



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



World Health  
Organization

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

Agenda Item 5

CX/FL 19/45/5Add.1

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

Forty-fifth Session

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

13 - 17 May 2019

### PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR THE LABELLING OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

#### Replies to CL 2019/13-FL

*Comments of Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, , Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras India, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uruguay, USA, CEFS, FoodDrink Europe, ICBA, IDF/FIL, IFU, IUFOST, World processing Tomato Council*

#### Background

1. This document compiles comments received through the Codex Online Commenting System (OCS) in response to CL 2019/13-FL issued in January 2019. Under the OCS, comments are compiled in the following order: general comments are listed first, followed by comments on specific sections.

#### Explanatory notes on the appendix

2. The comments submitted through the OCS are hereby attached as **Annex I** and are presented in table format.

## ANNEX

GENERAL COMMENTS	MEMBER/OBSERVER
<p><b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>We propose to make consequential changes in the <b>Procedural Manual</b>, following the adoption of this proposed draft guidance as an approved Codex text by the Commission</p> <p>.b) Discuss whether this guidance should be designated as a ‘Standard’ or a ‘Guideline’</p> <p>Comment: We propose that this guidance be designated as a ‘Standard’</p> <p>c) Decide, once the guidance in this draft document is finalized, how best to address the relationship between it and the existing provisions/guidance on labelling of non-retail containers in the following:</p> <p>a. Commodity standards with provisions for labelling of bulk/non-retail containers Annex 3);</p> <p>Comment: Once the proposed draft guidance is in place, it should replace all current provisions for labelling of non-retail containers of foods in the commodity standards. This document should be the single reference point for labelling of non-retail containers.</p> <p>b. General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981); and,</p> <p>Comment: We support the exclusion of food additives from this proposed guidance and keeping “General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981)”, as the reference for the labelling of food additives when sold other than by retail.</p> <p>c. Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual.</p>	<p><b>India</b></p>
<p>ii) The text from the GSLPF, wherever included in Appendix 1, will ultimately be replaced with a reference to the GSLPF, if it remains unaltered in this document at the end of the discussions. During the elaboration stages, therefore, the focus is on assessing whether the GSLPF text applies as such in respect of a non-retail container or needs to be amended to meet labelling requirements of a non-retail container.</p> <p>New Zealand supports the decision of the CCFL44 that this document should be developed as a standalone document, using cross references to relevant Codex texts to ensure consistency with those texts where appropriate. Cross referencing will ensure that requirements remain aligned should they be updated in the GSLPF in the future.</p> <p>b) Discuss whether this guidance should be designated as a ‘standard’ or ‘Guideline’.</p> <p>New Zealand supports this document being a Codex Standard not a Codex Guideline for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format of the document and the level of detail provided is similar to that of other Codex Standards, in particular the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (STAN 1-1985).</li> <li>• The intended level of uniformity in the implementation of the requirements set out in the document is comparable to that of other Codex Standards. There is very little discretion in the document for national authorities.</li> </ul> <p>c) Decide, once the guidance in this draft document is finalised, how best to address the relationship between it and the existing provisions/guidance on labelling of non-retail containers in the following:</p> <p>a. Commodity standards</p> <p>Commodity Standards that contain information on the labelling of non-retail containers currently have generally picked up the wording from the Procedural Manual. Once this new guidance is finalised the Procedural Manual would need to be updated as per comments under c. below. Consequentially any commodity Standards with requirements for the labelling of non-retail containers would need to be</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>

updated.

b. General Standard for the labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981)

Section 5 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981) requires all or the information required by section 5 of the draft guidance on the labelling of non-retail containers plus some additional requirements specific to the labelling of food additives. Section 6 of this standard, regarding the presentation of information on food additives, covers the requirements set out in the draft guidance on the labelling of non-retail containers. Section 7 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981) enables any 'additional or different provisions in a Codex standard, in respect of labelling, where the circumstances of a particular food additive would justify their incorporation in that standard'.

Therefore New Zealand does not see any need to update the General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such (CXS 107-1981) as a result of the creation of guidance on the labelling of non-retail containers.

c. procedural manual

The Procedural Manual covers how Codex operates as an organisation, it is not a standard. The material contained in the Procedural Manual on labelling non-retail containers is an instruction to commodity committees on what should appear in the standards they are developing. The material is essentially based on what CCFL, as the expert committee on labelling, recommends.

Once the guidance for the labelling for non-retail containers is finalised the CCFL should make a recommendation to amend the Procedural Manual to incorporate reference to the new standard/guideline to CCGP, which is responsible for the Procedural Manual.

In addition to this amendment to the procedural manual there may be consequential amendments required to other Codex documents. For example the General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985) applies to the labelling of all prepackaged foods for special dietary uses as defined in Section 2.1 to be offered as such to the consumer or for catering purposes and to certain aspects relating to the presentation thereof; and to claims made for such foods. New Zealand recommends CCFL identify and amend other Codex texts that may require consequential amendments.

Additional recommendation: Review of the definition of pre-packaged in the GSLPF (removal of catering foods)

In addition to above comments supporting the referencing of the GSLPF in draft guidance where appropriate, New Zealand also suggests that the Committee discusses the definition of "prepackaged" in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985) and whether this should be redrafted as shown below to remove the reference to foods catering purposes. Currently the definition states:

"Prepackaged" means packaged or made up in advance in a container, ready for offer to the consumer, or for catering purposes.

New Zealand considers that the definitions of "prepackaged" and "non-retail containers" should be mutually exclusive and differentiated by whether they are intended to be sold to consumers or not.

The rationale for suggesting that sales to caterers could be removed from the definition of "prepackaged" is to clarify where these food sales should sit and what labelling requirements should apply to them

Currently, with limited guidance for labelling of non-retail containers and specific reference to foods for catering in the definition of prepackaged foods, most food sold to caterers is taken to be included in the GSLPF and labelled accordingly. However, the proposed new guidelines for labelling of non-retail containers would also capture food sold to caterers as they would meet the definition of a "non-retail container" (as the sale is not to a consumer). This then means food sold to caterers would meet both the definition of "prepackaged foods" in the GSLPF and the definition of "non-retail container" in the new guidelines for labelling of non-retail containers. We suggest that this could cause confusion.

New Zealand therefore proposes that the labelling requirements for food sold to caterers (to then be used to make food for consumers)

<p>may not need to be the full labelling that a food for retail sale to a consumer may need and suggest that the “or foods for catering purposes” could be removed from the definition of “prepackaged”.</p> <p>This would mean:  GSLPF would apply to retail sales to consumers only (remove sales to caterers) = FULL LABELLING  Labelling for non-retail containers would apply to all containers whose sales are not to consumers (including to caterers) = minimum mandatory requirements on pack, other mandatory information plus any voluntary information by other means (documents or electronic etc).</p>	
<p>Guyana has reviewed this draft standard and found no reason that is sufficient to inhibit its adoption. Hence, we accept the Guidelines for the labeling of Non-Retail Containers of foods (CL 2019/13/OCS-FL</p>	<b>Guyana</b>
<p>DrinkEurope would like to thank the Chairs of the eWG (India, Costa Rica and the United States of America) for preparing this document. The proposed draft guidance has advanced significantly and we welcome the progress that has been made.</p> <p>In response to the questions/recommendations posed in CX/FL 19/45/5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the proposed content, a guideline seems to be the more appropriate approach;</li> <li>• This proposed document should be the reference point for labelling of non-retail containers. Therefore commodity standards should only have a reference to this document and should not contain specific provisions for labelling of non-retail containers;</li> <li>• Food additives are currently excluded from the scope; therefore, document CXS-107-1981 remains as a stand-alone document for the labelling of food additives when sold as such.</li> </ul>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>
<p>Australia welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed draft guidance for the labelling of non-retail containers of foods (CX/FL 19/45/5).</p>	<b>Australia</b>
<p>The U.S. would like to thank India for their work as the Chair of the electronic working (eWG) and Costa Rica as the fellow Co-chair, and appreciates the opportunity to comment on the text of produced by the eWG. We believe a lot of progress has been made and look forward to moving this text forward through the physical working group and plenary session.</p> <p>We believe it would be prudent to initiate a consultation with the Codex Secretariat and the CCFL chair to the intersection of this work and the existing provisions of the commodity standards, General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives When Sold as Such, and the Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual. We believe how these questions are answered may impact some of the language we use in the text.</p>	<b>USA</b>
<p>In principle, Thailand is of the opinion that the provisions for labelling of non-retail containers should be flexible, not causing burden to businesses. Therefore, this document should be a guidance for country to adapt as appropriate. In addition, the verb to express its nature of this document should be all changed from must/shall to should throughout.</p>	<b>Thailand</b>
<p>Brazil appreciates the excellent work done by India, Costa Rica and the United States of America and thanks for the opportunity to present the following comments on the Proposed Draft Guidance for The Labelling of Non-Retail Containers.</p>	<b>Brazil</b>
<p>We are agree with PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR THE LABELLING OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS OF FOODS, its a good proposed.</p>	<b>Iraq</b>
<p>Generally speaking, we think that the overall aim of such a guidance should be:  - facilitate trade</p>	<b>CEFS</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clear definitions</li> <li>- maximising harmonisation (avoiding national diverging implementation and interpretation)</li> <li>- minimising formalism</li> <li>- English as the preferred language</li> </ul> <p>Basically, while the document has made good progresses, there are still a number of issues needing to be solved</p>	
<p>It would appear that food processors or repackagers would need to know the ingredients of foods in non-retail containers. There is no explicit attention to this point in the draft guidance document.</p>	<b>IUFOST</b>
<p>3. DEFINITION OF TERMS: For the purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard], the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning defined below</p> <p>“Food Business” means an entity or undertaking, carrying out one or more activity(ies) related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), processing, packaging, storage and distribution (including trade) of food.</p> <p>[“Non-retail container” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer. The food<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer in loose/non-packaged form.]</p> <p>Or,</p> <p>[“Non-retail container” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer. The food<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer in prepackaged form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</p> <p>4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES: The following general principles apply in respect of non-retail containers</p> <p>6. SHARING INFORMATION BY MEANS OTHER THAN LABEL</p>	<b>Ecuador</b>
<p>Changes that have been made to the document at Step 3 are welcomed, including those made to address shipping containers; the general principle related to intent for sale at non-retail; the identification of a container as non-retail by means other than a label and the inclusion of the annex identifying the labelling requirements applying to different types of containers.</p> <p>We have the following general comments to make plus edits to the document as detailed below.</p> <p>1. Status as a standard or guideline. We support this document being a guideline due to the flexibility required to accommodate labelling differences at national level. The appropriate labelling of non-retail containers is a well-established practice internationally, meeting the needs of manufacturers, exporters, importers and competent authorities. Therefore, there is no significant risk to be addressed which would justify establishing this as a standard, resulting in high re-labelling costs for food businesses already providing adequate information.</p> <p>2. Definition of non-retail container. We support the second definition, with edits. Option 1 would not apply if the food was subsequently provided to the consumer in a non-packaged form e.g. bulk bins in retail businesses, delicatessen counters.</p> <p>Option 2 as it stands would mean only food to be prepared into a packaged format would be covered i.e. not catering or food in bulk</p>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>

bins sold in supermarkets etc.

Suggest the following modification:

Non-retail container” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities (including further food processing or use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food) before being used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer..]

3. We support the application of this guideline to food which will be used for catering purposes (where they are not captured by the Codex General Standard on Labelling of pre-packaged foods). It is important therefore that the definition does not restrict the scope to foods which are finally sold in packaged form and therefore the edits above are necessary. The Codex General Standard on Labelling of pre-packaged foods covers foods traded between food businesses which are not further processed. Business to business trade in foods which are intended for further processing would therefore be excluded from the CGSLP and should be captured by this guideline

4. Intent of product. We welcome the addition of the provision (section 4.5) that the non-retail status of a container is based on the intent of the manufacturer etc. However we note that in cases where the manufacturer may foresee that the food may be purchased by a consumer, even if that was not their intent, then the manufacturer may decide to label in accordance with the Codex General Standard for Labelling of pre-packaged Food. We suggest recognition of this practice is given in the General Section (section 8).

5. Identification mark. We support removing the square brackets from section 5.7 i.e. an identification mark should be acceptable to replace the specified elements of mandatory information. This method is the common practice for providing information on bulk bins, drums, bulk bags etc where specific identifying information is applied via printing on to the container

Furthermore, alternatives to a mark on the container should be acceptable where they provide a link to the accompanying documentation e.g. door seals on a shipping container.

6. Shipping containers – we believe the terminology used is misleading. Shipping containers are one type of large bulk container. Section 7 should be renamed Bulk Transport Containers, and the examples given should be shipping containers, tankers, barges, drums. Clearly the intent of this section is that it applies where the container itself is not transferred to the food business purchaser or not intended to be included in the final sale to the consumer.

7. Identification of non-retail containers. We welcome the alternatives to the use of the recommended wording to identify a container. However, we suggest an edit to indicate that a designation as a non-retail container is not necessary where the container is identifiable due to its physical appearance (e.g. its size, construction or other characteristics, as in the case of bulk bags, large volume vats of liquid etc), branding (e.g. a catering or ingredients brand name) or the goods being easily distinguished from those sold to consumers due to size and presentation (e.g. large blocks of butter, cheese etc). Currently the exemption is only for large shipping containers or for containers deemed by a competent authority to be a non-retail container. Requiring all other non-exempt non-retail food containers to be labelled is unnecessary and would incur extremely high re-labelling costs which would be disproportionate to any perceived benefits arising from this requirement.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SECTIONS	MEMBER AND OR OBSERVER
<b>SECTION 1: PURPOSE</b>	<b>JUSTIFICATION AND RATIONALE</b>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>this Standard</u> is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand would support this document being a Codex Standard for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-At WTO both Codex standards and guidelines have the same legal standing</li> <li>-In general Standards and guidelines are constructed differently with a standard having a greater level of detail, broader reaching provisions and is intended to be implemented with a high degree of uniformity across countries. Guidelines often leave more discretion to national authorities and have a less formalised structure to the document.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above this document is drafted more like a standard and as the aim is for a high degree of uniformity across countries (especially with regard to the minimum requirements to be physically on the label). Much of the drafting for non-retail containers is similar to that of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985)</p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> is to facilitate <u>international trade of non-retail containers of food and to promote fair trading practices, using appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail such containers of food and to which are not destined to the final consumer.</u> These Guidelines outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p> <p>FoodDrinkEurope considers that the purpose has been considerably improved compared to the previous version as it captures the overall idea behind the labelling of non-retail containers.</p> <p>However, we believe that some points are still missing, most notably an explicit reference to the fact that it is not destined to the final consumer.</p> <p>In addition, as the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual stipulates (26th edition, page 21) “ensuring fair practices in the food trade” is one of the purposes of Codex texts. This is particularly true for guidance on non-retail containers, whose aim should be to facilitate international trade between business operators (B2B). Using an appropriate harmonized labelling for non-retail containers is a way to achieve it.</p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</u></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>Brazil supports adopting the document as a standard aiming to maintain the same approach adopted for the other similar and related food labelling Codex texts, including General Standard for the</p>

	Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985).
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> these Guidelines is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p> <p>Status as a standard or guideline.</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p> <p>We support this document being a guideline due to the flexibility required to accommodate labelling differences at national level. The appropriate labelling of non-retail containers is a well-established practice internationally, meeting the needs of manufacturers, exporters, importers and competent authorities. Therefore, there is no significant risk to be addressed which would justify establishing this as a standard, resulting in high re-labelling costs for food businesses already providing adequate information.</p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p>	<p><b>World Processing Tomato Council</b></p> <p>The WPTC recommends that this should remain Guidelines and not a Codex Standard. Our motivation is given by the fact that the national legislations are very different and complex worldwide. Better approach from guidelines that can be a reference especially for developing countries that export so many raw materials and foods in non-retail formats.</p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> these Guidelines is to facilitate <u>international trade of non-retail containers of food and to promote fair trade practices, using appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail such containers of food and to which are not destined to the final consumer.</u> These Guidelines –outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p>	<p><b>CEFS</b></p> <p>CEFS considers that the purpose has been considerably improved as compared to the last version. It captures the overall idea behind the labelling of non-retail containers. However, some information are still missing.</p> <p>Indeed, referring to the fact that it is not destined to the final consumer is particularly important.</p> <p>In addition, As the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual stipulates (26th edition, page 21,) that “ensuring fair practices in the food trade” is one of the purpose of the Codex texts. This is particularly true for a guidance on non-retail containers whose aim should be to facilitate international trade between business operators (B to B). Using an appropriate harmonized labelling for non-retail containers is a way to achieve it.</p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>of</del> <b>this guideline</b> [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means.</p>	<p><b>Kenya</b></p>
<p><b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> these Guidelines is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required</p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b></p> <p>Dominican Republic considers that this draft should be referred to</p>



on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means. <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard] these Guidelines</del>	only as a guideline or guidance.
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / <del>[this Standard]</del> is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means. <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del>	<b>Colombia</b> Delete the text in brackets "this standard", since the proposed document is intended to provide orientations more consistent with the guidelines
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / <del>[this Standard]</del> is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means	<b>Guatemala</b> Requests clarification on the consideration of what amount of product is considered to be wholesale. We accept guideline instead of standard.
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means	<b>Chile</b> Chile supports this work to be a guideline.
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to <del>facilitate appropriate</del> provide guidance for the development/establishing of requirements for the harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means <u>food</u>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposes drafting adjustments, for the purpose to become clear and concise. The second statement was eliminated to avoid duplication with what was indicated in the scope.
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of <u>non</u> -retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of <u>non</u> -retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Uruguay</b> We believe that it should be a standard, and corrected the lack of the 'no'. This error in translation totally changes the scope of the standard. <i>.[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / <del>[this Standard]</del> is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of retail containers of food and to outline what information shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means. <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del>	<b>Honduras</b> The purpose regarding to which products does the document apply is not clear, we would need for it to be expanded.
<b>PURPOSE:</b> The purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] is to facilitate appropriate harmonized labelling of non-retail containers of food and to outline what information	<b>Ecuador</b>

shall be presented on the label and what information, while not required on the label, must be provided with a non-retail container by other means. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	
<b>SECTION 1 - SCOPE</b>	
<del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies]</del> This Standard applies to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1,2</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>New Zealand</b> Consequential change to the decision to be a Standard
<del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies]</del> These Guidelines apply to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>
<del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying <del>physical/electronic documents or by other means</del> <u>documents</u> , and the presentation thereof.	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil proposes the following exclusions to simplify the scope. In our opinion, "accompanying documents" covers all the situation to transmit the information and "other means" seems broad and imprecise.
<del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies]</del> These Guidelines applies to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies] <b>This guideline</b> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>Kenya</b>
<b>SCOPE:</b> <del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard][apply] / [applies]</del> These Guidelines will apply to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1,2</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>Dominican Republic</b>
<b>SCOPE:</b> [These Guidelines] / [This Standard] [apply] / [applies] to the labelling of non-retail containers of food <sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids) <sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer <sup>1</sup> , including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.	<b>Guatemala</b> We consider that the document should be a guideline and not a Standard. We accept using the term guidelines nstead of standard.

<p><b>SCOPE:</b> <del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del><del>[apply] / [applies]</del> These Guidelines apply to the labelling of non-retail containers of food<sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids)<sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer<sup>1</sup>, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.</p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile supports this work to be a Guideline.</p>
<p><b>SCOPE:</b> <del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del><del>[apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food<sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids)<sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer<sup>1</sup><del>Error! Bookmark not defined.</del>, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica considers that the document should be a Guideline. This is because, according to the approach of the purpose and of the scope, what is intended to provide is guidance for this kind of products with clear and harmonized concepts so that foods may be marketed. In this regard, the Guidelines issued by Codex are intended to provide information and advice based on empirical data, as well as best practices or guidelines for the interpretation of the provisions of the general standards of Codex General.</p>
<p><b>SCOPE:</b> <del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del><del>[apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food<sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids)<sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer<sup>1</sup>, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> It is necessary to expand and clarify to which products does this document apply</p>
<p><del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del><del>[apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food<sup>1</sup><del>Error! Bookmark not defined.</del> (excluding food additives and processing aids) not intended to be sold directly to the consumer<sup>1</sup><del>Error! Bookmark not defined.</del>, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation</p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b> We understand that it should be a standard as the one for labeling.</p>
<p><del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del><del>[apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food<sup>1</sup> (excluding food additives and processing aids)<sup>1,2</sup> not intended to be sold directly to the consumer<sup>1</sup>, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> We consider that the document should be a Guideline and not a Standard</p>
<p><b>SCOPE:</b> <del>[These Guidelines] / [This Standard]</del> <del>[apply] / [applies]</del> to the labelling of non-retail containers of food (excluding food additives and processing aids) not intended to be sold directly to the consumer, including the information provided in the accompanying physical/electronic documents or by other means, and the presentation thereof.</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p>
<p><b>SECTION 3 - DEFINITION OF TERMS</b></p>	
<p><b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del><del>this Standard</del>, the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning as defined below:</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>
<p><b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del><del>these Guidelines</del>, the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p>

meaning as defined below:	
<b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of <del>[these Guidelines]</del> / [this Standard], the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning as defined below:	<b>Brazil</b>
<b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of <del>[these Guidelines]</del> / <del>[this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> , the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning as defined below:	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard], the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning as defined below:	<b>Guatemala</b> We accept the definition of food business; as well as the second definition of non-retail container.
<b>DEFINITION OF TERMS:</b> For the purpose of <del>[these Guidelines]</del> / <del>[this Standard]</del> , <u>these Guidelines</u> the relevant definitions in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985) apply. In addition, the following terms have the meaning as defined below	<b>Chile</b> Chile supports this work to be a Guideline.
<b>DEFINITION OF FOOD BUSINESS</b>	
<b>“Food Business”</b> means an entity or undertaking, carrying out one or more <del>activity(ies)</del> <u>activities</u> related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), processing, packaging, storage <del>and or</del> <u>distribution</u> (including trade) of food <sup>1</sup> .	<b>Australia</b>
<b>“Food Business”</b> means an entity or undertaking, carrying out one or more activity(ies) related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), processing, packaging, storage and <del>distribution (including trade)</del> <u>distribution</u> of food <sup>1</sup> .	<b>USA</b> Unclear what “(including trade)” refers to. We propose striking.
<b>“Food Business”</b> means an entity or company, carrying out one or more activity(ies) related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), <del>processing, manufacturing, processing, preparation,</del> <u>packaging, storage and distribution (including trade) marketing</u> of food	<b>Colombia</b> More links of the food production chain are included
<b>“Food Business”</b> means an entity or undertaking, carrying out one or more activity(ies) related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), processing, packaging, storage and distribution (including trade) of food.	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to incorporate, in the form of definitions, the examples of non-retail containers that are in the annex.
<b>“Food Business”</b> <del>means an entity</del> An <u>entity</u> or company, carrying out one or more activity(ies) related to any stage(s) of production (excluding production at farm level), processing, packaging, storage and distribution (including trade) of food	<b>Nicaragua</b>
<b>DEFINITION OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINER: OPTION 1</b>	
<del>[“Non-retail container” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food</del>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand does not support this option for the definition of non-

business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	retail container
[ <del>“Non-retail container”</del> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>
[ <del>“Non-retail</del> <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> used in food business activities that encloses food and is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>USA</b> We believe the first proposed definition (with minor modification) is clearer and more concise because the definition of “food business” clarifies the activities that are undertaken with food in a non-retail container.
[ <del>“Non-retail container”</del> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil considers that the second sentence of the proposed definition for non-retail container is clear and appropriate. In our point of view the most important characteristic of a ‘non-retail container’ is that it is not intended to be offered for direct sale to consumer and the proposed definition clearly states it.
[ <del>“Non-retail container”</del> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA supports the first version of the definition due to its greater simplicity.
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> .The food <sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]	<b>CEFS</b> The definition of “Non-retail containers” still needs to be clarified. Both options are quite unclear. Even the examples in the Annex are quite complicated to understand. It should be the task of the eWG to develop a very precise and clear definition that is understandable without the need to refer to examples. To our understanding, a definition of “Non-retail containers” needs to have two boundaries: 1/ Containers that contain food and that are not covered by the GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PREPACKAGED FOODS 2/ Containers that contain food and that are not covered by the GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PREPACKAGED

	FOODS are not automatically “Non-retail containers”.
<p>["<b>Non-retail container</b>” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>.The food<sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]</p>	<p><b>Sri Lanka</b> This is a better definition</p>
<p>["<b>Non-retail container</b>” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer. The food in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer in loose/non-packaged form.]</p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> Supports the second definition on the grounds that it gives greater clarity regarding the concept of "non-retail container".</p>
<p><del>["<b>Non-retail container</b>” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer.The food in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer in loose/non-packaged form.]</del></p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b> We consider the second definition proposed to be better the first.</p>
<p>["Non-retail container” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>.The food<sup>1</sup> in non-retail containers is intended for further food business activities, except for direct sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in loose/non-packaged form.]</p>	<p><b>IFU</b> IFU prefers the first definition as being most appropriate.</p>
<b>DEFINITION OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINER: OPTION 2</b>	
<p><del>["<b>Non-retail</b>” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering sale/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]_</del></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand appreciates the amendments made to the previous draft to clarify the requirements for shipping containers. While New Zealand did not support the capture of these containers in the definition of a non-retail container in earlier comments, we can however accept their inclusion in this definition if separate requirements for presentation/provision of information on shipping containers and other bulk transport containers such as tankers and barges is set out in the guidance, as is provided for in the current draft. Including such “containers” in the scope of this guidance significantly increases the complexity of the guidance i.e. by the need to have separate provisions for these containers in the guidance.</p>
<p>["<b>Non-retail container</b>” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</p>	<p><b>Guyana</b></p>
<p>["<b>Non-retail container</b>” means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Whereas the second version of the definition of “non-retail container” is preferable over the first, FoodDrinkEurope believes that the</p>

as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	definition is still rather unclear. Furthermore, the examples provided in the Annex are not very easy to understand.
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . <del>The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities (including further processing or use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food), before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering sale/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).</del> ]	<b>Australia</b> Australia supports the differentiation of ‘non-retail container’ from pre-packaged being by whether they are intended for direct sale to consumers. We support Option 2 but suggest amendment to simplify, provide greater clarity and to ensure the definition captures the examples as set out in the Annex.
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . The food <sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in prepackaged <sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand is of the view that this definition has more details and thus provides better clarification of non-retail container. In addition, we would like to point out that in some current Codex Standards, non-retail containers may also include those packaging for direct sale to consumers. The working group may want to examine this issue to ensure that the new definition will not cause confusion and conflict among Codex Standards.
[ <del>Non-retail</del> <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . The food <sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food) before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering sale/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in prepackaged <sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	<b>IDF/FIL</b> 2. Definition of non-retail container. We support the second definition, with edits. Option 1 would not apply if the food was subsequently provided to the consumer in a non-packaged form e.g. bulk bins in retail businesses, delicatessen counters. Option 2 as it stands would mean only food to be prepared into a packaged format would be covered i.e. not catering or food in bulk bins sold in supermarkets etc. Suggest the following modification: Non-retail container” means any container that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . The food <sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities (including further food processing or use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food) before being used for sale/catering to the consumer..]
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . The food <sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in prepackaged <sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	<b>Kenya</b> The ones strike out is an error
[ <b>“Non-retail container”</b> means any container <sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer <sup>1</sup> . The food <sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the	<b>Kenya</b> We support option 2The sentence " being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer <sup>1</sup> in prepackaged <sup>1</sup> form,

consumer <sup>1</sup> in prepackaged <sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food " makes it more clearere
<p><del>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food. <sup>1</sup>-form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Kenya</b></p> <p>We accept option 2 and agreed to remove both open and closed square brackets including the bracket between "processing and the end of this sentence. Option two is more detailed and self explanatory</p>
<p><del>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b></p> <p>Dominican Republic is in favour of the second paragraph as we consider it more appropriate to the Guideline.</p>
<p><del>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p> <p>Chile supports this definition of non-retail container, because it seems to be more clear and without room for interpretations.</p>
<p><del>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Container Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>
<p><del>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p> <p>Costa Rica supports this definition.</p>
<p><del>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</del></p> <p><b>["Non-retail container" means any container<sup>1</sup> that is not intended to be offered for direct sale to the consumer<sup>1</sup>. The food<sup>1</sup> in the non-retail containers is for further food business activities before being eventually used for sale/distribution/catering to the consumer<sup>1</sup> in prepackaged<sup>1</sup> form, either as such or after further processing (including use as an ingredient for manufacturing another food).]</b></p>	<p><b>Peru</b></p> <p>Peru supports the second definition as it seems more clear.</p>



ingredient for manufacturing another food).]	
<del>Some examples of non-retail containers are illustrated in the Annex.</del>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>Regarding the proposed examples of non-retail containers presented in annex, we highlight that it was a very useful tool during the elaboration of the document. It helped clarifying the scope and definitions of the text. However, taking into consideration the significant advance in relation to these items, we consider that it is no longer necessary and should be deleted. In this sense, it is important to consider that its interpretation may be confusing when performed outside the standard drafting process.</p>
<b>SECTION 4 - GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b>	
<b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES:</b> The following general principles apply in respect of non-retail containers:	<p><b>Guatemala</b></p> <p>Guatemala is in agreement with the proposed general principles.</p>
<del><b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES:</b> The following general principles apply in respect of non-retail containers:</del>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p> <p>We consider that the text is not necessary.</p>
4.1 The general principles established in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (GSLPF) apply equally, as appropriate, to the labelling of non-retail containers of foods.	<p><b>Thailand</b></p> <p>Thailand does not object this principle though we suggest a clarification on which principles of GSLPF applied should be elaborated.</p>
<del>4.2 The labelling requirements for non-retail containers of foods should be differentiated clearly from the labelling requirements for prepackaged<sup>1</sup> foods.</del>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>Brazil suggests excluding principle 4.2.</p> <p>We believe that the existence of a specific guideline / standard for non-food retailers already clearly indicates the need for specific labeling requirements for it.</p> <p>Moreover, the sentence seems to contradict principle 5.1 that states “The general principles established in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged foods (GSLPF) apply equally, as appropriate to the labelling of non-retail containers of foods”.</p>
4.2 The labelling requirements for non-retail containers of foods should be differentiated clearly from the labelling requirements for prepackaged foods. [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>
4.3 The non-retail containers should be clearly identifiable as such.	<p><b>Thailand</b></p> <p>Thailand does not object this principle. However, this principle is applied to containers, not labelling. Thus we are not sure if this is</p>

	within the scope of this document.
<b>4.4</b> The label along with the documents accompanying a non-retail container or information provided by other acceptable means shall provide relevant information to enable the labelling of food, intended for sale to the consumer, <del>with the required information</del>	<b>Nicaragua</b> We propose to delete this text to avoid redundancies.
<b>4.4</b> The label along with the documents accompanying a non-retail container or information provided by other acceptable means shall provide relevant information to enable the labelling of food, intended for sale to the consumer, with the required information	<b>Honduras</b> We suggest that, given the logical order and the relation of the principles, this be placed as 4.2 and that the present 4.2 should become 4.3
<b>4.5</b> The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the <del>manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter</del> <u>manufacturer or vendor</u> <del>packer</del> .	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports the addition of principle 4.5 The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor, but with edits to remove 'distributor, importer, exporter or vendor' from the principle.  New Zealand notes the inclusion of the word "intended" in the definition of "non-retail container" and therefore supports the determination of a non-retail container being the intended status of the container as determined by the manufacture or packer. New Zealand suggests however that this is limited to the intention of the manufacturer and or packer as to open this to other players in the supply chain may result in conflicting intentions being expressed.
<b>4.5</b> The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor.	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand does not object this principle. However, it regards the intention of producers, not the labelling. Also, we note that there may be some containers that are intended to be non-retail container but still in some ways accessible by consumers.
<b>4.5</b> The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor.	<b>Iran</b> wholesaler instead of vendor.
<b>4.5</b> La condición de envase no destinado a la venta deberá basarse en la intención del fabricante, envasador, distribuidor, importador, exportador o <del>vendedor</del> <u>vendedor y los materiales usados en su constitución, deben ser grado alimenticio cuando el envase está en contacto directo con el alimento.</u>	<b>Colombia</b> Las normas sanitarias de los países miembros contienen especificaciones técnicas al respecto de los materiales usados en el envasado o empacado de alimento
<b>4.5</b> The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor.	<b>Chile</b> Chile requests clarification regarding this principle, since what it want to express is not understandable neither in English nor in Spanish.

4.5 The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Chile</b>
4.5 The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Nicaragua</b>
4.5 The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Honduras</b> The condition of container would also include types of container?
4.5 The non-retail status of a container shall be based on the intention of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor.	<b>Ecuador</b>
4.6 The labelling requirements for non-retail containers should be established taking into account the information requirements and implementation capabilities of the relevant stakeholders (food business and competent authorities), in order to avoid any confusion at its final destination.	<b>Ecuador</b>
4.6 The labelling requirements for non-retail containers should be established taking into account the information requirements and implementation capabilities of the relevant stakeholders (food business and competent authorities).	<b>Thailand</b> This is the core principle of Codex. All Codex documents deem to follow this principle. Therefore, it may not be necessary to state it again here, otherwise it may cause confusion in other texts that also strictly follow this principle but do not explicitly mention the statement in their contexts.
4.6 The labelling requirements for non-retail containers should be established taking into account the information requirements and implementation capabilities of the relevant stakeholders (food business and competent authorities).	<b>Nicaragua</b> We suggest revising this principle, since its flexibility can be in contrast to the mandatory requirements specified in the document.
4.7 Where appropriate, <u>and subject to the mandatory requirements outlined in section 5,</u> the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold.	<b>New Zealand</b>
4.7 Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable <del>innovative</del> practices for sharing the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold.	<b>Australia</b> Australia considers the word 'innovative' is superfluous in this section and can be deleted.
4.7 Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing	<b>USA</b> We note the link to the labeling technology discussion paper and encourage discussion of how this aligns with the intent and language

<p>the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), <del>as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold.</del></p>	<p>of this section with that paper. The reference to “competent authorities” is unnecessary</p>
<p><b>4.7</b> Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold. <i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>
<p><b>4.7</b> Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing the relevant information, <del>for example, electronic transfer of information</del>), <del>as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold.</del></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>
<p><b>4.7</b> Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold.</p> <p><u>In the case of an electronic document it can be sent before or at the same time as the delivery.</u></p>	<p><b>Peru</b></p> <p>For Point 4.7 we suggest additional text specifying that, in the case of an electronic document, it may be sent before or at the same time as the delivery.</p> <p>4.7. The above proposal is to facilitate logistics and avoid unnecessary burdens on the exchange of such documents. It is important to consider electronic options when they are feasible.</p>
<p><b>4.7</b> Where appropriate, the information requirements in respect of non-retail containers of food may be met through appropriate means other than on a label (including accompanying documents or other globally acceptable innovative practices for sharing the relevant information, for example, electronic transfer of information), as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which it is sold. (Ecuador requests that the information requirements for food containers not intended for retail sale, may be declared through appropriate means other than a label, as long as these requirements are not the ones considered mandatory).</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p>
<p><b>SECTION 5 - MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL</b></p>	
<p><b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, <del>unless provided otherwise:</del></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand supports the intent of the guidance to outline the minimum requirements for information which must be on the label and what information can be supplied in accompanying documentation or by other means.</p> <p>Suggest the information types are given in the same order as given in the Codex General Standard for pre-packaged food for ease of comparison i.e.:</p>

	<p>Name of the food                  Net contents                  Name and address                  Lot ID                  Date marking and storage                  ID as a non-retail container                  Label ID mark</p>
<p><b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>                  Considering the importance for these guidelines to facilitate international trade practices and logistics operations, it is relevant to consider them from a practical point of view. More specifically, only explicit and unambiguous mandatory labelling information should be provided on the label, i.e. the name of the transported food product(s), the lot identification and details for traceability of the container.</p> <p>As mentioned above, regarding non-retail containers, the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual (26th edition, page 60) reads that “information [...] shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the product, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer shall appear on the container. However, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer may be replaced by an identification mark provided that such a mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents.”</p> <p>Thus, only this most essential information is necessary on the label of non-retail containers. Any other mandatory and relevant information can be exchanged between B2B sender/receiver by means other than label. This information can be shared thanks to electronic means (e.g. EU TRACES database on TRAdE Control and Expert System). In the case of electronic goods flow programs, it may even be sufficient to enter an EAN code on the container for identification purposes, as any other information is stored electronically.</p>
<p><b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:</p>	<p><b>USA</b>                  Request clarification on if “unless otherwise provided” is a direct reference to 5.7. Calling this Section “Mandatory Information Requirements on Label” may not be entirely accurate if it is acceptable to provide this information some other way. The text, as</p>

	drafted, implies it can be satisfied some other way than the actual label.
<b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:	<b>IDF/FIL</b> we would suggest the information types are given in the same order as given in the Codex General Standard for pre-packaged food for ease of comparison
<b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise <del>otherwise</del> <b>by other means:</b>	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA proposes the change indicated below for greater consistency of language with the rest of the document.
<b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:	<b>CEFS</b> Considering the importance for such guidelines to facilitate international trade practices and logistic operations, it should be relevant to consider them from a practical point of view. More specifically, only explicit and unambiguous mandatory labelling information should be provided on the label, i.e. the name of the transported food product(s), the lot identification and details for traceability of the container.  As mentioned above, regarding non-retail containers, the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual (26th edition, page 60) reads that "information [] shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the product, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer shall appear on the container. However, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer may be replaced by an identification mark provided that such a mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents."  Thus, only this most essential information is necessary on the label of non-retail containers. Any other mandatory and relevant information can be exchanged between B2B sender/receiver by means other than label. This information can be shared thanks to electronic means (e.g. EU TRACES database on TRAdE Control and Expert System). In the case of electronic goods flow programs, it may even be sufficient to enter an EAN code on the container for identification purposes, as any other information is stored electronically.
<b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:	<b>Guatemala</b> For the paragraph 5.1.1., it is recommended to delete the word "normally" to be consistent with the labeling. For 5.2 the text in square brackets is accepted with the modifications listed below.

	<p>Delete: "or avoidupois weight system or both the systems of measurement".</p> <p>PROPOSAL: "[ or the systems of units as required by the competent authority]" For 5.3 we request to copy what is written on Codex Stan 1 - 1985. PROPOSAL: "5.3 Lot identification: Each container shall be embossed or otherwise permanently marked in code or in clear to identify the producing factory and the lot." For paragraph 5.5 we are agree deleting the last paragraph as this detail is found in paragraph 7.1 of this document. Similarly, on paragraph 5.7 we request explanation what is meant and a definition of the term "brand" in the sense of replacing the mandatory information, probably an interpretation in the translation.</p>
<p><b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p> <p>Nicaragua considers that the last statement must be completed. When indicating "unless provided otherwise", it must indicate regarding what, it may be a Codex Standard or Codex texts.</p>
<p><b>MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, <del>unless provided otherwise:</del></p> <p><b><u>Refer to requirements 5.1. to 5.4 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</u></b></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>
<p><b>5. MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS ON LABEL:</b> The following information shall appear on the label of non-retail containers of food, unless provided otherwise:</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p>
<p><b>SECTION 5.1 THE NAME OF THE FOOD</b></p>	
<p>It is proposed to include the name/address in case the processing is carried out by a maquiladora. <u>5.1 The name of the food food</u></p> <p><b><u>On the label, next to the name of the food or very close to it, will appear the additional words or phrases necessary to avoid misleading or deceiving the consumer regarding the authentic nature and physical condition of the food, including but not limited to to the type of cover medium, the form of presentation or its condition or the type of treatment to which it has been subjected, for example, dehydration, concentration, reconstitution, smoking.</u></b></p> <p>It is proposed to include the name/address in case the processing is carried out by a maquiladora.</p>	<p><b>Colombia</b></p> <p>We propose adding point number 4.1.2 of the current Codex Standard 1-1985, since this an important information as there are companies that perform intermediate maquila processes.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1</b> The name shall indicate the true nature of the food and normally <u>must</u> be specific and not generic.</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>

<p><b>5.1.1.1</b> <del>Where a name or names</del> <u>When one or more names have been</u> established for a food in a Codex standard, at least one of these names <del>shall</del> <b>must</b> be used.</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposes drafting adjustments for purposes of understanding.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.2</b> In other cases, the name prescribed by national legislation <u>in the importing country</u> shall be used.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>
<p><b>5.1.1.3</b> In the absence of any such established or prescribed name, either a common or usual name existing by common usage as an appropriate descriptive term which is not misleading or confusing <del>in the country in which the food is intended to be sold shall be used.</del> <b>to the food business or</b> in the country in which the food is intended to be sold shall be used.</p>	<p><b>Thailand</b> This document aims to assist competent authorities as well as business to harmonize the labelling of non-retail containers, therefore both parties should be mentioned for the purpose of clarification.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.4</b> A “coined”, “fanciful”, “brand” name or “trade mark” may be used provided it accompanies one of the names provided in Subsections 5.1.1.1 to 5.1.1.3.</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> For point 5.1.1.4: we suggest to accept the use of a name brand or trademark without the need to add the full legal name. 5.1.1.4: In the case of a container that does not reach the consumer, that is not used for direct sale and is delivered with sale documentation to add the full legal name, this should not required since it complicates the logistics and costs of marketing</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country <del>in</del> <u>into</u> which the product is <del>sold</del> <u>imported</u>.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>
<p><b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>USA</b> We do not believe it is necessary to include the reference to the consumer nor the reference to competent authorities.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, <del>as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.</del></p>	<p><b>USA</b> We do not believe it is necessary to include the reference to the consumer nor the reference to competent authorities.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>Thailand</b> Allowing authorities of each country to decide the permission of either names of all the foods and/or generic descriptor provides flexibility but also allows unharmonised labelling, which may deviate from the purpose of this work.</p>
<p><b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>Thailand</b> Thailand is of the view that the display of generic descriptor should be allowed on the label, with the names of all the foods specified in accompanying documents or by other means. Hence, in this section,</p>



	a link between this Section and Section 6 Sharing Information by Means Other Than Label should be made clear.
<b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein <del>and/or a generic descriptor</del> <del>descriptor, or both</del> that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA suggests that it would further improve clarity to 1) Rewording as shown below in bold text to clarify that either the descriptor OR the names of the foods OR both together may be used. 2) move this point before 5.1.1.4, which describes terms that must be used only in addition to the names described in 5.1.1.1-5.1.1.3.
<b>5.1.1.5</b> Where the non-retail container contains multiple types of food, the names of all the foods contained therein and/or a generic descriptor that best explains the foods present together in the container shall be provided on the label, as allowed by the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold.	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua requests clarification of this requirement as it is not understandable. There is still no definition for multiple containers. The relevance of developing a new work on this issue is being analyzed within the framework of the CCFL.
<b>SECTION 5.2 - NET CONTENT</b>	
<b>Net Contents</b>	<b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica considers that the "net content" should not be part of the mandatory requirements; and to include instead "Exchange of information by means other than the label". This is due to the fact that, in many cases, non-retail containers are manipulated or subdivided by another party within the distribution and marketing chain. In addition, being a sale to another company within the chain, the size of the transaction (number of units) is very large. In addition, being a sale to another company within the chain, the size of the transaction (number of units) is very large. Given this fact, and taking into account that the marking of the net content of the unit will not have any impact on the consumer (units will be subdivided), we consider that it is not necessary to place this information in each label, but that the total net content of the transaction between the parties can be indicated on the documents accompanying the goods.
The net contents <sup>3</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) [or avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be sold]. This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand supports the declaration of metric system, which is in line with Codex Stan 1-1985. We do not oppose if business would like to additionally declare other weight system.
The net contents <sup>3</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) <del>[or avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be sold]</del> SI). This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil supports deleting the text in squared brackets to maintain consistency with CXS 1-1985, item 4.3.1, which states that the net contents shall be declared in the metric system ("Système

	International" units.).
The net contents <sup>1</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) [or avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be sold]. This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Dominican Republic</b> Dominican Republic supports the use of both systems
The net contents <sup>1</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) <del>or</del> <u>the</u> avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be <del>sold</del> <u>sold</u> . This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Dominican Republic</b>
El contenido neto <sup>3</sup> debe declararse en el sistema métrico (el Sistema Internacional de Unidades, SI) [o en el sistema de pesos avoirdupois o ambos sistemas de medida según lo requerido por la competente autoridad en el país en el que el alimento pretende ser vendido]. Esta declaración se efectuará de la siguiente manera:	<b>Colombia</b> Se propone mantener el texto entre corchetes. Permite a cada país utilizar el sistema vigente en su regulación.
<del>The net contents<sup>1</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) [or avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be sold]. This declaration shall be made in the following manner:</del>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua supports the declaration according to the SI.
The net contents <sup>1</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) <del>or</del> <u>the</u> avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be <del>sold</del> <u>sold</u> . This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Chile</b> Chile supports to remove the square brackets.
The net contents <sup>1</sup> should be declared in the metric system (The International System of Units, SI) [or avoirdupois weight system or both the systems of measurement as required by the competent authority in the country in which the food is intended to be sold]. This declaration shall be made in the following manner:	<b>Peru</b> NET content must be declared in both systems.
(a) for liquid foods, by volume or weight;	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand would like to seek clarification on the declaration of net content for liquid foods by weight. In general practice as well as in Codex Stan 1-1985, liquid foods are usually expressed in volume basis. Therefore we would like to know in which situation liquid foods should be expressed in weight basis.
a) for liquid foods, by volume <del>or</del> weight;	<b>Nicaragua</b> In accordance with Codex Stan 1-1985
(c) for semi-solid or viscous foods, <del>either by weight or volume; either by weight or volume;</del>	<b>Iran</b> either by net weight ;
<b>SECTION 5.3 - LOT IDENTIFICATION</b>	
Each container shall be marked in code or in clear to identify the producing factory and	<b>Jamaica</b>

the lot.	Each container shall be embossed or otherwise permanently coded or un-coded to identify the producing factory and the lot. Where a code is used, the key to the code shall be provided to the national standards body in the country in which the product is to be sold.
Each container shall be <u>embossed or otherwise permanently</u> marked in code or in clear to identify the producing factory and the lot.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Alignment with wording of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-Packed Foods.
Each <u>non-retail</u> container shall be <u>embossed or otherwise permanently</u> marked in code or in clear to identify the producing factory and the lot.	<b>Australia</b> Australia supports consistency with the wording of GSLPF and therefore proposes the following amendment plus the bolded insertion of non-retail to reflect the subject of the draft guidance
Each container shall be marked in code or in clear <del>to identify the producing factory and the lot.</del> <u>for effective traceability.</u>	<b>Thailand</b> In current practice, business has diversified approaches for lot identification, not only the producing factory and the lot. Nevertheless, the ultimate aim of lot identification is the same for any approach, which is to enable effective traceability. Therefore, Thailand proposes this amendment to ensure flexibility of this provision.
Each container shall <del>be marked</del> be engraved or marked in any other way, but indelibly, <del>on</del> a code indication <del>in code</del> or in <u>clear language</u> to identify the producing factory and the <u>lot.</u>	<b>Colombia</b> This wording corresponds to what was defined in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985)
<del>Each container shall be marked in code or in clear to identify the producing factory and the lot. Each container shall be engraved or marked in any other way, but indelibly, a code indication or in clear language to identify the producing factory and the lot.</del>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposes drafting changes to improve understanding.
Each container <del>shall be marked</del> engraved or marked in any other way, but indelibly, <del>on</del> a code indication <del>in code</del> or in <u>clear language</u> to identify the producing factory and the lot.	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to use the wording of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985), since it makes it more clear that the mark must be indelible.
Each container shall be <del>marked</del> engraved or marked in any other way, <u>but indelibly</u> , a code indication or in clear language to identify the producing factory and the lot.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<b>SECTION 5.4 - DATE MARKING AND STORAGE INSTRUCTIONS</b>	
<b>Date marking and storage instructions<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand proposes a separation of storage instruction section from

	<p>date marking section. With this, we can include the statement from section 5.7 “Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.” under the section of storage instructions.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that special conditions for the storage of food shall be declared on the label so the information is easily accessible by operators. If this information is declared via identification mark or other means, there may result in the compromise of the integrity of the food packed within as the operators may neglect the information.</p>
<p><b>Date marking and storage instructions<sup>4</sup></b></p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b></p> <p>We understand that, if it is a separate document, this point could be developed.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5.5 - IDENTIFICATION OF A NON-RETAIL CONTAINER</b></p>	
<p><b>Identification of a non-retail container</b></p>	<p><b>Thailand</b></p> <p>Thailand is of the opinion that the identification of a non-retail container may not be necessary on the label as most non-retail containers are between business to business transaction. If this is in agreement with the working group, we propose to make a new section for ‘optional labelling’, similarly to Section 7 of CXS 1-1985, identifying that ‘when business deems such an identification necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food)’</p> <p>Anyhow, we do not object if the working group determines that this section is mandatory information to be shown on label. However, we do not agree with the allowing authorities of each country to decide on exemption as this can diversified regulations hence barrier to trade.</p>
<p><b>Identification of a non-retail container</b></p>	<p><b>World Processing Tomato Council</b></p> <p>Regarding the Clause 5.5 Identification of a non-retail container, we suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) For food items packaged in large containers (e.g. 10kg or 20kg bag-in-box, 200kg drums, 1000 kg bins or IBCs, etc.), which are obviously not for retail sale, the labelling should be excluded.</li> <li>b) Food items manufactured for specific food service customers for further handling and processing should be</li> </ul>

	<p>excluded regardless of their packaging size.</p> <p>c) The reason of this request is that products are being « only » distributed to the specific customers and will not be distributed in the market. As stated in “III Major discussion points in the EWG ii) General Principles”, non-retail status of the container is based on the intention of the manufacturer.</p> <p>The mandatory indication on the label of an indication that it is a NON-RETAIL CONTAINER is unnecessary for drums of 200 kg or bins of 1000 kg, while the draft would expect exclusion only for tanks or barges of loose products.</p> <p>We could ask the Codex Commission to insert the mandatory description only for containers of such size that they can be confused with retail containers. For tomato products the limit could be 5 kg or 10 kg. That is, if the container size is less than 10 kg but is not intended for the final consumer, then it should be indicated it on the label, otherwise there should be no need to indicate it.</p>
<p><b>Identification of a non-retail container</b></p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b></p> <p>We understand that the most complete and clear identification is the last one “NON-RETAILCONTAINER - NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO CONSUMER” We believe that it is important that this identification is in text in the language of the country of destination and not a mark.</p>
<p>Identification of a non-retail container</p>	<p><b>IFU</b></p> <p>IFU Comment. We agree that is not necessary to label all types of non-retail containers to distinguish them from retail containers.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5.5 PARA 1</b></p>	
<p><del>The A non-retail containers of foods container</del> shall be clearly identifiable as such. To this end, a non-retail container may:</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p>
<p>The non-retail containers of foods shall be clearly identifiable as such. To this end, a non-retail container <del>may</del> should:</p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p>
<p>The non-retail containers of foods shall be clearly identifiable as such. To this end, a non-retail container <del>may</del> <u>should</u>:</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>

bear a statement to indicate that the food is not intended to be sold directly to <del>consumer</del> <u>consumers</u> <sup>2</sup> or to clearly identify it as a non-retail container. Some examples of such statements are:	<b>Australia</b>
Bear a statement to indicate that the food is not intended to be sold directly to consumer <sup>2</sup> or to clearly identify it as a non-retail container. <del>Some examples of such statements are</del> <b>Using any of the following statements:</b>	<b>Honduras</b> As a good standarization practice of normalization, we suggest to implement declarations and to avoid using examples
<del>NOT FOR DIRECT TO THE CONSUMER</del> <b>FINAL CONSUMER”</b>	<b>Honduras</b>
<del>NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO THE CONSUMER</del> <b>FINAL CONSUMER”</b>	<b>Honduras</b>
“NON-RETAILCONTAINER - NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO CONSUMER”	<b>Iran</b> The most clear statement than others
“CONTAINER NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO CONSUMER - NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO THE <del>CONSUMER</del> <b>FINAL CONSUMER”</b>	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>SECTION 5.5 PARA 1 BULLET 2</b>	
carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or <u>which is clearly identifies - identifiable as a non-retail container in the country into which the product is imported.</u>  <u>Or,</u> • <u>logistics make it inappropriate to label the non-retail container and the container is clearly identifiable as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold.</u>	<b>New Zealand</b> The country in which a sale is made is hard to determine when the sale is from one country to the other. We therefore suggest the text is clarified to show it is the importing countrys ability to identify the container as non-retail that is important. Some containers e.g. shipping containers / tankers etc are not appropriate to bear a label.
carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or clearly identifies it as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold. <u>Or carry any other mark agreed upon by a regional body or bilateral trading partners.</u>	<b>Guyana</b> This sentence leaves room for potential dis-harmonization in labeling of non-retail containers for food and as such it is recommended that examples mentioned in section 5.5 be set as the standard labels regionally and globally to avoid such (consideration given to section 8.2.1-2). Hence, consideration should be given for the sentence to be removed or an additional phrase be added to the sentence which states that 'any other mark agreed upon by a regional body or bilateral trading parties.'
<del>carry any other mark</del> <u>carry any other mark</u> that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or clearly identifies it as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold.	<b>Iran</b> The definition of that mark is necessary for preventing any misunderstanding
carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or <u>which is clearly identifies it - identifiable</u> as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> These changes are made to permit containers which are clearly not for sale to consumers e.g. bulk bags to be exempt from carrying a mark identifying it as non-retail

<p>carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or clearly identifies it as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b>          . We do not share this option. We understand that the message should be clear and understandable. The proposed sentences, are better than a mark</p>
<p>carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to the consumer or clearly identifies it as a non-retail container in the country in which the <b>final</b> product is sold. <b><u>These marks could be: identification marks, Rapid Response Code, Bar Code, Alphanumeric Identification Code.</u></b></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b>          We consider this last line to be repetitive and, for that reason, we suggest to delete it as it is sufficiently explained with the first line of the paragraph.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5.5 PARA 2</b></p>	
<p><del>Such identification enables labelling of non-retail containers as per the relevant provisions that allow minimum information to be presented on label with the rest being shared through other means, informs consumers that such containers were not intended to be sold to them, and prompts Competent Authorities to take into account the nature (non-retail) of the container at the time of verifying labelling compliance.</del></p>	<p><b>USA</b>          We propose to strike two paragraphs from the end of Section of 5.5 because the information contained in it is written elsewhere in the document, and we do not believe it is necessary to include the reference to the consumer nor the reference to competent authorities.</p>
<p>Such identification enables labelling of non-retail containers as per the relevant provisions that allow minimum information to be presented on label with the rest being shared through other means, informs consumers that such containers were not intended to be sold to <del>them</del> them these should follow the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985), and prompts Competent Authorities to take into account the nature (non-retail) of the container at the time of verifying labelling compliance.</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p>
<p><del>Such identification enables labelling of non-retail containers as per the relevant provisions that allow minimum information to be presented on label with the rest being shared through other means, informs consumers that such containers were not intended to be sold to them, and prompts Competent Authorities to take into account the nature (non-retail) of the container at the time of verifying labelling compliance.</del></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>
<p>Such an identification may not be necessary for large <del>shipping-transport</del> containers (for example <u>shipping, containers, tankers, barges</u> etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b>          New Zealand supports the use of an identification mark which links to information about the product but strongly suggests that such an identification mark should only link to information that may be provided by other means (clause 6) and that such a mark should not replace any of the minimum information required to be on the label (clause 5). As noted above, New Zealand supports that this would not apply to shipping containers and other bulk transport containers such as tankers and barges due to their physical nature and that for shipping containers all information may be provided in accompanying documentation so long as there is traceability between the container</p>

	and the information.
<b>SECTION 5.5 PARA 3</b>	
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</del>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Section 7.1 provides guidance for shipping containers. Therefore, we propose to delete this text in section 5.5 in order to avoid duplication.
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers</del> bulk transport (for example <del>example, shipping containers, tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, or where</del> the competent authority of a country may identify <del>identifies</del> and allow <del>allows</del> exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.	<b>Australia</b> Australia also suggests the last paragraph of section 5.5 is amended to provide clarity and consistency with section 7.1, including Australia's suggested amendments to that section, i.e. we propose reference to 'large shipping containers' is amended to 'bulk transport containers'. Additionally this paragraph could be clarified such that any container that is deemed easily identifiable as a non-retail container by the competent authority need not have the identification mark, in addition to bulk transport containers. Australia proposes the following amendments:
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</del>	<b>USA</b> We propose to strike two paragraphs from the end of Section of 5.5 because the information contained in it is written elsewhere in the document, and we do not believe it is necessary to include the reference to the consumer nor the reference to competent authorities.
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</del>	<b>Thailand</b> Allowing competent authority of a country to identify and make exemptions of identification of non-retail container may cause unharmonized practices in international trade. Moreover, this sentence contradicts with the following Section 5.7, which specified that the identification must be displayed on label. Therefore, Thailand proposes deletion of this phase.
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping transport containers (for example shipping containers, tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> As noted in the beginning there are other types of container which are clearly not intended for retail use. It should not be necessary to seek competent authority permission for each type of container in advance when they are clearly not for retail use.
<del>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</del>	<b>Colombia</b> Section 7.1 provides guidance for shipping containers. We therefore propose deleting this text in section 5.5 to avoid duplication.



Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>SECTION 5.6</b>	
<b><u>Name and Address</u></b> Name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor of the food shall be declared.	<b>New Zealand</b>
Name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or <del>vendor</del> <u>vendor</u> of the food shall be declared.	<b>Iran</b> Wholesaler
Name and address of the manufacturer, packer, distributor, importer, exporter or vendor of the food shall be declared.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> provisions should be emboldened in common with the other information requirements
Se declarará el nombre y dirección del fabricante, envasador, distribuidor, importador, exportador o vendedor del alimento, <u>según corresponda</u> .	<b>Chile</b> Chile propone agregar esta frase para dejar claramente establecido que no se deberá etiquetar la dirección del fabricante, envasador, distribuidor, importador, exportador o vendedor del alimento, al mismo tiempo.
<b>SECTION 5.7 PARA 1</b>	
[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports the use of an identification mark which links to information about the product but strongly suggests that such an identification mark should only link to information that may be provided by other means (clause 6) and that such a mark should not replace any of the minimum information required to be on the label (clause 5).
[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> FoodDrinkEurope notes that there is no definition at Codex level of 'identification mark'; therefore, this could be a hurdle for harmonization. CCFL may wish to address this.
<del>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an</del> <u>[6.1 An</u> identification mark may replace the information on the label <del>except the name of the product (Section (in section 5.1), 1)</del> and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of	<b>Australia</b>

<p>information exchange where all such information shall be provided.- <u>Some examples of identification marks are Quick Response Code, Barcode and alphanumeric identification code. However, any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.</u></p>	
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> Australia notes this section relates to providing information by means other than the label. We therefore consider it would be better placed under section 6 (see below for proposed new section 6.1). In moving the information from this section to new section 6.1, section 5.7 can be deleted.</p>
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>USA</b> We believe this section needs more consideration and discussion. It is not clear based on this text which information the identification mark can replace on the label. The proposed text references Section 5, Mandatory Information Requirements on Label but then states the identification mark can substitute for everything except the name. There are additional labeling requirements under Mandatory Information section besides the name. If that information can be replaced with an identification mark, they are not truly Mandatory Information Requirements “on Label.”</p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</del></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> Brazil suggests deleting the section 5.7 as the proposed approach already separates the information that should be on the label from the information that can be transmitted by other means. It does not make sense to allow information that is essential for declaration on the label and which have specific requirements to be stated otherwise.</p>
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>ICBA</b> Given that some non-retail containers contain multiple types of foods, and that in some geographies there is a need to communicate label information in multiple languages, ICBA supports allowing the use of identification marks where technology enables the placement and reading of such marks.</p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</del></p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b> This information needs reordering and including in the section below as it is related to when a label is not needed</p>
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information</p>	<p><b>Kenya</b></p>

<p>Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p>we have no objection, it is elaborate and more inclusive therefore we propose the removal of the open and closed square brackets</p>
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic supports the integration of this article 5.7 with both full paragraphs, as we consider them relevant to the guidelines.</p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding</del> Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b></p>
<p>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> The Sub-Committee on food labelling agrees to include the paragraphs in square brackets.</p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding</del> Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</del></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>
<p><del>[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly</del></p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b> We do not agree with the option that an identification mark (bar code type or QR code) can replace the mandatory information on the label which should be on the non-retail container, We believe the label of</p>

<del>identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</del>	these products must be clear and legible and in view of the authorities to make the appropriate verifications.
[Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.	<b>Peru</b> 5.7. We suggest to accept the use of a brand name or trademark without the need to add the full legal name.  5.7 – In the case of a container that does not reach the consumer, that is not used for direct sale and that is provided with sale documentation, it should not be required to add the full legal name since this complicates the logistics and costs of marketing.
5.7 [Notwithstanding the above in the present Section on the Mandatory Information Requirements on Label, an identification mark may replace the information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a non-retail container (Section 5.5), provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador suggests that the indicated paragraph should be deleted as it could run the risk that the information enclosed or contained through other means of exchange of information, may not be available at the time of verifying what is the final destination of the food; as well as running a risk of the food arbitrarily reaching the hands of the consumer and such consumer not possessing the correct information to identify the product.
<b>SECTION 5.7 PARA 2</b>	
<del>Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]</del>	<b>New Zealand</b>
Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]	<b>Thailand</b> This sentence should be moved to the Section 'storage instruction'. For special conditions of storage, the information should be made clear on the label.
<del>Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]</del>	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil suggests deleting the section 5.7 as the proposed approach already separates the information that should be on the label from the information that can be transmitted by other means. It does not make sense to allow information that is essential for declaration on the label and which have specific requirements to be stated otherwise.
<del>Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]	<b>Dominican Republic</b>
Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]	<b>Chile</b> Chile requests clarification of this paragraph, since neither in English

	nor in Spanish the wording is understood.
Provided also that any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]	<b>Chile</b>
5.4 <del>Provided also that</del> Any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.]	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>SECTION 5.7 PARA 3</b>	
<del>Some examples of identification marks are Quick Response Code, Barcode, alphanumeric identification code etc.</del>	<b>Brazil</b> Brazil suggests deleting the section 5.7 as the proposed approach already separates the information that should be on the label from the information that can be transmitted by other means. It does not make sense to allow information that is essential for declaration on the label and which have specific requirements to be stated otherwise.
<del>Some examples of identification marks are Quick Response Code, Barcode, alphanumeric identification code etc.</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<del>Some examples of identification marks are Quick Response Code, Barcode, alphanumeric identification code etc.</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
<del>Algunos ejemplos de marcas de identificación son Código de Respuesta Rápida, Código de Barras, Código de Identificación Alfanumérico, etcétera.</del>	<b>Uruguay</b> esta es aclaracion de la opcion anterior. El codigo a nuestro entender no puede sustituir lo declarado.
5.5 Identification of a non-retail container  The non-retail containers of foods shall be clearly identifiable as such. To this end, a non-retail container should/must:  <input type="checkbox"/> bear a statement to indicate that the food is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or to clearly identify it as a non-retail container. Some examples of such statements are:  “NON-RETAIL CONTAINER” “NOT FOR CONSUMER SALE” “NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO CONSUMER”.  “NON-RETAILCONTAINER - NOT FOR DIRECT SALE TO CONSUMER”  Or, <input type="checkbox"/> carry any other mark that indicates that the container is not intended to be sold directly to consumer or clearly identifies it as a non-retail container in the country in which the product is sold.  Such identification enables labelling of non-retail containers as per the relevant provisions that allow minimum information to be presented on label with the rest being	<b>Ecuador</b>

<p>shared through other means, informs consumers that such containers were not intended to be sold to them, and prompts Competent Authorities to take into account the nature (non-retail) of the container at the time of verifying labelling compliance.</p> <p>Such an identification may not be necessary for large shipping containers (for example tankers, barges etc.) and, in other cases, the competent authority of a country may identify and allow exemptions where such an identification is determined to be not necessary to distinguish a non-retail container from a retail package (prepackaged food), in respect of the product sold in that country.</p>	
<b>6. SHARING INFORMATION BY MEANS OTHER THAN LABEL</b>	
<p><b>6. SHARING INFORMATION BY MEANS OTHER THAN LABEL</b></p>	<p><b>Guatemala</b>          We reiterate that a definition of "mark" in this context should be obtained. For numbered point 6.1 the text in brackets is accepted under the premise that a definition will be given to us. For numbered point 6.2 we request to modify the text to improve comprehension. Delete the word "nutrition..." "and the..."</p> <p>PROPOSAL: "6.2 Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information that allows to know the properties of the product and claims from the preferences the consumer, etc"</p>
<p>6.1 The following additional mandatory information, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in <u>the</u> non-retail container:</p>	<p><b>Australia</b>          Australia does not support the text in square brackets as this duplicates information from our proposed change to the new section 6.1 (as discussed below) and therefore is not needed. We also suggest a few editorial amendments (including a change to the location of the footnote) as follows.</p>
<p>6.1 The <del>following additional</del> <u>following</u> mandatory information, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in non-retail container:</p>	<p><b>Thailand</b></p>
<p>6.1 The following additional mandatory information<sup>4</sup>, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in non-retail container:</p>	<p><b>ICBA</b>          ICBA recommends adding a reference to the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food as shown below.</p>
<p>An identification mark may replace the mandatory information on the label except the name of the product (Section 5.1), and the Statement/mark used for identification of a <u>non-retail container (Section 5.5), if required, provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</u> Some examples of identification marks are Quick</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p>

<p>Response Code, Barcode, alphanumeric identification code etc.</p> <p><u>However any special conditions for the storage of the food shall be declared on the label in cases where they are required to support the integrity of the food.</u></p> <p>6.1 The following additional mandatory information, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in non-retail container:</p>	
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>44</sup> for prepackaged <del>foods in which the food from the non-retail container will be used or packaged.</del> <u>foods.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>4</sup> for prepackaged foods in which the food from the non-retail container will be used or packaged.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Thailand</b></p> <p>Thailand would like to seek clarification on this sentence. From our view, this statement implies that the businesses who sell only raw materials for processing by other businesses are also required to follow the mandatory labelling requirements for prepackaged foods, even though they do not produce any finished products for direct sale to consumers.</p> <p>It may be more flexible if this sentence is amended to address that the information required to be shared by means other than label should be based on the agreement between businesses. It is the responsibility of the counterparts who produce the finished products to ensure that the information transferred to them will meet the mandatory labelling requirements.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Information</del> Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>4</sup> for prepackaged foods in which the food from the non-retail container will be used or packaged.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Iran</b></p> <p>Ingredients, preservatives and allergens are important to be mentioned.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>4</sup> for prepackaged foods in which the food <del>from</del> <u>in</u> the non-retail container <u>will be used</u> or packaged</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>This text is irrelevant as it is covered in 6.1</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> </ul>	<p><b>Thailand</b> This sentence may be deleted as it is repetitive with those mentioned in Section 5.7.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>Brazil</b> As already pointed out by Brazil, we consider that it is not appropriate to replace the information that is essential for declaration on the label by an identification mark. So, we propose deleting the second bullet.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> </ul>	<p><b>ICBA</b> ICBA supports keeping the text in square brackets. Please see related comments for 5.7.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b> This sentence is repetitive of the information above and therefore unnecessary</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>Kenya</b> We have no objection so we propose to open the square brackets</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic supports the adoption of this bullet, as well as those already raised.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b></p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>



<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</del></li> </ul>	<p><b>Chile</b></p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p> <p>Costa Rica supports the inclusion of this provision, in accordance with the provisions of the Procedure Manual, which indicates the following:</p> <p>“Information on ... shall be given either on the container or in accompanying documents, except that the name of the product, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer shall appear on the container. However, lot identification, and the name and address of the manufacturer or packer may be replaced by an identification mark provided that such a mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents.” Therefore, Costa Rica supports the label of a non-retail container to have only the name of the product and a brand identification, provided that compliance with the provision of the procedure Manual. This will allow the proposed Codex text be in accordance with the provisions already laid down in the manual and also facilitate the application without compromising the mandatory information to be provided.</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container.</li> </ul> <p><u>An identification mark may be placed on the label which links to information required by section 6 provided such mark is clearly identifiable with the accompanying documents or other means of information exchange where all such information shall be provided.</u></p> <p><u>Some examples of identification marks are Quick Response Code, Barcode, alphanumeric identification code etc.</u></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details information require by the [guidance/standard] shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>For the remaining dot point in this section, we understand the intent is that all mandatory information should be provided for each food types not just the additional mandatory information referred to in this section. Therefore Australia considers the text in this dot point with the below amendments is better placed elsewhere such as in section 8.1 as follows</p>
<p><b>6.1 Bullet 3</b></p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container. . [TN: Redaction comments apply only to the Spanish version]</li> </ul>	Chile proposes to include the term "non-retail container containing multiple types of foods" at the point of definitions.
<p><b>6.1 <u>Bullet 3</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container. .[TN: Redaction comments apply only to the Spanish version]</li> </ul>	<b>Chile</b>
<p><b>6.1</b> The following additional mandatory information, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in non-retail container:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>4</sup> for prepackaged foods in which the food from the non-retail container will be used or packaged.</li> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container.</li> </ul>	<b><u>Ecuador</u></b> Ecuador suggests to consider the criteria that all mandatory information must be declared on the label and not through accompanying documents or by other appropriate means.
<p><b>6.1</b> The following additional mandatory information, if not provided on the label, shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through other appropriate means (e.g. electronically between food businesses), provided such documents or information is effectively traceable to the food in non-retail container:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information necessary to meet mandatory labelling requirements<sup>4</sup> for prepackaged foods in which the food from the non-retail container will be used or packaged.</li> <li>[In cases where an identification mark is used on the label, all the information replaced by the identification mark on label should be included in the accompanying documents or shared through other means.]</li> <li>In cases where a non-retail container contains multiple types of foods, the above details shall be provided for each food contained in the non-retail container.</li> </ul>	<b>IFU</b> IFU Comment. We do not consider that this information should be mandatory
<p><b>6.2</b> Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and <del>6</del>6.1 and 6.2), may be <del>shared</del><u>provided</u> by means other than the label. For example, information to enable nutrition and consumer preference claims etc.</p>	<b>Australia</b>
<p><b>6.2</b> Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information to enable <del>nutrition and consumer preference claims etc.</del> the use of</p>	<b>Brazil</b> Since there is not a Codex Alimentarius definition to “consumer preference claims”, we suggest replacing it by “claims” to use the

claims*. <b>*As defined in the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985)</b>	same terminology that is already present in the CXS1-1985. We also propose including a footnote referring to the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985).
<b>6.2</b> Relevant information, <del>other than</del> <u>in addition to</u> the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information to enable nutrition and consumer preference claims etc.	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA suggests the following changes for greater clarity.
<b>6.2</b> Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, <u>nutritional</u> information <del>to enable nutrition</del> and consumer preference properties <del>claims</del> etc.	<b>Colombia</b> It is suggested to add the presence of allergens or allude to paragraph 4.2.1.4 of Codex Stan 1 - 1985.
<b>6.2</b> Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information to enable <del>nutrition</del> <u>nutritional claims</u> and consumer preference claims, <u>among others</u> , etc.	<b>Chile</b>
<b>6.2</b> <del>Information</del> <u>Other</u> relevant information, <del>other than the</del> <u>different from the</u> mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information to enable <del>nutrition</del> <u>nutritional claims</u> and consumer preference claims etc.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<b>6.2</b> Relevant information, other than the mandatory information identified in the preceding sections (Sections 5 and 6), may be shared by means other than the label. For example, information to enable nutrition and consumer preference claims etc.	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador suggests to consider the criteria that all mandatory information must be declared on the label and not through accompanying documents or by other appropriate means.
<b>SECTION 7 - SHIPPING CONTAINERS</b>	
<b>SHIPPING- <u>BULK TRANSPORT CONTAINERS</u></b>	<b>New Zealand</b>
<b>SHIPPING- <u>BULK TRANSPORT CONTAINERS</u></b>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<b>SHIPPING CONTAINERS</b>	<b>Guatemala</b> We agree with paragraph 7.1
<b>7.1</b> In case of <del>shipping</del> <u>bulk transport</u> containers such as tankers, barges etc., all the information stipulated in section 5 and section 6 shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through appropriate other means (e.g. electronically between food businesses) and shall be effectively traceable to the food in such containers.	<b>New Zealand</b> Shipping containers are only one example of bulk transport containers
<b>7.1</b> In <u>the case of</u> <del>shipping</del> <u>bulk transport</u> containers such as <u>shipping containers</u> , tankers, barges <del>etc.</del> <u>and drums</u> , all the information stipulated in section 5 ( <u>excluding 5.5</u> ) and section 6 shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through appropriate other means (e.g. electronically between food businesses) and shall be effectively traceable to the food in such containers.	<b>Australia</b> Australia considers shipping containers are just one type of large bulk container but the intention is that section 7.1 applies where the container itself is clearly not intended to be included in the final sale to the consumer based on its size and/or form/appearance. Therefore

	Australia proposes this section be re-named as "Bulk transport containers" with expanded examples. Australia also suggests there is an exemption from the requirement in section 7.1 for the information required by section 5.5 (identification of a non-retail container), to provide consistency with the exemption outlined at the end of section 5.5. The proposed amendments are as follows:
<b>7.1</b> In case of shipping containers such as tankers, barges etc., all the information stipulated in section 5 and section 6 shall be provided <u>either</u> in the accompanying documents or through appropriate other means (e.g. electronically between food businesses) and shall be effectively traceable to the food in such containers.	<b>USA</b> Minor edit. We also request clarity about the phrase "shall be provided" and to whom the information should be provided.
<b>7.1</b> In case of <del>shipping bulk transport</del> containers such as <u>shipping containers</u> , tankers, <del>barges barges, drums</del> etc., all the information stipulated in section 5 and section 6 shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through appropriate other means (e.g. electronically between food businesses) and shall be effectively traceable to the food in such containers.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<b>7.1</b> In case of shipping containers such as tankers, barges etc., all the information stipulated in section 5 and section 6 shall be provided in the accompanying documents or through appropriate other means ( <del>e.g. electronically between food businesses</del> ) and shall be effectively traceable to the food in such containers.	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>8. PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION</b>	
<b>PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION</b>	<b>Guatemala</b> For paragraph 8.1.4 we request that it be modified as, depending on the packaging, not all information can be placed in the same field of vision. PROPOSAL: "may be in the same field of vision." For paragraph 8.2.2 we request to complete the text to specify. PROPOSAL: "and accurately the mandatory information contained in the...".
<b>8.1.1</b> Labels on non-retail containers of foods shall be applied in such a manner that they will not <del>become separated</del> <u>separate</u> from the container.	<b>Nicaragua</b>
<b>8.1.1</b> Labels on non-retail containers of foods shall be applied in such a manner that they will not <del>become separated</del> <u>separate</u> from the container.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<b>8.1.1</b> Labels on non-retail containers of foods shall be <del>applied</del> <b>placed</b> in such a manner that they will not become <del>separated</del> <b>detach</b> from the container.	<b>Ecuador</b>
<b>8.1.2</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent,	<b>USA</b> Suggest consistency with the GSLPF language, which states, "under

readily legible <u>under normal conditions of purchase and applied in such a manner that any tampering with it will be evident.</u> <del>use.</del>	normal conditions of purchase and use.” The proposed language is less flexible.
<b>8.1.2</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent, readily legible and applied in such a manner that any tampering with it will be evident.	<b>Dominican Republic</b> We reiterate that we consider this draft must be named as a Guideline or orientation..
<b>8.1.2.</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent, readily legible and applied in such a manner that any tampering with it will be evident.	<b>Dominican Republic</b>
<b>8.1.2</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent, readily legible and applied in such a manner that any tampering with it will be evident.	<b>Colombia</b> Delete the text in brackets "this Standard", as the proposed document is intended to provide orientations which are more consistent with the Guidelines
<b>8.1.2</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of <del>[these Guidelines] / [this Standard]</del> <u>these Guidelines</u> or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent, readily legible and applied in such a manner that any tampering with it will be evident.	<b>Chile</b> Chile supports to be Guideline
<b>8.1.2</b> Information and the statements required to appear on the label by virtue of [these Guidelines] / [this Standard] or any other Codex Standards shall be clear, prominent, readily legible <b><u>and applied/placed in such a manner as to support evidently that any tampering with it.</u></b>	<b>Ecuador</b>
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it <del>or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.</del>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand support the minimum mandatory requirement outlined in section 5 being on the label and legible to handlers of these containers.
<b>8.1.3</b> Where <del>the a non-retail container(s) container</del> is covered by a wrapper <u>transparent</u> , the wrapper <del>shall</del> container should carry the <del>necessary</del> required information, or the label on the <del>non-retail container</del> containers inside shall <u>carry the mandatory information and</u> be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it <del>or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities</del> <u>transparent container.</u>	<b>Australia</b> Australia notes that the definition of ‘container’ in the GSLPF includes wrappers and therefore the wrapper itself could be a non-retail container. We therefore suggest section 8.1.3 is expanded to allow for the situation whereby the non-retail container itself is transparent (such as a transparent wrapper) and the label beneath it can be read. We also are unclear why a non-retail container covered by a wrapper is able to provide information through means other than set out in the

	guidance/standard i.e. as agreed among competent authorities. We propose the following amendments:
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.	<p><b>Thailand</b></p> <p>Thailand is of the opinion that wrapper can obstruct certain practices in handling the non-retail containers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If wrapper obscures the information on the label, it may require operators or officers to open up wrapper for examination.</li> <li>- Requesting business to place duplicate information, of which already displayed on label, onto the wrapper is also not very feasible.</li> <li>- Another concern is that if this provision allows all information declared on the label to be exchanged through other means, it may compromise the mandatory provisions of the earlier section.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, we propose the working group to consider this section carefully.</p>
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it <del>or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.</del>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>Brazil considers that the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible in all conditions, including when it is covered by a wrapper. As already pointed out by us, the proposed approach already separates the information that should be on the label from the information that can be transmitted by other means. Thus, it does not make sense to allow information that is essential for declaration on the label may be exchanged through other means. Therefore, we propose deleting the last sentence.</p>
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by <del>it</del> <u>it</u> , or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.	<p><b>ICBA</b></p> <p>ICBA suggests adding a comma before “or the information ...” as shown below as it improves the readability of the sentence.</p>
<del><b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it or the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.</del>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p> <p>We feel that this is redundant, as this is covered by the other principles</p>
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the necessary information, or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it <del>or</del> <u>or</u> , the information may be exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities.	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p>
<b>8.1.3</b> Where the non-retail container(s) is covered by a wrapper, the wrapper shall carry the compulsory/necessary information or the label on the non-retail container shall be readily legible through the outer wrapper or not obscured by it; or the information may be	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p>

<p>exchanged through other means as agreed among the competent authorities <u>as long as the compulsory information is declared in the primary container.</u></p>	
<p><b>8.1.4</b> The mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a prominent position on the non-retail container and in the same field of vision.</p>	
<p><b>8.1.4</b> The mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a prominent <del>position</del> <u>position</u> on the non-retail container and in the same field of vision.</p>	<p><b>Iran</b> Using capital large fonts</p>
<p><b>8.1.4</b> The mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a prominent position on the non-retail container and in the same field of vision. <b>8.1.5</b> <u>Where a container may be used for retail or non-retail use a manufacturer may chose to label according to the General Standard for Labelling of Pre-packaged foods rather than in conformity with this guideline.</u></p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b> Suggest an additional provision to cover cases where the manufacturer may foresee that the food may be purchased by a consumer, even if that was not their intent. The manufacturer may decide to label in accordance with the Codex General Standard for Labelling of pre-packaged Food.</p>
<p><b>8.1.4</b> The mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a prominent position on the <u>commercial non-retail</u> container <del>and in the same field of vision.</del></p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> We propose to delete the phrase <del>and in the same field of vision</del></p>
<p><b>8.1.4</b> The mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a <del>prominent</del> <u>stand out and easily visible</u> position on the <u>non commercial non-retail</u> container <del>and in the same field of vision.</del></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica believes that it is not possible to ensure that the label on a non-retail container will be always placed in the same field of vision, given the kind of manipulation that will have. In addition, it is not applicable. It is relevant in this case that it will be in a prominent position and that it coul be easily observed</p>
<p><b>8.1.4</b> <b>The</b> mandatory information requirements on label (Section 5) shall appear in a prominent position on the non-retail container and in the same field of vision.</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> For point 8.1.4 we suggest removing the obligation that the mandatory reporting requirements have to appear in the same field of vision.  8.1.4. We don't agree that certain mandatory elements have to be in the same field of vision as it depends on the available space and dimensions of non-retail container. Also, considering that it is not destine for the end consumer, and that there is possibility of sending attachet documents, it will not be critical that all the elements are in the same field of vision.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 8.2 - LANGUAGE</b></p>	
<p><b>Language.</b> [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>
<p><b>Language.</b> [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> In accordance with the terminology used in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</p>

<p><del>8.2.1 If the language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in official language(s) of the country in which the product is sold</del>receiving country, a translation of the information in the labelling should be provided in the required language in the form of re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Within the scope of the international B2B exchange of goods, we maintain that the labelling of the goods only in English should be sufficient. This would be a genuine and useful simplification of the labelling, as individual labelled “non-retail containers” (with resulting costs and efforts) could be avoided. One single labelling of “non-retail containers” would be sufficient for the worldwide transport.</p>
<p><del>8.2.1 If the language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold</del>acceptable, a translation of the information in the labelling should be provided in the required language in the form of re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents <del>to meet</del> <u>containing the requirements of the country</u> <del>mandatory information in which the product is sold</del>. <u>required language may be used instead of relabeling.</u></p>	<p><b>USA</b> Suggest we be as consistent as possible with GSLPF, Section 8.2.1, which states, “If the language on the original label is not acceptable, to the consumer for whom it is intended, a supplementary label containing the mandatory information in the required language may be used instead of relabelling.” We would also propose to add additional flexibility by allowing the translation to be in accompanying documents</p>
<p>8.2.1 If the language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold, a translation of the information in the labelling should be provided in the required language in the form of re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>Iran</b> It is better to mention clearly that the producer should afford the required language in the form of re-labelling.</p>
<p>8.2.1 If the language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold, a translation of the information in the labelling should be provided in the required language in the form of re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold.</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> Brazil believes that all mandatory information requirements on label should be provided in the required language by the country in which the product will be sold either in the form of re-labelling or in supplementary label.  We consider that in some cases providing information in the required language only by the accompanying documents could create obstacles for an appropriate identification of the non-retail container. In this regard, it is important to consider that may be difficulties in translating and associating the information present in the document with the correspondent container.</p>
<p><del>8.2.1 If the</del> <u>The preferred language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold, a translation of the information in the labelling should be provided in the required language in the form of re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents</u> <u>English</u> to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold <u>facilitate business to business relationships.</u></p>	<p><b>CEFS</b> The preferred language should be English to ease B2B relationships.</p>
<p>8.2.1. If <u>When</u> the language <u>in which the original label is written</u> original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold, a</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> In accordance with the terminology used in the General Standard for</p>



translation of the information in the labelling <del>should</del> <u>has to be provided</u> in the required language in <del>the form of</del> a re-labelling, supplementary label and/or in the accompanying documents to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold.	the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.
<b>8.2.1</b> If the language in the original labelling is not acceptable to the competent authority in the country in which the product is sold, A SUPPLEMENTARY LABEL TRANSLATED TO THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE TARGET COUNTRY DECLARING ALL THE COMPULSORY INFORMATION and/or in the accompanying documents to meet the requirements of the country in which the product is sold.	<b>Ecuador</b>
8.2.2 The information provided through translation in the required language shall fully and accurately reflect that in the original labelling.	
8.2.2 The information provided through translation in the required language shall <del>fully</del> <u>completely and exactly</u> <del>accurately</del> reflect the information <u>appearing</u> in <del>that in</del> the original labelling.	<b>Costa Rica</b> In accordance with the terminology used in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.
<b><u>ANNEX – SOME EXAMPLES OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</u></b>	
<b><u>SOME EXAMPLES OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</u></b>	<b>Thailand</b> Thailand appreciates the examples given for non-retail containers. We are of the opinion that it might be even clearer if we insert other examples of single package under FC 1. Since the draft has already contained FC 1.2 for multiple packs and clearly identify the differentiation between non-retail and prepackage. Therefore, if the same description be applied to FC 1.1, for food in single package, it will provide better clarification.
<b><u>SOME EXAMPLES OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</u></b> PROPOSE TO DELETE THE ANNEX	<b>Brazil</b> As already pointed out by Brazil, we consider that the examples of non-retail containers presented in annex was a very useful during the elaboration of the document helping to clarify the scope and definitions of the text. However, as there has been a significant advance in relation to these items, we consider that the it is no longer necessary and can be deleted. In this sense, it is important to consider that its interpretation may be confusing when performed outside the standard drafting process.
<b><u>SOME EXAMPLES OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</u></b>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We notice that a new concept is being put forward in this annex “not non-retail containers”
<b><u>SOME EXAMPLES OF NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</u></b>	<b>Nicaragua</b>

	Nicaragua considers that this example is not clear and does not add to the understanding of the document. Additionally, it suggests taking into account that at the Codex level (CCGP) there is a debate regarding the inclusion of examples in the texts of Codex.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------