and working groups, including the development of guidance documents, building on lessons learned.</p> <p>3.1.3 Plan, with the involvement of Codex Members, a successor initiative for the Codex Trust Fund.</p> <p>3.1.4 Encourage financial contributions from Members to the Codex Trust Fund.</p>		<p>all members and was the role of the Commission, not the CCEXEC.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: remove CCEXEC</i></p> <p>Activity 3.1.3 (Work Plan): on planning the successive initiative to the Trust Fund, the responsible parties were amended to refer to the Commission and FAO and WHO.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: remove CCEXEC; add <u>CAC; FAO and WHO.</u></i></p>	<p>Therefore, the committee agreed to remove CCEXEC as the Responsible Party and identify CAC as the lead for Activity 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern; however, recognized that CCEXEC was the lead party to support on behalf of the CAC the implementation of a successor initiative to the Codex Trust Fund. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain CCEXEC as the lead party, but noted that the Commission and FAO/WHO will play a significant role in adoption of a successor initiative.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3.2:</u> Promote capacity development programs that assist countries in creating sustainable national Codex structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2.1 Encourage FAO and WHO to implement capacity development programs that support the creation of sustainable national Codex-related structures. 3.2.2 Encourage developing countries to 	<p>FAO/WHO</p> <p>CCNASWP</p> <p>CCEURO</p>	<p>Activity 3.1.1: Indicator 2 is unclear as written and possibly needs to include some reference to an increase in activities of strength of the national structures.</p> <p>Objective 3.2: The Coordinating Committee further recommended that the sub-Committee re-examine Objective 3.2 to introduce activities that leverage ongoing activities on strengthening food safety systems of members.</p> <p>Activity 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 (Work Plan): It was agreed that encouraging member countries to</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the FAO/WHO comment and reviewed the Indicator 2 for this activity. The subcommittee recognized the need to identify members with a permanent national Codex structure as it would allow Codex to prioritize capacity building activities. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain the Measurable Indicator as drafted.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the CCNASWP comment and recognized that Codex should leverage existing activities and initiatives to avoid duplication and ensure efficiency. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to add the following note at the beginning of the work plan: “Codex should leverage the use of existing reports and data collection activities to monitor progress through the “Measurable Indicators.”</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to replace CCEXEC with CAC as the</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>identify and prioritize Codex committees and task forces of significance to them.</p> <p>3.2.3 Where practical, the use of Codex meetings as a forum to effectively conduct educational and technical capacity building activities.</p>		<p>strengthen national structures was addressed to all members and was the role of the Commission, not the CCEXEC.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Responsible Party: remove CCEXEC, add <u>CAC</u></i></p>	<p>lead responsible party for Activity 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.</p>
	FAO/WHO	<p>Activity 3.2.1: FAO already undertakes a lot of capacity development in relation to Codex activities at national level and provide information on this annually to the CAC. Any increase or enhancement will be directly related to an increase in resources. The baseline for the indicators would also need to be clarified.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to delete “Increase in the #” reference in the Measurable Indicators/Outputs.</p>
<p>Strategic Goal 4: Implement effective and efficient work management systems and practices.</p>	CCASIA	<p>The Coordinating Committee generally supported Strategic Goal 4.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p><u>Objective 4.1:</u> Strive for an effective, efficient, transparent, and consensus based standard setting process for the timely adoption of standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1.1 Periodically review the work processes and procedures used by the CAC and its subsidiary bodies to ensure impediments to standard-setting work are identified and addressed. 4.1.2 Assess benefits and, where cost effective, implement new information technologies to improve, Codex communication, work flow, and management of 	CCNASWP	<p>Objective 4.1: The Coordinating Committee recommended to broaden Activities 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 to all technologies and to clarify the “Responsible party” in the activities of Objective 4.1, in particular those of the Committee on General Principles and of the Codex Secretariat.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the CCNASWP comment and agreed to remove term “information” in Activity 4.1.2 and Activity 4.1.3 to broaden the scope of technologies as recommended by the regional committee. The subcommittee also revised the Responsible Party section for Objective 4.1 and identified only the lead parties that will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the activity but noted that other parties would make a significant contribution.</p>
	CCEURO	<p>Objective 4.1 was amended to reflect that timely adoption of standards was not an objective per se, and it was more important to ensure the credibility and consistency of the process, so that standards could meet the expectations of all members.</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to delete term “for the timely adoption of standards” in Objective 4.1.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that that review of work processes may result in changing of procedures.</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
<p>activities.</p> <p>4.1.3 Assess benefits and, where cost effective, implement new information technologies to improve member participation in committees and working groups.</p> <p>4.1.4 Ensure timely distribution of all Codex working documents.</p> <p>4.1.5 Increase the scheduling of Work Group meetings in conjunction with Committee meetings.</p>		<p><i>Conclusion: “Objective 4.1: Strive for an effective, efficient, transparent, and consensus based standard setting process for the timely adoption of standards to ensure credibility and consistency in Codex decision making.”</i></p> <p><u>In Activity 4.1.1</u>, the term “procedures” was deleted as procedures were established on a long term basis and only processes should be reviewed periodically.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: 4.1.1 Periodically review the work processes and procedures used by the CAC and its subsidiary bodies to ensure impediments to standard-setting work are identified and addressed.</i></p> <p><u>Work Plan:</u> The Committee deleted the reference to “procedures” in the “Indicators” to ensure consistency with the amendment made to Activity 4.1.1.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Measurable Indicators: “Reports of reviews of work processes and procedures identifying”</i></p>	<p>Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to retain term “procedures”; however, agreed to add “if necessary” to Activity 4.1.1.</p>
	CCLAC	<p><u>Activity 4.1.4:</u> The Committee agreed to add at the end of the activity the words “in the working languages of the Committee / Commission”.</p> <p><u>Activity 4.1.5:</u> The Committee discussed how this activity could be clarified to facilitate participation of all members in working groups, while realizing that in some cases physical meetings were beneficial to find a consensus among members.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: The Committee agreed to amend</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and agreed to revise Activity 4.1.4 to include “in the working languages of the Committee/Commission”.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that it was important that electronic working groups are the first choice. The Codex Secretariat noted that the current “Guidelines on Electronic Working Groups” in the Procedural Manual noted that “Codex Committees, when deciding to undertake work between sessions,</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p><i>the activity to read as follows: “To ensure that electronic working groups are the first choice when deciding to undertake work between sessions, and if the committee considers it necessary to establish a physical working group, this should be held in conjunction with committee meetings and in the official languages of the Committee.</i></p>	<p>should give the first priority to considering the establishment of electronic working groups.” The subcommittee also noted that a statement was added to the “Introduction” section which noted that the strategic plan should not supersede, extend or contradict the interpretation of the Codex mandate, standards or provisions of the Procedural Manual. Therefore, for the purpose of using simplified language in the strategic plan, the subcommittee agreed to retain the activity as drafted, while referring the committee to the addition of the appropriate statement in the “Introduction” section.</p>
		<p><u>Addition of New Activities:</u> The Committee discussed possibilities to facilitate the participation of all members of Codex in the standard setting process through modern technology. The Committee noted that Codex meetings had different levels of formality: electronic and physical working groups and official meetings of Codex subsidiary bodies (committees and task forces) and the Commission. The Codex Secretariat noted that concerning working groups it should first be noted that their organization was the responsibility of the lead country of the relevant groups. For electronic working groups, the secretariat was currently exploring the possibility to extend and adapt the electronic commenting system for this purpose. For possibilities of virtual meetings of working groups, the secretariat is in touch with the IPPC</p>	<p>The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized that Activity 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 focused on Codex exploring technological platforms that would enable virtual participation in meetings. The Codex Secretariat also informed the subcommittee that members can request a report from the Codex Secretariat on legal implications of application of new technology. However, the subcommittee recognised the need to ensure that use of electronic platform is adequately reported. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed that Activity 4.1.3 promoted use of technology to facilitate participation in committees and working groups and agreed to add a new Measurable Indicator/Outputs for Activity 4.1.3 as follows: Measurable Indicators/Output: 3) Report on meetings and work processes allowing electronic participation.</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		<p>Secretariat that is regularly using commercially available tools facilitating such meetings. The Secretariat also indicated that when exploring the possibility of allowing virtual participation of delegations in official meetings of Codex subsidiary bodies and the Commission, there were not only technical concerns but also legal concerns due to the official character of these meetings. Thus it would be necessary to get the legal advice of the parent organizations on these issues.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the different possibilities and agreed that in a strategic plan it was appropriate to explore any new options that facilitate the work and participation of members and that in a stepwise approach virtual meetings could first be used for informal meetings and meetings of working groups and, if successful, their extension to official meetings could be explored at a later stage.</p> <p><i>Conclusion: Add new activity:</i></p> <p><i>“4.1.6 Encourage the host countries of working groups to utilize an electronic platform that permits virtual participation in the meetings.</i></p> <p><i>4.1.7 Request the Codex Secretariat to develop a technological platform for Codex, which will permit for virtual participation of countries in working group meetings and at the same time explore the legal implications of extending the use of the platform to meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary organs.”</i></p>	
	CCNEA	Activity 4.1.4: It was mentioned it was important that the working documents should be	The subcommittee noted the concern and recognized the need to ensure that working

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
		distributed in all working languages in a timely manner to prepare the feedback in a timely manner. It was also suggested that the timeframe for this activity should be ongoing.	documents are distributed in all working languages of the Committee/Commission. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Activity 4.1.4 as follows: “Enhance timely distribution of all Codex working documents in the working languages of the Committee/Commission”.
	CCAFRICA	<p>The Committee recalled that this Goal was intended to improve working procedures. Some delegations expressed the view that it was not clear how the region could contribute to this objective, what was the purpose of these activities and how activity 4.1.1 in particular would be implemented. The Committee did not make any specific recommendation at this stage and noted that the complexity of the subject would require further consideration by countries in the region.</p> <p>Activity 4.1.4: One delegation expressed the view that 4.1.4 on the distribution of documents was not necessary as a specific activity since this aspect required a few adjustments but was generally satisfactory. The Committee however agreed to retain it as it had been regularly put forward in earlier discussions.</p>	Given that the comment does not impact the current text of the draft strategic plan, No action was required.
<p>Objective 4.2: Enhance capacity to arrive at consensus in standards setting process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.1 Improve the knowledge and skills of Codex delegates of Codex guidelines respecting consensus building. 	CCNASWP	Objective 4.2: the Coordinating Committee recommended to reword the activities to clarify that their purpose was mainly to disseminate and revise the guidance on consensus that is included in the Procedural Manual, before considering additional guidance to be developed.	The subcommittee noted the comment and recognized that the intent of the Objective 4.2 was not accurately captured in the Activities. The subcommittee noted that Activity 4.2.1 focuses on improving Codex members’ and delegates’ understanding of importance of consensus building in Codex work and the tools available to them to facilitate consensus

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
4.2.2 Improve the skills of Committee and Working Group Chairs.			<p>building. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise the Activity 4.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>Activity 4.2.1: Improve the understanding of Codex members and delegates of the importance of and approach to consensus building of Codex work.</p> <p>Responsible Party: All Committees</p> <p>Expected Outcome: Member countries and delegates awareness of the importance of consensus in the Codex standard setting process improved.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outcomes: 1) Training material on guidance to achieve consensus developed and made available in the languages of the Commission to delegates. 2) Regular dissemination of existing material to members through Codex Contact Points. 3) Delegate training programs held in association with Codex meetings. 4) Impediments to consensus being achieved in Codex identified and analyzed and additional guidance developed to address such impediments, if necessary.</p> <p>The subcommittee noted that the intent of Activity 4.2.2 was to enhance Codex's ability to achieve consensus at working groups and committees, especially through improving the tools and skill sets of the Chair and Working Groups. Therefore, the subcommittee agreed to revise Activity 4.2.2 as follows:</p> <p>Activity 4.2.2: Through networking, training, and workshops, seek to improve the skill set of chairs of working groups and committees to</p>

Draft Codex Strategic Plan: 2014-2019 circulated to regional coordinating committees for comments	Regional Committee	Comments as received from the Regional Coordinating Committees	Disposition/Suggested Text/Rationale
			<p>achieve consensus.</p> <p>Responsible Party: Chair of the Commission</p> <p>Expected Outcome: Consensus achieved at working group and committees.</p> <p>Measurable Indicators/Outcomes: 1) Training available to all Chairs and work group (physical and electronic) chairs on how to lead and facilitate committee meetings. 2) Best practices to achieve consensus at committees and working groups shared amongst chairs.</p>