



Agenda Item 3a)

CX/EURO 10/27/4-Add.3

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
FAO/WHO COORDINATING COMMITTEE EUROPE**

Twenty seventh Session

Warsaw, Poland, 5 - 8 October 2010

**FAO/WHO ACTIVITIES COMPLEMENTARY TO THE WORK OF THE CODEX
ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

CODEX TRUST FUND (Comments in reply to CL 2010/44-EURO)

Question 1: Should there be a shift in emphasis from Objective 1 to Objectives 2 and 3?

ARMENIA

Yes.

EUROPEAN UNION

The EUMS fully support that more attention has to be paid to objective 2 aiming at strengthening overall participation and expected output of developing country delegations in Codex meetings. At the same time, effort still needs to take place to ensure that developing countries are present at the meetings. Therefore priority should be given to both objectives 1 and 2. Objective 3 aiming at enhancing scientific and technical participation is also important but should be treated as a second priority, the most important at this stage being to have developing countries present at the meetings and contributing effectively to the development of standards. It has also to be recognised that before being active in Codex work, a learning process has to be followed, and it cannot be expected that delegates present for the first time can be fully operational. The EUMS wish to reiterate that a twinning or mentoring programme consisting in establishing close relations between a mentor (e.g. a developed country) and a developing country could contribute to the achievement of these objectives, but this programme would have to be managed by the Codex Secretariat and established with a set of rules to ensure its impartiality and efficiency.

Furthermore, the focus on Objectives 2 and 3 should not imply that countries that are still in need of CTF-support to physically participate in Codex meetings (Objective 1), which often correlates with the countries' most in need of support, are left behind as "orphans".

The EUMS are of the opinion that before determining the share of CTF-funds being allocated to which objective, the needs and demands need to be identified. Setting up separate windows before having mapped the actual need, demand and cost of various activities related to each objective, could lead to rigidities in the system that may be counterproductive if we aim for effective delivery of results.

The EUMS agree with the recommendation of the mid-term review on the need to assess real country needs further and to apply a more stringent application procedure. This becomes more relevant the higher we are moving in the objective hierarchy, since more advanced and economically developed countries are targeted in these objectives.

Regarding the eligibility criteria in terms of country category, the EUMS would like to stress that the CTF should primarily focus on Group 1A (Least Developed Countries (LDC)) and 1B (Other Low Income Countries (LIC)).

SWEDEN

As Sweden highlighted during the donor meeting for the CTF (side event to the 33rd Session of the CAC in July 2010), Sweden supports the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) on placing more emphasis on Objectives 2 and 3. If the CTF is to achieve all three objectives, there is a need to step up the efforts on Objective 2 and 3 and identify suitable activities that will result in achieving these objectives.

Having said that, some key considerations need to be taken, inter alia:

- The focus on Objective 2 and 3 must not imply that countries that are still in need of CTF-support to physically participate in Codex meetings (Objective 1), which often correlates with the countries' most in need of support, are left behind as "orphans".
- Before determining the share of CTF-funds being allocated to which objective, the needs and demands need to be identified. Setting up separate windows before having mapped the actual need, demand and cost of various activities related to each objective, will cause rigidities in the system that may be counterproductive if we aim for effective delivery of results.
- Sweden agrees with the recommendation of the MTR on the need to assess real country needs further and to apply a more stringent application procedure. This becomes more relevant the higher we are moving in the objective hierarchy, since more advanced and economically developed countries are targeted in these objectives. An element of matched funding could be considered, e.g. through creative measurements such as self-financed participation in Codex meetings, in-country focus and dedication to Codex-related national institutions etc. (rather than matched funding to the specific activity).
- On eligibility criteria in terms of country category, Sweden reiterates that the CTF should primarily focus on Group 1A (Least Developed Countries (LDC)) and 1B (Other Low Income Countries (LIC)). Eligible countries should also be on the DAC List of Recipient Countries.

Question 2: If yes, what is the "niche" for the Codex Trust Fund?

ARMENIA

The following mechanisms for delivering capacity-building activities could be proposed:

- Establishing regional network of CCPs, which will assist in strengthening CCPs and National Codex Committees (NCC) through getting focal points together, discussing problems and identifying solutions;
- Regional trainings for CCPs;
- Workshops for main stakeholders;
- Providing expertise for NCC members.

EUROPEAN UNION

Taking into account that the CTF budget is limited, the EUMS are not convinced that specific capacity building activities should take place under this budget but believe that a closer cooperation could be established with the already existing activities, e.g. capacity building activities managed by FAO, programme "Better Training for Safer Foods" managed by the European Commission. Of course, the presence of supported delegates at Codex meetings should be fully exploited and some training activities could take place back-to-back of these meetings or even in the margins of these meetings.

The EUMS would recommend using already existing coordinating mechanisms for Codex-related capacity development, e.g. the Standards and Trade Development Facility and the WTO SPS-Committee in order to facilitate the mapping of possible interventions.

The EUMS believe that targeting the coordinating bodies within the FAO and WHO for the two bodies' own work and activities (global regional and national) with food safety systems would be a natural step:

- In the FAO Strategic Framework the coordinating mechanism for FAO's Strategic Objective D - "*Improved quality and safety of food at all stages of the food chain*".
- In the WHO Medium-term strategic plan (2008-2013) - The coordinating mechanism for WHO's Strategic Objective 9 - "*To improve nutrition, food safety and food security throughout the life course, and in support of public health and sustainable development*".

The EUMS are of the opinion that the type of capacity building activities (e.g. negotiation skills, developing national positions etc.), should not be pre-determined, but fully demand driven by beneficiary countries, given the link to Codex participation is clear and strong. Once the demand is identified a selection and clustering of activity types can be developed.

SWEDEN

Given limited administrative capacity and the size of the trust fund, Sweden would encourage the CTF to "piggy back" on related events and activities in terms of providing capacity building activities to promote Codex participation under Objective 2 and 3. Using existing coordinating mechanisms for Codex-related capacity development, e.g. the STDF and the WTO SPS-committee will facilitate mapping of interventions to team up with and "piggy back" on.

Also, targeting the coordinating bodies within the FAO and WHO for the two bodies' own work and activities (global regional and national) with food safety systems would be a natural step:

In the FAO Strategic Framework: The coordinating mechanism for FAO's Strategic Objective D- "Improved quality and safety of food at all stages of the food chain".

In the WHO Medium-term strategic plan (2008-2013): The coordinating mechanism for WHO's Strategic Objective 9 – "To improve nutrition, food safety and food security throughout the life course, and in support of public health and sustainable development".

On the type of capacity building activities (e.g. negotiation skills, developing national positions etc.), this should not be pre-determined, but fully demand driven by beneficiary countries, given the link to Codex participation is clear and strong. Once the demand is identified a selection and clustering of activity types can be developed. Sweden endorses the MTR on the need for the CTF financed activities to stay focused on enhanced participation in Codex.

Question 3: Should there be a mechanism to continue support for physical participation for those who need it most (including graduates who cannot sustain participation)?

ARMENIA

Yes.

EUROPEAN UNION

The EUMS fully support the establishment of a mechanism aiming at continuing to support some countries once they "graduate" and are not anymore receiving support for their participation. If a country cannot afford to participate anymore after having been supported during several years, the investment made will be very quickly lost and everything will have to be started again in the future. Some clear and transparent rules have to be defined to assess the real situation of these countries to ensure that support is given to those which need it most.

SWEDEN

Sweden is of the opinion that the terms on which different countries would be able to access funding from the CTF has been clear from the beginning. Countries belonging to higher income country categories have been aware of the graduating mechanism from the start.

Sweden believes we should continue with the current structure as the default mode of operation for the CTF facility, while proper monitoring and follow-up on the participation of countries that graduate in 2010 and 2011 is carried out, in line with the MTR recommendations. Also, as proposed in the MTR, the CTF should be prepared to respond if participation declines sharply, but the type of measures to be taken should not be decided upon before the problem arises, in order to send coherent signals and incentives to graduated countries. A matched-funding-type arrangement could an instrument to tackle decline in participation, should this issue arise.

Focus should be on the LDCs and LICs.

Question 4: Should there be re-consideration of the criteria for allocation of support ?

ARMENIA

Yes. For example, Armenia is getting support for participation since 2006. During these five years we have participated only at 8 meetings (CAC (5 times), CCEURO (twice) and CCFICS (once), because we

experience big problem in identifying potential participants due to language barrier. So, if there is no solution found, we are going to “graduate” without using CTF resources in their full capacity.

EUROPEAN UNION

The EUMS are of the opinion that the original UN based criteria for CTF eligibility are still valid and certainly constitute the most objective basis to grant support to potential candidates. Eligibility is reviewed annually and is based on the three official classifications produced within the United Nations system: the list of Least Developed Countries established by the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the World Bank classification of economies and the UNDP Human Development Index. However as discussed in the previous question, some fine-tuning is needed to ensure that already supported countries do not stop to participate when not anymore supported. These UN based criteria are particularly valid for the objective 1. In the context of objective 2, the EUMS believe that a specific training and capacity building programme could be defined so that delegates would receive appropriate support as soon as they start to join Codex meetings in close cooperation with already existing providers and also possibly with the help of a mentoring programme.

The Codex Secretariat could establish a mentoring mechanism which aims to bring together individuals who are fulfilling the function of the Codex Contact Points in different Members Countries. The objective of this voluntary procedure would be to assist Members who are not fully involved in the Codex works (e.g. how to write national position). A differentiated model could be considered for higher income country categories, e.g. self-financed physical participation in Codex meetings could be “rewarded” with fully financed capacity building and training under objectives 2 and 3.

SWEDEN

LDCs and LICs should be fully financed beneficiaries for toward reaching Objective 2 and 3. A differentiated model could be considered for higher income country categories, e.g. self-financed physical participation in Codex meetings could be “rewarded” with fully financed capacity building and training under objective 2 and 3. Also, graduate countries assuming a mentorship role to support LDCs and LICs can also be “rewarded”. For higher income country categories, an incentive-based approach should be sought, with criteria incorporating matched performance and efforts.

Question 5: Should the lifespan of the Codex Trust Fund be extended?

ARMENIA

Yes.

EUROPEAN UNION

The EUMS, noting that the participation of developing countries in the work of Codex has been identified as a key challenge for the future, are of the opinion that consideration should be given to the extension of the lifespan of the Codex Trust Fund. The CTF original duration was fixed at 12 years and more than half of this period has already elapsed. It is very unlikely that the few years left will allow addressing all the problems still existing. The mid-term review has already demonstrated how beneficial the CTF has been in the recent years and how it has allowed to increase the participation of developing countries. Several success stories about the role played today by countries which were not even present a few years ago demonstrate the usefulness of this instrument. The need and demand for support to enhanced participation in Codex is likely to remain beyond 2014. CTF stakeholders should return to this issue at a later stage, well in advance of the current programme’s expiry date, in order to ensure predictability and take the appropriate decisions.

The Europe region comprises 49 members out of which 19 are eligible to the CTF (including 3 EU Member States). These countries should be encouraged to benefit more from this opportunity and contribute to Codex work with a view to develop their structure and economy and also contribute to promote the interests of the Europe region.

SWEDEN

We are only just past half-way into the 12-year programme and a decision on extending the life-span is premature at this point. Having said that, Sweden recognizes that need and demand for support to enhanced participation in Codex is likely to remain beyond 2014. CTF stakeholders should return to this issue at a later stage, however, well in advance of the current programme’s expiry date, in order to ensure predictability and a (possibly) responsible phase-out.