



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 6

CX/FL 19/45/6 Add.1 Rev.1

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

Forty-fifth Session  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
13 - 17 May 2019

### PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING

(Replies to CL 2019/14-FL)

*Comments of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iran, Jamaica, Kuwait, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay, USA, BEUC CEFS, Consumers International, ESSNA, Food Industry Asia; FoodDrink Europe, ICBA, ICGMA, IDF/FIL, IFU, IUFOST, World Federation of Public Health associations,*

#### Background

1. This document compiles comments received through the Codex Online Commenting System (OCS) in response to CL 2019/14-FL issued in February 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 II** are the comments received by email.

Text	Comment
<p>GENERAL COMMENT: Argentina, wishes to point out the significant difference that exists in the writing of the document in the English version, with respect to the Spanish version.</p> <p>The coordination of the working group is requested to take this aspect into consideration, in order to facilitate the work and avoid inappropriate interpretations.</p>	<b>Argentina</b>
<p>Policy coherence between the work of Codex and WHO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed draft guidelines on Front-of-Pack Nutrition Labelling could be more consistent with the World Health Organization principles and framework manual for front-of-pack labelling for promoting healthy diets. There are some significant differences between the two sets of draft guidelines including in reference to addressing non-communicable diseases (NCDs) and reference to the substantial body of work WHO has done on nutrient profiling, the scoring mechanisms underlying FOPNL.</li> </ul> <p>Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia's experience which has been highlighted during the current five year review of the Health Star Rating system has reinforced the role for government leadership in consumer trust and perceptions of system integrity.</li> <li>• There is no mention of a funding structure, however Australia notes from our experience that government ownership is key to public perception of trust and integrity.</li> <li>• The document should include some reference to conflict of interest processes. It is appropriate for the food industry to be consulted on the implementation of a FOPNL scheme, however significant industry involvement in design and governance may not be appropriate, particularly in countries with limited resources/extra susceptibility to undue influence, and may undermine the efficacy of a FOPNL scheme by creating consumer distrust.</li> <li>• Industry involvement in design/governance and a voluntary system (particularly without explicit and meaningful uptake and compliance targets) may have consequences for efficacy of FoPL in terms of health/consumer outcomes</li> <li>• Each country should retain the right to determine how they engage other stakeholders in the making of their health policies in accordance with their own legislative processes – it should not be required to make industry a collaborative partner as suggested by the current draft given the inherent risks of financial conflicts of interest. Consultation should be a sufficient minimum basis for procedural fairness.</li> <li>• Capacity for research to support development of a new FoPL scheme may be limited in some countries - This could be acknowledged, alongside reference to potential adoption of systems from other countries (for example Fiji's request to implement the HSR).</li> </ul> <p>Mandatory FOPNL and trade implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Codex has a dual mandate – to protect consumer health and promote fair trade practices. In considering whether to make FOPNL mandatory, countries don't only need to consider trade impacts, but whether a voluntary FOPNL would achieve the same health and consumer information outcomes. Recent work by WHO has encouraged mandatory FOPL (see for example WHO EURO HEN report, and WHO ECHO Report). This will be a matter for each country to consider.</li> </ul>	<b>Australia</b>
<p>Brazil generally agrees with the proposed draft. However, there are some provisions in sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 that need further considerations, as highlighted under specific comments.</p>	<b>Brazil</b>

<p>General comment</p> <p>It is proposed to consider the topics covered in the previous revision:</p> <p>Question 6.2</p> <p>How can Codex address the principles to support harmonization?</p> <p>Question 6.3</p> <p>If each country requires a different system, which is consistent with the FOPNL principles, how can Codex better support its mandate to support public health and fair trade practices?</p>	<p><b>Colombia</b></p>
<p>HIGH IN" WARNING LABELS TO BE CONSIDERED FOPNL: Underscoring this document should be the acknowledgement that "High in" Warning Labels Should be Considered a FOPNL. Interpretive front-of-pack labels are recommended by the WHO in their report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity, and warning labels such as "high in sugar" are considered to be such "interpretive labels". Thus, "High In" labels form part of the WHO definition of FOPNL. To ensure consistency and policy coherence, Codex documents should also consider such labels to be FOPNL.</p> <p>Furthermore, various countries who are developing or have developed such warning labels also consider them to be FOPNL. In fact, FAO and PAHO have publicly lauded the "High In" warning label put forth in Chile as an example of front-of-pack labelling that the rest of the world should follow. It is prudent for Codex to include such labels in the definition of FOPNL.</p>	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p>
<p>POLICY COHERENCE: It is critical that Codex FOPNL guidelines are coherent with regional and international recommendations put forth by WHO. WHO and its regional offices have issued important documents to guide the nutritional criteria of foods and beverages that can provide scientific evidence for the development of national FOPNL systems. Importantly, Codex actions should ensure coherence with the work of WHO and WHO regional offices with respect to FOPNL.</p> <p>Codex guidelines should be consistent with the WHO Guideline: sugar intake for adults and children, WHO regional Nutrient Profile Models, such as that of PAHO, as well as recommendations for labelling in the Global Action Plan for Noncommunicable Diseases, the WHO report of the Commission to End Childhood Obesity and the PAHO Action Plan for the prevention of obesity in children and adolescents. It is important to keep in mind that Codex's mandate is to not only address trade concerns but also address consumer health (<a href="http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/en/">http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/en/</a>) and considering that the Codex is a committee created by FAO and WHO it is imperative that Codex guidelines are coherent with the recommendations put forth by WHO and FAO.</p>	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p>
<p>SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The entire document lacks an acknowledgement of the harms of conflict of interest in policy formation.</p> <p>While, historically, Codex committees have set standards with the extensive involvement of industry groups as Recognized Observers, there is growing recognition that industry involvement hinders, not helps health and consumer protection standards. For instance, the United Nations Secretary General's Independent Accountability Panel urged Member States to "design and commit to a comprehensive international binding convention to tackle rising obesity and NCDs among women, children and adolescents... As with the [Framework Convention on Tobacco Control] drafting process, rent-seeking interests should be excluded from the negotiations." Similarly, the World Cancer research Fund recommended conflict of interest safeguards in a report published this year, Building Momentum: Lessons on building a robust front-of-pack food label.</p> <p>The WHO's tool for safeguarding against possible conflicts of interest is a key reference that should be considered (available at <a href="http://www.who.int/nutrition/consultation-doi/comments/en/">http://www.who.int/nutrition/consultation-doi/comments/en/</a>) . It is also important to recognize that the FAO/WHO 2nd International Conference on Nutrition developed a Framework for Action as an outcome document <a href="http://www.fao.org/3/a-mm215e.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/a-mm215e.pdf</a> . This document has been agreed on by member states that recognizes the need</p>	<p><b>Consumers International .</b></p>

for safeguards against conflict of interest in policy development. It is imperative that this document acknowledges the need for safeguards against conflict of interest	
Costa Rica appreciates the opportunity offered to issue comments within the framework of this Committee. In this sense, we have analyzed the document and we want to detail some changes for greater clarity. Likewise, because the FOPNL systems are the result of specific national needs, Costa Rica recommends that the establishment of equivalence / mutual recognition agreements be considered to reduce trade barriers that may result from the use of different systems in different countries.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
We can agree with 4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons within categories and/or between categories.	<b>Food Industry Asia</b>
Guyana has reviewed this draft standard and found no reason that is sufficient to inhibit its adoption. Hence, we accept the Draft Guidelines on Front-of-Pack Nutrition Labeling	<b>Guyana</b>
We support this document being Annex 2 of the Guidelines for Nutrition labelling, with a cross-reference to it in section 5 of that Guideline, rather than inserted as text in section 5. This is because the format and level of detail of the document, with purpose, scope, principles etc is more appropriately presented in a stand-alone annex, than as subsections of the GNL. A minor amendment to section 5 to refer to Front-of Pack labelling and the annex will be required	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
we are agree with the proposal draft guidelines, and we have no comment.	<b>Iraq</b>
its good draft , so We are agree with proposal draft guidelines with regard.	<b>Iraq</b>
IUFoST does not see any additional value to this approach since existing nutritional labeling is already adequate to inform consumers, Any front of label additional nutritional labeling , which is not specified in the drat guidelines, would be more likely to be deceptive than informative. Either more specificity must be added to state what type of information can be put on the front label, of the proposed initiative should be dropped	<b>IUFOST .</b>
New Zealand would like to offer the following general comments on the draft guidelines on front of pack nutrition labelling. We support this guidance document being Annex 2 of the Guidelines for Nutrition labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985), with a cross-reference to it in section 5 of that Guideline. A minor amendment to section 5 to refer to Front-of Pack labelling and the annex will be required to refer to the new annex. New Zealand is cognisant that the World Health Organisation (WHO) has developed draft principles for front of pack nutrition labelling and recommends that this guidance takes account of these draft principles. In line with this, we would encourage the public release of the WHO document as soon as is practical to allow their consideration by CCFL. New Zealand also notes the relevance of the paper at agenda item 11, discussion paper on “Criteria for the definition of “high in” nutritional descriptors for fats, sugars and sodium” to the development of this guidance document. b) Supplementary nutrition labelling: New Zealand supports a slight modification to the wording of section 5 ‘supplementary nutrition labelling’ in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985) to refer to FOPNL. New Zealand proposes the following for consideration: 5. Supplementary NUTRITION INFORMATION Supplementary nutrition information is intended to increase the consumer’s understanding of the nutritional value of their food and to assist in interpreting the nutrient declaration. There are a number of ways of presenting such	<b>New Zealand</b>

<p>information that may be suitable for use on food labels.</p> <p>Front of pack nutrition labelling is a form of supplementary nutrition labelling. ANNEX 2 Provides guidance on the development and implementation of front of pack nutrition labelling.</p> <p>The use of supplementary nutrition information on food labels should be optional and should only be given in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration, except for target populations who have a high illiteracy rate and/or comparatively little knowledge of nutrition. For these, food group symbols or other pictorial or colour presentations may be used without the nutrient declaration.</p> <p>Supplementary nutrition information on labels should be accompanied by consumer education programmes to increase consumer understanding and use of the information.</p> <p>c) Next Steps:</p> <p>New Zealand recommends the following next steps to progress this guidance document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An eWG be formed to undertake the following work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Consideration and comparison of the draft guidance with regard to the WHO Principles on Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling (once the WHO document is publically released)</li> <li>o Finalise drafting for sections 1-4 of the guidance</li> <li>o Elaboration of considerations in section 5 of the guidance 'Other aspects to consider'</li> <li>o Propose amendments to section 5 of the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1985) 'Supplementary nutrition labelling' (if not finalised at CCFL)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A referral be made to the Codex Committee on nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses to consider the nutrients that should underpin FOPNL systems</li> </ul>	
<p>General comment:</p> <p>Uruguay does not agree with Codex to develop nutrient profiles for the application of the FOPNL, since this mandate corresponds to WHO and its regional offices</p>	<b>Uruguay</b>
<p>The United States recognizes the hard work of the Chair of the electronic working group, Costa Rica, and the Co-chair, New Zealand, and appreciates the opportunity to comment on this agenda item, Front of Package Nutrition Labeling (FOPNL)</p> <p>We believe that a revision and/or amendment to the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CXG 2-1985), specifically section 5, "Supplementary Nutrition Information" will be required as we move forward with this work. The committee should discuss whether this document will be inserted into the GNL or if it will be a standalone guidance document</p> <p>As noted in the electronic working group (EWG) report, the membership does not currently have access to the "WHO Guiding Principles and Framework Manual for Front-of-Pack Labelling for Promoting Healthy Diets." Since we have not been able to review this publication, we cannot consider the relevancy to this document. We understand one of the goals of the CCFL work is to increase harmonization of approaches to FOPNL systems; however, we do not believe that CCFL work should be held up by the absence of the publication of the WHO Guiding Principles.</p>	<b>USA</b>
<p>World Federation of Public Health Associations (WFPHA has two overarching comments in relation to omission from this Guideline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is essential that the role of FOPNL in addressing non-communicable disease be referenced appropriately. A substantial body of work by WHO on FOPNL recommends these labels as part of a suite of policies to address diet-related NCDs and this Guideline currently omits a single reference to these existing global mandates.</li> <li>- This Guideline is not currently coherent with the Draft WHO Guidance on this topic. It is essential that elements of best-practice health policy making from that document developed by the world's experts on FOPNL are integrated into</li> </ul>	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b>

these Guidelines to produce consistent guidance for policymakers considering FOPNL.	
---	--

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SECTIONS	MEMBER AND OR OBSERVER
<b>SECTION 1 - PURPOSE</b>	<b>JUSTIFICATION AND RATIONALE</b>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation, <u>as a tool to facilitate the consumer's identification of healthy foods as well as foods that increase risk for unhealthy diets, obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases.</u></p>	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p> <p>Justification for insertion of diet-related non-communicable diseases in purpose: The FOPNL is an initiative that has emerged out of the interest to prevent NCDs. This is clearly demonstrated by existing WHO documents. In the WHO report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity, as well as in the WHO Best Buys for Non-Communicable Diseases and the WHO Report of the High-Level Commission on Non-Communicable Diseases, the front-of-pack label is promoted as a strategy to reduce the burden of obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases. It is important to clarify this in the purpose.</p>
<p><b>Rewritten Purpose:</b></p> <p><u>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food in line with national, science-based dietary guidelines and to minimize potential barriers to trade due to inconsistent front of pack labeling standards</u></p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA suggests a statement be included in the purpose to indicate the importance of these guidelines to also facilitate trade in addition to supporting improved public health outcomes. The importance of developing the guidelines to support public health and to reduce trade barriers is well understood. Not including such a statement in the purpose is a missed opportunity to provide national governments and other stakeholders another reason to develop FOPL programs based on these guidelines.</p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, <u>a form of supplementary nutrition information</u>, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>By clearly indicating that the FOPNL is a form of supplementary nutrition information, which by definition in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling is a form of nutrition labelling, it ensures that the purpose and principles of those guidelines are also covered – including this key purpose: To ensure that nutrition labelling does not describe a product or present information about it which is in any way false, misleading, deceptive or insignificant in any manner, as well as the text set out in Sections 4.1 and 5 of these Guidelines.</p> <p>Furthermore, we strongly recommend that the following text in section 5.2 of the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling on supplementary nutrition information be amended, as a number of countries have already moved towards mandatory FOPNL systems.</p> <p>5.2 The use of supplementary nutrition information on food labels [DELETE: should be optional and] should only be given in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration, except for target populations who have a high illiteracy rate and/or comparatively little knowledge of nutrition. For these, food group symbols or other pictorial or colour presentations may be used without the nutrient declaration.</p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development <u>and implementation</u> of front-of-pack nutrition <del>labelling</del>labelling (FOPNL), as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national <u>public</u> health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>Not all countries have national dietary guidelines or national nutrition policies</p>

	<p>It should be sufficient that FOPNL are based on evidence-based national, regional or global dietary guidance</p> <p>It would also be useful here that FOPNL are recognised as part of comprehensive strategies to address diet-related NCDs, as acknowledged by WHO in several Mandates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases (GAP) and its updated Appendix 3</li> <li>- the High-Level Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity’s Report and Implementation Plan</li> <li>- the Framework for Action of the Joint WHO and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Second International Conference on Nutrition –</li> <li>- outcomes of specific FOPNL workshops hosted by WHO – including the forthcoming WHO Guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>We would suggest explicit reference to NCDs be reinstated to maintain policy coherence here with parallel processes at WHO. It could state</p> <p>‘to facilitate consumer identification of foods associated with increased risk of non-communicable diseases’</p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice of food consistent with <del>the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation</del> <u>national, regional and/or international dietary guidance.</u></p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>WFPHA continue to note that not all countries have national health and nutrition policies currently in force. The terms should allow reliance on national, regional and/or international dietary guidance.</p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the <del>development</del> <u>development, implementation and evaluation</u> of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>Aspects of this guideline cover implementation, monitoring and evaluation.</p>
<p><del>To provide general</del> <u>Provide general</u> guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice of food consistent with <u>national dietary guidance for the general population, including any existing national health and nutrition policy-policies</u> of the country of implementation.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand supports the proposed purpose but would like to suggest the above edits to help with clarity. New Zealand supports the inclusion of text “dietary guidance” which being a broader term can include dietary guidelines or other nutrition policies. We support the intent that where countries have dietary guidelines and/or national nutrition policies in place, any front of pack nutrition labelling scheme should be consistent with these. We have included the text ‘for the general population’ as we support FOPNL applying to foods for the general population. This is in line with the exclusion of most foods for special dietary uses from the scope of this guidance.</p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice <u>and understanding of food consistent in line with the international and/or national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation</u> <del>and</del> <u>dietary guidelines.</u></p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p>
<p>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p> <p>Proposal:</p>	<p><b>Guatemala</b></p> <p>Translation to Spanish could be improved.</p>



"Dar una orientación general para ayudar en el desarrollo del etiquetado nutricional en la parte frontal del envase, como una herramienta para facilitar la elección del alimento por parte del consumidor consistente con la política nacional de salud y nutrición del país donde se implementa	
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition <del>policy</del> <u>policy</u> <del>dietary guidelines</del> of the country of implementation.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food <del>consistent in line with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation</del> <u>national, science-based dietary guidance</u> .	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA recommends referring to dietary guidance instead of policy. Further, the purpose should note that the guidance must be science-based.
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food <u>toward a balanced diet</u> , consistent with the <u>evidence-based</u> national health and nutrition policy <u>and/or dietary guidelines</u> of the country of implementation.	<b>CEFS</b> CEFS still considers that the first aim of FOPNL systems is to better inform consumers and help them achieving a balanced diet.  In addition, while we understand that certain countries may not have dietary guidelines in place, we consider that any policy should at least be evidence-based in order to be taken into account.
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate <u>to the consumer</u> <del>consumer's</del> <u>the</u> choice of <u>healthy</u> food <del>consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador is partially in agreement with the proposed text and new text is suggested at the end of the paragraph (in bold and underlined), as it has been eliminated " consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation "
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy <u>or the food guidelines</u> of the country of implementation	<b>Uruguay</b> This comment was proposed in the previous revision stage, and we reiterate it.
<del>Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</del> Provide general guidance to assist in <u>the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's understanding about the nutritional content, that allows making an informed consumption decision</u>	<b>Colombia</b> The purpose should be focused on facilitating the understanding of the nutritional content by the consumer to allow an informed purchase .
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate <del>the consumer's choice of food choices</del> <u>consistent by the consumer</u> , <u>consistent</u> with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Provide general guidance <del>to assist in</del> the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, <del>as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food</del> <u>consistent</u> with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation as a tool to facilitate the <u>consumer's understanding and choice of food</u>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua supports the purpose proposal, but suggests editorial adjustments to improve its understanding.
Provide general <u>guidance</u> to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, <u>as a tool to facilitate</u> <u>guide</u> the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition <u>policy</u> of the country of implementation	<b>Peru</b>
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health	<b>Ecuador</b>

and nutrition policy of the country of implementation	
Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation	<p><b>IFU</b></p> <p>IFU proposes that the guidelines shall be in line with supranational/regional, science-based dietary guidance.</p> <p>Proposed amended wording: Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food in line with supranational/regional, science-based dietary guidance.</p>
<b>SECTION 2 SCOPE:</b>	
<b>SCOPE:</b>	<p><b>Guatemala</b></p> <p>Item 2.1 agree. Item 2.2 agree with text clarification. Delete word "certain" from the text, as foods for special dietary uses have specific Codex labelling requirements. Item 2.3 agree with first bullet. For second bullet we suggest adding... "Foods in small units, or with other packaging limitations e.g. glass returnable package."</p>
<b>SCOPE:</b>	<p><b>International Special Dietary Food Industries</b></p> <p>ISDI welcomes the recognition by the eWG that it is inappropriate to apply a FOPNL developed for foods for the general population to certain foods. ISDI supports the current proposal in paragraph 2.2.; the clarification on the exclusion of Foods for Special Dietary Uses (FSDU) and the clear distinction between exemption and exclusion.</p>
<b>Section 2.1</b>	
2.1 These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) <u>whether voluntary or mandatory</u> to be used on pre-packaged foods <sup>1</sup> <u>for retail sale</u> that include a nutrient declaration. <sup>2</sup>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA generally supports the proposed scope, although we suggest several additions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICGMA supports exemptions for alcoholic beverages and foods for special dietary uses such as infant formula, food for infants, sports foods or drinks, foods for special medical purposes.</li> <li>• ICGMA supports exemptions for foods with special packaging limitations that make it difficult to make such labeling changes. We encourage exclusion of glass reusable bottles and similar packaging where label information is embossed/printed into bottles or other packaging given the difficulty, cost, and environmental impact associated with changing the way these products are labeled. Although we are not seeking an exemption if the reusable packaging displays paper/stickered labels (which are more easily changed), there are still countries where the label is embossed directly onto or into the packaging (such as being etched into glass). Therefore, such changes could require the entire existing packaging stock to be discarded.</li> <li>• ICGMA requests clarification on the term "food service". Does this refer to the foods included in the definition of "foods for catering purposes" in the General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods? If so, ICGMA recommends using "foods for catering purposes" instead as there is a Codex definition and therefore may be more easily understood. The text should not be understood as referring to menu labelling.</li> <li>• ICGMA supports an exemption for foods not sold directly to consumers such as food service products and foods with special packaging limitations that make it extremely difficult to make such labeling changes.</li> <li>• In terms of shelf tags, it should be clearly acknowledged that this guidance is</li> </ul>

	<p>not designed for this purpose, but that there may be benefits to consistency between the FOPNL and shelf tags, etc. We do not object to additional nutritional information being provided near the point of display in a retail setting, but do not believe this type of labeling meets the spirit or definition of FOPL as the inclusion of information on or near foods as this is not generally understood meet the definition of "Front-of-pack" labeling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ICGMA notes that there is CCFL work on the labelling of foods for e-commerce/internet sales. Given the potential overlap between FOPNL and internet sales/ecommerce, ICGMA would like to stress the importance of consistency in these areas.</li> </ul>
<p>2.1 These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (<del>FOPNL</del> to be (FOPNL), whether on a voluntary or mandatory basis, used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> that include a nutrient declaration, including where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service) or where foods are sold online (e.g. information available at point of purchase or on websites).<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It should be clarified that FOP nutrition labelling can be voluntary or mandatory. Either way, these guidelines are applicable</li> <li>- Perhaps better to use "foods for catering purposes" (aligned with the General Standard on the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods) instead of "food service"?</li> <li>- For consistency, these guidelines should also be directly applicable to other forms of provision of simplified nutrition information in the way suggested as per the track changes.</li> </ul>
<p>2.1 These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> that include a nutrient declaration.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>As already pointed out by Brazil during the e-WG discussions, the work on FOPNL must guarantee consistency with the provisions of supplementary nutrition information in the Guidelines for Nutrition Labelling as defined in the with the project document approved by CCFL (Appendix III of REP 18/FL).</p> <p>In this sense, the second paragraph of section 5 of the Guidelines of Nutrition Labelling already states that supplementary nutrition information might be provided without the nutrient declaration for target populations that have a high illiteracy rate or comparatively little knowledge of nutrition.</p> <p>Thus, we do not support restricting the scope of FOPNL to pre-packaged foods that include nutrient declaration. We suggest deleting that the last part of the first sentence.</p>
<p>2.1 These guidelines apply to <u>voluntary</u> front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> that include a nutrient declaration.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p>
<p>2.1 These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (<del>FOPNL</del>)-(FOPNL), whether <u>voluntary or mandatory</u>, to be used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> <u>for retail sale</u> that include a nutrient declaration.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>ICBA</b></p> <p>2.1 ICBA proposes the additional language below to clarify that these guidelines apply to foods sold in the retail environment.</p>
<p>These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> that include a <del>nutrient</del> declaration of <b>critical</b> nutrients<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>EI Salvador</b></p> <p>EI Salvador, in 2.1, is in partial agreement with the paragraph and has added text, in bold and underlined, about "critical" nutrients".</p> <p>The term of critical nutrients is added in function of the work presently being developed on establishing a nutrient profile within the CCNFSDU. Countries will be able to determine which nutrients will be included in the FOPNL and therefore superscript No. 2 is eliminated.</p>
<p>2.1. These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods<sup>1</sup> <del>that include a nutrient declaration</del>.<sup>2</sup></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p> <p>In the <i>Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling</i> CAC / GL 2-1985, it is established that they</p>

	<p>apply to all foods. Given the above, the second sentence could be confusing. In addition to this, the inclusion of a nutrient declaration is already contemplated in the principles.</p>
2.1. These guidelines apply to nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods that include a nutrient declaration	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p> <p>Ecuador requests to include those processed foods which, in their formulation, no other ingredients have been added, such as salt / sodium, sugar and fat; since they are considered by the World Health Organization as critical nutrients that contribute to the presence of Non Communicable Diseases-NCD.</p>
2.1 These guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) to be used on pre-packaged foods that include a nutrient declaration.	<p><b>IFU</b></p> <p>IFU proposes that the guidelines apply to front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) whether on a voluntary or mandatory basis.</p>
<b>Section 2.2</b>	
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del> , foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup> .	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p> <p>Sports drinks and food for infants and young children are a source of added sugars in the diet and consumers should be aware of their excessive sugar content. The proposed exclusion of sports foods and drinks is particularly alarming, due to its lack of specificity and potential breadth. Products marketed as "sports foods and drinks" are increasingly prevalent, yet they may contain significant quantities of nutrients that are associated with increased burdens of non-communicable diseases. Furthermore, foods for vulnerable populations such as young children, should receive a FOPNL, especially because added sugars and sodium could be especially harmful to these populations because of their low threshold for intake of these nutrients. There is no apparent reason for excluding these products from FOPNL systems. Consumers would benefit from FOPNL on these products.</p>
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, including foods for infants and young children</del> <sup>new</sup> , sports foods or drinks]drinks, foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup> .	<p><b>Food Industry Asia</b></p> <p>Suggest to delete "infant formula" as this is included as one of the foods for infants and young children and to add a new footnote stating "as specified in General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985)".</p>
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain <del>Certain</del> foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, formula and foods for infants and young children</del> <sup>new</sup> infants, sports foods or drinks]], foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup> .	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Canada recommends removing alcoholic beverages, foods for young children, and sports foods and drinks from the exclusion and modifying the text of 2.2.</p> <p>Alcoholic beverages: Canada recognizes the association between alcohol and health harms. However, given that plain and mixed alcoholic drinks can be a significant source of Calories, particularly those containing sugars and fat, FOPNL may be warranted on these products.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the type of system being applied (e.g. systems that promote healthier choices, such as endorsement logos and summary indicator system vs. systems that show a judgement or recommendation, such as warning labels and traffic lights) and the existing nutrition labelling requirements of the country of implementation.</p> <p>Canada recommends that alcoholic beverages be "exempt" from displaying a FOPNL</p>

	<p>vs. “excluded”. Recommend including this in section 2.3 instead.</p> <p>Foods for special dietary uses: Canada agrees with exclusions for foods that are often the primary or sole source of nutrition for vulnerable groups and are used under medical supervision. Therefore, exclusion from FOPNL should be limited in this case to infant formula and foods, foods for special dietary uses and foods for special medical purposes that have specific nutrient composition requirements.</p> <p>Canada does not necessarily agree that exclusions should apply to products that are not designed as sole-source nutrition and are available for the general population. These foods can be high in sugars, sodium and/or fat and consumers should be aware in order to make an informed decision. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special diet foods that are readily available on the market (e.g. gluten-free)</li> <li>- Foods for young children (e.g. toddler snacks, ready-to-eat mixed dishes)</li> <li>- Sports foods (e.g. energy bars, gels) and drinks</li> </ul> <p>In addition, sports foods or drinks are not defined in Codex texts and there may be a wide range of foods included in this category. Many products marketed as sports drinks are consumed as beverages by the general population.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children<del>children</del>, sports foods or drinks]</b>, <del>foods for special medical purposes are excluded</del> <b>sports foods or drinks and foods for special medical purposes are excluded</b><sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>ESSNA</b></p> <p>Sports food is not defined in EU legislation and is since July 2016 regulated under general food law, having been excluded from the definition of foods for special dietary used and not falling within the scope of Regulation (EU) No 609/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council on food intended for infants and young children, food for special medical purposes, and total diet replacement for weight control ('Food for Specific Groups') which was adopted on 12 June 2013 and applies from 20 July 2016.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</b>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>BEUC</b></p> <p>Sports foods and drinks should not be granted an automatic exemption from any FOPNL scheme. They are products which are often consumed by the general population, not just athletes. Children can also consume these products regularly in spite of their often high content of sugar. These products are also not currently legally defined by the EU</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant and follow-up formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</b>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>Australia notes there is concern that some ‘sports food and drinks’, products are consumed as part of a “regular” diet t and are to be considered alongside “regular” products, but notes this distinction/definition is difficult to make (even with something as explicit as the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code)</p> <p>Suggest including codex standards references here for infant formula and follow on formula, foods for special medical purposes and meal replacements for weight loss.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</b>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>We agree with the exclusion for infant formula as per existing international frameworks that regulate the marketing of these products.</p> <p>We also agree with the exclusions already accepted here for special dietary uses and medical purposes.</p> <p>Exclusions for some other products in the brackets will depend upon the form of FOPNL</p>

	<p>selected.</p> <p>While we agree broadly that FOPNL should not be used to suggest any alcohol is 'healthy', if the system selected is a nutrient-specific warning label, this may still apply usefully to alcohol, particularly mixed-alcoholic drinks.</p> <p>Nutrient-specific warnings may also be appropriate for sports foods where these are not well-defined and are frequently consumed by the general population (e.g. electrolyte drinks high in sugar).</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including including but not limited to, infant formula, follow up formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks], meal replacements for weightloss and</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>[3]</sup>.</p> <p><u>.FOPNL should not be used on these foods or on foods that are regulated at a national level as [special purpose food / foods for special dietary uses].</u></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand understands and generally supports the intent of preventing alcoholic beverages from bearing FOPNL. However in countries that use 'warning type' FOPNL the extension of this to alcoholic beverages may be something those countries would consider. Given most countries exempt alcohol from a mandatory nutrient declaration, the intent that FOPNL only be in addition to the mandatory nutrient declaration would likely limit the application of FOPNL on alcohol. New Zealand recommends there is a discussion by the CCFL on whether the guidance should refer to alcoholic beverages being excluded or exempted from FOPNL.</p> <p>The current wording of 2.2 could be edited to improve clarity on what would be considered 'foods for special dietary uses'. New Zealand has provided suggested edits to the text above. It would be helpful to provide reference to the appropriate Standard where there are Codex standards for specific Foods for Special Dietary Uses (ie Infant formula, follow on formula, food for special medical purposes and meal replacements for weight loss). Some countries may have specific regulation at a national level which clarifies which foods are considered special purpose foods.</p> <p>The issue of sports foods or drinks needs greater discussion by CCFL. Sports foods are not defined by Codex and different countries may view what products are included under the term 'sports foods' differently. Note that in NZ and Australia the category for 'formulated supplemented sports foods' which is considered a special purpose food, however other foods are marketed as sports foods that do not fall into this category. In this case Formulated Supplementary Sports Foods are excluded from the Health Star Rating system as are all other special purpose foods as defined by either Codex or national legislation.</p> <p>The last part of footnote 3 is unclear and could be reworded as follows to improve clarity. "Exemptions are where the food does not have to have FOPNL, but where FOPNL is used voluntarily this guidance applies"</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses (FN1) <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p><u>1 CODEX STAN 146-1985, "Foods for Special Dietary Uses are those foods which are specially processed or formulated to satisfy particular dietary requirements which exist because of a particular physical or physiological condition and/or specific diseases and disorders and which are presented as such.1 The composition of these foodstuffs must differ significantly from the composition of ordinary foods of comparable nature, if such ordinary foods exist."</u></p>	<p><b>USA</b></p> <p>We should consider footnoting to the definition of "foods for special dietary uses" which is in CODEX STAN 146-1985, "Foods for Special Dietary Uses" and removing that bracketed text, some of which is not consistent with the definition in the Standard.</p> <p>If the intent of "sports foods" was to include dietary supplements, then that should be clearly stated. We do not believe that non-supplement sports foods and drinks should be excluded because they may be commonly consumed and may be a considerable contributor to the overall diet.</p>

<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</b>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> FoodDrinkEurope supports the exclusion from the scope of foods for special dietary uses.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, <del>sports foods or drinks</del>sports foods or drinks]</b>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Iran</b> They should include nutrition labels</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <u>(insert new footnote - As defined in the General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985))</u> <b>[including infant formula, including foods for infants and young children, <del>sports foods or drinks</del>formula foods for use in weight control diets, and</b> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>International Special Dietary Food Industries</b></p> <p>To ensure the clarity of the guidelines, and in line with the approach taken in these guidelines for referencing other Codex texts, ISDI recommends the addition of a footnote to reference the General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985), which defines FSDU.</p> <p>The definition of Foods for Special Dietary Uses (FSDU) can be found in the General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985) in section 2.1 on Description. In that section, the footnote 1 clearly identifies that FSDU include foods for infants and young children.</p> <p>Foods for infants and young children encompass infant formula, follow on formula and [name of the product] for young children, under discussion in the frame of the Codex FUF revision, Processed Cereal-Based Foods for Infants and Young Children, Canned Baby Foods and Formulated Complementary Foods for Older Infants and Young Children.</p> <p>Therefore, ISDI suggests to keep the simple reference to “foods for infants and young children” as specified in General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985).</p> <p>ISDI would also like to stress that sports foods and sports drinks, when meeting the definition of FSDU, are FSDU. On that basis, many countries around the world recognise the sport food category as an FSDU and have established specific regulations and/or guidelines for these products. In these countries, a clear distinction exists at national level between general food marketed to sport people (including energy drinks) and FSDU for sport people (such as carbohydrate electrolytes drinks, protein supplements etc.).</p> <p>In that context ISDI would also like to flag the CEN initiative for an Antidoping Standard that recognises the specific nature and role of these products.</p> <p>Considering the differences in the classification of sports foods and drinks as FSDU around the world, ISDI recommends to list as examples FSDU categories of products covered by specific Standards, such as foods for infants and young children, formula foods for use in weight control diets and foods for special medical purposes, and to delete the sports foods or drinks reference. It should however be noted in the CCFL report that countries can still decide to consider sports foods and drinks as FSDU and exclude them from FOPNL.</p> <p>In addition, and to build on the principle of referring to product categories covered by a specific Standard under the FSDU category, ISDI would suggest the inclusion in the list of Formula Foods for Use in Weight Control Diets (CODEX STAN 181-1991). This Standard covers products also called meal replacement or slimming food, where the</p>

	<p>product must provide 30% of nutrients intake and therefore the application of FOPNL would be illogical. ISDI believes the example of this exclusion to be important, as the rational/ground for the exclusion is different compared to the other FSDU.</p> <p>ISDI would also like to stress, in that perspective, Formula Foods for Use in Very Low Energy Diets for Weight Reduction, covered by CODEX STAN 203-1995 are FSMP and are consequently already covered in the exclusions.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic <del>beverages and certain beverages,</del> foods for special dietary uses and vitamin and mineral food supplements <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p> <p>In relation to the exclusions, we recommend using the same terminology that is already present in the Guidelines of Nutrition Labelling and other related Codex documents.</p> <p>It should be noted that foods for special dietary uses are not restricted to infant formula, food for infants and foods for special medical purposes. Codex documents do not recognize sports foods or drinks as foods for special dietary uses. Thus, we suggest deleting these examples.</p> <p>Additionally, we would like to propose including the vitamin and mineral food supplements that are covered by the Guidelines for Vitamin and Mineral Food Supplements as an exemption. These products are intended for use in supplementing the daily diet with vitamins and minerals.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <u>infant formula (CODEX STAN 72-1981), follow-on formula (CODEX STAN 156-1987), Standard for Formula Foods for Use in Very Low Energy Diets for Weight Reduction (CODEX STAN 203-1995</u> <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p> <p>We recommend providing links to Codex standards for specific Foods for Special Dietary Uses which should be excluded from FOPNL. This provides clarity as the square brackets currently include foods where FOPNL may be appropriate (e.g. foods for young children) but omits some which should be excluded (e.g. follow-up formula). The square brackets should refer to infant formula, follow-on formula, Food for Special Medical Purposes and Use in Very Low Energy Diets for Weight Reduction with appropriate Codex standards linked.</p> <p>We do not recommend, sports food be included in the list of foods which are excluded from carrying FOPNL. There is no Codex standard for these products and there are national variations in determining foods as sports foods. If necessary, where a national authority has a designated sports food classification they can opt to exclude such foods or not.</p> <p>It is important however that the development of a FOPNL system consider how it should be applied to foods with specified compositional requirements such as sports foods. We therefore suggest sports foods are deleted from the square brackets above, but addressed under section 5.2 (see below).</p> <p>Foods for infants and young children should not be listed as an exclusion as there needs to be some accountability for the formulation of foods for young children. This also could be addressed under section 5.2.</p> <p>The last part of footnote 3 is unclear and needs rewording. The sentence states. "Exemptions are where the food does not have to have FOPNL, but if it does, it does not affect its application". It is unclear what is meant by 'affect its application'.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <b>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</b> foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Kuwait</b></p>



<p>We recommend that sports foods and drinks should be included in the scope of foods with FOPNL. This is because these are very popular items consumed by very important age group i.e. the youth. These items are readily accessible in retail stores.</p>	
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, and foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador supports the text in square brackets</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, and foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic agrees to include the information between brackets in this paragraph 2.2</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> Place the footnote referring to the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses</i> CODEX STAN 146-1985, and related standards CODEX STAN181-1991, CAC/GL 55-2005, CODEX STAN 72-1981, CODEX STAN 156-1987 where the concepts related to food for special regimes are best described.</p>
<p><del>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>. <u>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, food for medical purposes for infants, young children and adults, dietary supplements are excluded<sup>3</sup></u></p>	<p><b>Argentina</b> Justification: This drafting proposal considers that formulas for infants, foods for infants and young children, foods for medical purposes intended for infants, young children and adults and dietary supplements, given their specificity of use are covered by other regulations (with a particular treatment) and, therefore, they must be exempted from being subject to front-of-pack labeling</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, and foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b> In the national legislation of Uruguay, food for infants and young children are not exempted from front-of-pack labeling, as these foods may have an excessive content of nutrients associated with non-communicable diseases.</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>. <u>2.2 Excluded are alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses such as infant formula, foods for special medical purposes or sport foods or drinks, which have defined limits for nutrients or food factors that are considered for FOPNL, according to the regulatory policy of each country.</u></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> The proposal of Chile to modify paragraph 2.2 responds to the opinion those foods whose formulation is in compliance with medical nutritional principles scientifically accepted or internationally recognized, since these types of foods have specific composition requirements. However, not all these types of foods have limits defined in standards or Codex guidelines for nutrients or food factors that are considered for the FOPNL.  In addition, Chile recommends, that the CCFNSDU updates the parameters of the applicable standards or guidelines of the Comitee, such as CODEX STAN 73-1981, CODEX STAN 74-1981 and CAC/GL 8 - 1991).</p>
<p>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks]</del>, foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup>. <u>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses [including infant formula, follow-up formula (6-36 months) (or the</u></p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> The requirements for "follow-up formula" (6-36 months), are contemplated in the Codex Standard for follow-up formula Codex Stan 156-1987.</p>

<u>name that is going to be assigned to this category), sports foods or drinks], foods for special medical purposes are excluded</u>	
<del>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses [including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks], foods for special medical purposes are excluded<sup>3</sup></del> <u>2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses are excluded<sup>3</sup></u>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p> <p>Costa Rica supports excluding foods for special dietary uses, taking into account the scope of CAC / GL 2-1985. Those are foods with modifications in their composition or with nutritional compositions regulated by specific standards that would not be destined for consumption by all the population.</p> <p>However, sports food and drinks are not defined in Codex standards and they are more widely distributed in the population, which could lead to problems of application since there are no clear criteria for exclusion. Therefore, Costa Rica does not support keeping the text in brackets.</p>
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p> <p>Nicaragua considers that these examples can be confusing, especially in the case of "sports foods or drinks", since they are not defined in Codex texts and there may be a wide range of foods included in this category. Additionally, the general population consumes this type of food and beverages, even if they are marketed for special consumption purposes..</p>
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p> <p>We believe that the exclusion is maintained, but sports foods and drinks are also a pre-packaged food and fall within the scope of this guideline. Additionally, we request to explain further the exclusion of sports foods and drinks, as it is important to contextualize why not including this last type of food</p>
2.2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded <sup>3</sup>	<p><b>Peru</b></p> <p>We recomend including the following excludions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Food suplements</li> <li>Promotional items and gift packages</li> <li>Containers not intended to be sold to the consumer</li> </ol>
2. Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses <del>[including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks],</del> foods for special medical purposes are excluded	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p>
<b>FOOTNOTE 3</b>	
Exclusions are foods that must not have FOPNL. Exemptions are where the food does not have to have FOPNL, but if it does, it does not affect its application.	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>The definition of exemption in the footnote is unclear and may need revising.</p>
Las exclusiones son alimentos que no deben tener un ENPFE. Las exenciones son aquellos casos en que los alimentos no tienen que tener un ENPFE, pero en caso de que la tengan, no afecta a su aplicación.	<p><b>Chile</b></p> <p>Chile sugiere modificar la redacción para que se explique mejor, ya que no se entiende claramente</p>
<b>Section 2.3</b>	
.2 2 Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses [including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks], foods for special medical purposes are excluded .	<p><b>IFU</b></p> <p>The proposal is acceptable.</p>
2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted <sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as :	<p>For the sake of clarity, we would propose to add more examples of packaging that are excluded from FOPNL:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the</li> </ul>	<p>Foods in small units and other packaging limitations, example: unlabelled recyclable</p>

<p>quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• foods in small units ;</li> </ul>	<p>packaging glass bottles.</p>
<p>2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted<sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as<sup>4</sup>:</p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA generally supports the proposed scope, although we suggest several additions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICGMA supports exemptions for alcoholic beverages and foods for special dietary uses such as infant formula, food for infants, sports foods or drinks, foods for special medical purposes.</li> <li>• ICGMA supports exemptions for foods with special packaging limitations that make it difficult to make such labeling changes. We encourage exclusion of glass reusable bottles and similar packaging where label information is embossed/printed into bottles or other packaging given the difficulty, cost, and environmental impact associated with changing the way these products are labeled. Although we are not seeking an exemption if the reusable packaging displays paper/stickered labels (which are more easily changed), there are still countries where the label is embossed directly onto or into the packaging (such as being etched into glass). Therefore, such changes could require the entire existing packaging stock to be discarded.</li> <li>• ICGMA requests clarification on the term “food service”. Does this refer to the foods included in the definition of “foods for catering purposes” in the General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods? If so, ICGMA recommends using “foods for catering purposes” instead as there is a Codex definition and therefore may be more easily understood. The text should not be understood as referring to menu labelling.</li> <li>• ICGMA supports an exemption for foods not sold directly to consumers such as food service products and foods with special packaging limitations that make it extremely difficult to make such labeling changes.</li> <li>• In terms of shelf tags, it should be clearly acknowledged that this guidance is not designed for this purpose, but that there may be benefits to consistency between the FOPNL and shelf tags, etc. We do not object to additional nutritional information being provided near the point of display in a retail setting, but do not believe this type of labeling meets the spirit or definition of FOPL as the inclusion of information on or near foods as this is not generally understood meet the definition of “Front-of-pack” labeling.</li> <li>• ICGMA notes that there is CCFL work on the labelling of foods for e-commerce/internet sales. Given the potential overlap between FOPNL and internet sales/ecommerce, ICGMA would like to stress the importance of consistency in these areas.</li> </ul>
<p>2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted<sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as<sup>4</sup>:</p>	<p><b>USA</b></p> <p>We would encourage further discussion around whether foods of low nutritional significance should be exempted or if it would be helpful to encourage consumption of such foods. On foods with low nutritional significance, FOPNL could be useful to signal to consumers that some of these foods may be a good choice. They may be in the same category as other, less healthful foods, so FOPNL could be helpful.</p>
<p>2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted<sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as<sup>4</sup>:</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p> <p>Further examples could be added, e.g. food supplements, foods not intended for retail</p>

<p>2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted<sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as<sup>4</sup>  <b><u>Those foods that are unprocessed and minimally processed or that naturally contain critical nutrients. For example: honey, oil, salt, plain milk, sugar among others.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>- foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.</u></b></p>	<p>sale, foods with packaging limitations, etc.</p> <p><b>El Salvador</b>  El Salvador does not agree with the paragraph and suggests returning to the draft of the eWG document. We suggest adding the following text in bold and underlined.  Justification: According to the definition established in the Nutrient Profile Model of the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO/WHO).</p>
<p>2.3 Additionally, certain prepackaged foods may be exempted<sup>3</sup> from FOPNL such as<sup>4</sup>:</p>	<p><b>Peru</b>  The references in Chile and Mexico are 30 cm<sup>2</sup>. We suggest revising the minimum size because in the FOPNL case they can include graphics .</p>
<p>foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain <u>packaged water, plain</u> tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.</p>	<p><b>Food Industry Asia</b>  Suggest to include plain packaged water which is also a common food product available for sale in the market that is of low nutritional significance.</p>
<p>foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been <del>added</del><u>added</u> , chewing gum, plain packaged and flavored water; chewing gum, plain packaged and flavored water</p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p>
<p><del>foods alcoholic beverages:</del>  •<b><u>foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and/or the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain packaged water, plain</u></b> tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added;<u>and</u>.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b>  For the reasons stated in section 2.2, Canada recommends including alcoholic beverages in the list of prepackaged foods that may be exempted from FOPNL. Canada also suggests modifying the second bullet to clarify that a food with low nutritional significance could relate to its composition and/or the quantity consumed. Both conditions do not have to occur for the food to qualify for an exemption. For example, coffee and tea have low nutritional significance but can be consumed in large quantities.  Canada also recommends including packaged water as another example of a beverage with low contribution to macro and micronutrients and may also qualify for this type of exemption.</p>
<p>foods with <del>low nutritional significance or dietary insignificance</del> in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added;  <b><u>- foods for catering purposes;</u></b>  <b><u>- foods in non-retail containers;</u></b></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b>  In relation to the exemptions, we recommend using the same terminology that is already present in the Guidelines of Nutrition Labelling and other related Codex documents.  We also suggest including foods for catering purposes and foods in non-retail containers as possible exemptions as these foods are usually not intended to be offered as such to the consumer. It should be noted that the present work must be aligned with the work on the labelling of non-retail container.  For consistency with section 6 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food, we believe that footnote 5 should be amended. Additionally, it is not clear if the adoption of the concept of small units from the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food would be appropriated for the Guidelines on Front-of-pack Nutrition Labelling.</p>

	Finally, the scope of the present work does not include unpackaged foods or foods sold via online. Thus, we suggest deleting these products from the last paragraph.
foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain <u>packaged water, plain tea</u> and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.	<b>ICBA</b> 2.3 ICBA suggests that packaged water is an important example of a food/beverage that qualifies for this type of exemption.
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.	<b>Argentina</b> We propose to include other specific case, that are: -Food aditives and technology aids. -Spices. - Natural mineral waters, and other waters intended for human consumption . -Vinagers. -Salt (Sodium chloride). -Coffee, yerba mate, tea and other herbs, without additions of other ingredients. -Food prepared and packaged in restaurants or gastronomic stores, ready to consume. - Products fractioned in retail outlets that are marketed as pre-measured. -Fruits, vegetables and meats that are presented in their natural state, refrigerated or frozen.  We propose as well to include the following sentence: It also excludes those foods composed of a single ingredient (eg sugar, oil, milk). Justification: it is necessary to make a more exhaustive enumeration of examples, with the aim of being as clear as possible and avoid confusion. The cases mentioned above are those currently contemplated as exceptions in Resolution GMC No. 46/03, harmonized at the MERCOSUR level.
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no <del>other ingredients have been added</del> <u>ingredients have been added that modify their initial nutritional value</u>	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to modify this phrase, since there are ingredients that do not modify the nutritional contribution of this type of foods and could be exempted from FOPNL.
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with <del>low nutritional significance</del> <u>not significant nutritional contribution</u> in terms of both of its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.	<b>Chile</b> Improves the wording.
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with <del>low insignificant nutritional importance significance</del> in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.	<b>Costa Rica</b> The term "low" can create confusion, so it is suggested to change it to "insignificant nutritional importance" to be consistent with CAC / GL 2-1985 3.1.2.
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.</del> <u>Foods with very low nutritional significance in terms of both of its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. chewing gum, plain bottled water, herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.</u>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Wording changes are proposed for better understanding.
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: <del>e.g.</del> <b>for example</b> , herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which	<b>Honduras</b>

no other ingredients have been added.	
<input type="checkbox"/> foods with low nutritional significance in terms of both its composition and the quantities consumed: e.g. herbs, spices, plain tea and plain coffee to which no other ingredients have been added.	<b>Honduras</b> As a good standardization practice we suggest not to use examples and to specify to which foods the FOPNL will not apply
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>Consumers International</b> Justification NOT TO exempt foods in small units: FOP labelling is better suited to small packages than detailed nutrition labelling; many or all products that are otherwise relieved of providing nutrition information due to limits of available label space may be able to provide FOPNL information. The inclusion of FOPNL on these products is important, because many products with packaging limitations may have significant nutritional content, such as candies and individual snack items. We suggest that the guidelines recommend a modified FOPNL design for products with packaging limitations. The specific size requirements for a product to be eligible for a modified FOPNL design should be clearly outlined. In the alternative, if the electronic working group proceeds with the exemption for products with packaging limitations, then it should delineate the size requirements for the exemption.
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ; <u>2.4 In the case of foods in small units or with other packaging limitations that are covered under the exemption, simplified nutrition information can be made by alternative means<sup>[new]</sup>.</u>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> Suggests inclusion of this sentence to enrich the users of this guideline with other ways to provide useful simplified nutrition information to consumers. Examples of alternative means can be added as a footnote.
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ; or food with other packaging limitations <sup>[6]</sup> :	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> With the addition of this, we suggest to include a footnote to define these products – include limited label space on returnable and reusable bottles, including glass bottles with embossed labels and rPET
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ; or other packaging limitations • Foods not intended for retail sale, i.e. sample packages; and • Foods and beverages with packaging limitations (e.g. limited label space or glass reusable bottles and similar packaging where label information embossed/printed into bottles or other packaging).	<b>ICGMA</b>
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>Australia</b> While there is a general exemption for nutrition labelling on small packets at Codex, some countries have also found work-around this for FOPNL e.g. Chile allows display not on the front if package space doesn't allow.
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> While there is a general exemption for nutrition labelling on small packets at Codex, some countries have also found work-arounds for this for FOPNL e.g. Chile allows display not on the front if space doesn't allow.
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> or with other packaging limitations; <u>2.4 In the case of foods in small units or with other packaging limitations, reference to accessing information that would otherwise be provided by the FOPNL can be made by alternative means, e.g., quick response (QR) codes, customer service hotlines, or manufacturer websites.</u>	<b>ICBA</b> 2.3 ICBA respectfully suggests the following changes to account for limitations besides size that may impact the application of FOPNL. Returnable, reusable bottles are examples. Further, ICBA proposes alternative means of providing information for those products not included in the first bullet point under 2.3.

foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ; <b><u>-Processed foods without adding ingredients that contain critical nutrients</u></b>	<b>El Salvador</b> Add another class of foods exempt from the FOPNL
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>Argentina</b> Regarding item 2.3, which excludes food in small units, given that there was no consensus on the subject, we choose to note that the Current Resolution in force at the national level (Res. GMC No. 46/03 MERCOSUR), provides that foods in containers whose visible surface for labeling is less than or equal to 100 cm <sup>2</sup> are excepted, and this exception does not apply to foods for special purposes or foods that present nutritional claims.
<u>In the case of containers in small units which the main face is less than 30 cm<sup>2</sup>, the labeling should be included in the larger container that contains them, which is the main packaging.</u> <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>Uruguay</b> The national regulation establishes that for those foods in which the front face of the container has an area smaller than 30 cm <sup>2</sup> , the secondary container that contains them should be labeled.
foods in small units; <u>in a small package that does not allow labelling them</u> <sup>5</sup>	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to modify the wording of this sentence and eliminate the footnote, as this definition refers to the general food labeling and not for the FOPNL. Chile considers that 10 cm <sup>2</sup> could be a too small a size as, in addition to the FOPNL, the mandatory information must also be labeled. Chile proposes that the size of packaging for food to be exempt from FOPNL could be discussed in the eWG.
foods in small units <sup>5</sup> ;	<b>Colombia</b> We suggest to reconsider the area of 10 cm <sup>2</sup> for "small container" as it is considered a small surface for frontal labeling.
food and beverages with packaging limitations, for example: <u>Limited space in small units, the label</u> <sup>5</sup>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Wording changes are proposed for better understanding.
Section 6 of the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985)</i> mentions "small units" as in the case when the area is less than 10 cm <sup>2</sup> .	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to delete the footnote, since this definition refers to the general labeling of food and not for the FOPNL. Chile considers that 10 cm <sup>2</sup> may be too small a size, as, in addition to the FOPNL, mandatory information must also be labeled. Chile proposes that the size of container for the food to be exempt from FOPNL could be discussed in GTe.
These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>IFU</b> IFU would appreciate the clarification of the term "food service". IFU would like to note that there is the CCFL discussion on the labelling of foods for e-commerce/internet sales. We therefore propose omitting reference to "foods sold via online" awaiting outcomes of discussions on labelling of foods for e-commerce/internet sales.
<i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for <del>unpackaged</del> non-prepacked foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> To apply the term uniformly, we suggest changing unpackaged to non-prepacked foods.
<i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or <del>food service</del> [food service]), for</i>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> Food service might not be understood the same way for different audience hence we

<p><i>unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p>would like to request for a definition under the footnote.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the <u>prepackaged food</u> (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for <del>unpackaged foods or or</del> for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on <del>websites</del>websites)]</i></p> <p><i>2.4 In the case of foods in small units or with other packaging limitations, reference to <u>accessing information that would otherwise be provided by the FOPNL can be made by alternative means, e.g., quick response (QR) codes, customer service hotlines, or manufacturer websites.</u></i></p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>Australia</b> We note the significant difference between FOPNL on shelf-tags/food service (at point of purchase) with limited space, and what might be provided online. Unclear if this text is to become part of the guideline given italicisation, but specification that it is a 'guide' only suggest it does not have major consequences.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> We note the significant difference between FOPNL on shelf-tags/food service (at point of purchase) with limited space, and what might be provided online. Unclear if this text is to become part of the guideline given italicisation, but specification that it is a 'guide' only suggest it does not have major consequences.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports this additional text but suggest it is moved under the purpose rather than the scope.</p>
<p><del><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></del></p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> FoodDrinkEurope prefers the inclusion as suggested in 2.1 for consistency.</p>
<p><del><i>2.4. These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></del></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> In relation to the exemptions, we recommend using the same terminology that is already present in the Guidelines of Nutrition Labelling and other related Codex documents. We also suggest including foods for catering purposes and foods in non-retail containers as possible exemptions as these foods are usually not intended to be offered as such to the consumer. It should be noted that the present work must be aligned with the work on the labelling of non-retail container. For consistency with section 6 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food, we believe that footnote 5 should be amended. Additionally, it is not clear if the adoption of the concept of small units from the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food would be appropriated for the Guidelines on Front-of-pack Nutrition Labelling. Finally, the scope of the present work does not include unpackaged foods or foods sold via online. Thus, we suggest deleting these products from the last paragraph.</p>



<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via <del>online</del> online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the <u>prepackaged food</u> (e.g. <del>shelf-tags or food service</del>), <u>shelf-tags</u>) [or for <del>unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online</del> (e.g. information available at point of purchase on <del>websites</del>)websites]</i></p>	<p><b>ICBA</b>  ICBA requests clarification on the term “food service”. Does this refer to the foods included in the definition of “foods for catering purposes” in the General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods? If so, ICBA recommends using “foods for catering purposes” instead as there is a Codex definition and therefore may be more easily understood. The text should not be understood as referring to menu labelling. ICBA also requests that “unpackaged foods” be removed from this paragraph, as it is out of the scope of GSLPF as referenced in 2.1.  Regarding “foods sold online”: As there is proposed CCFL new work on the labelling of foods for e-commerce/internet sales under consideration, ICBA suggests that the Committee consider how the proposed work will be referenced or harmonized with the guidance provided here. ICBA proposes bracketing the text and returning to it when other work has progressed to ensure consistency.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>EI Salvador</b>  EI Salvador is in agreement with this text.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b>  The Dominican Republic ratifies the position indicated in the second document, dated 23 October 2018, that the FOPNL is for the individual information of the consumer, so we recommend the deletion of this paragraph.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>Argentina</b>  In line with the response of Argentina to the second discussion document of the eWG, we reiterate the comment that the three cases listed should not be mentioned in this document, as it is considered to be confusing information. In the first case it is not clear what type of information is alluded; in the second case, it is not applicable to make reference to non-packaged foods as it would go in contrast with the purpose of the document referring to packaged foods; and finally, it is not appropriate to refer to a form of marketing.  GENERAL COMMENT: The FOPL should include consideration of a special treatment for some foods that, given their intrinsic characteristics and/or nutritional quality, should not be improperly classified at the time of implementing the front labelling system.</p>
<p><i>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</i></p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b>  Nicaragua does not support including "information that is displayed near the food" in the scope of the document. As indicated in the title of the draft, these guidelines apply specifically to the FOPL of the product, and the inclusion of additional information is beyond the purpose of this document and adds complexity to its understanding and application.</p>

<del>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>Honduras</b> Within the Scope (first paragraph), it is specified that these guidelines apply to prepackaged foods, excluding therefore foods that have not been packed. We consider they should be excluded, as the regulations that apply to prepackaged products that are marketed via the web, must also comply with the guidelines and <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> , and therefore, to add a new disposition would overregulate this type of trade.
<del>These guidelines can also be used as a guide in the case where simplified nutrition information is displayed near the food (e.g. shelf-tags or food service), for unpackaged foods or for foods sold via online (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</del>	<b>Peru</b> We consider this note to fall out of the scope of the guidelines and suggest deletion.
<b>SECTION 3 - DEFINITION OF FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING (FOPNL)</b>	
<b>DEFINITION OF FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING (FOPNL)</b>	<b>Guatemala</b> Spanish version mentions note 77. That note doesn't exist. Agree with Item 3.1 with text clarification, as follows: "Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL) is any system based on science and evidence that presents simplified nutrition...". Item 3.2 agree with exclusions, suggest adding for bullets (i) and (ii) the next footnote: "As defined on CAG/GL 23/1997."
<b>3. DEFINITION OF FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING (FOPNL)</b>	<b>Honduras</b> We believe that there must be a definition of simplified nutrition information and foods with minimum and high nutritional value
<b>SECTION 3.1 Front-of-pack nutrition labelling</b>	
3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack of pre-packaged foods. It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.	<b>IFU</b> IFU recommends to specify that FOPNL shall be clear, science based and shall not mislead consumers. It shall not be discriminatory.  It is necessary, that not only negative aspects can be shown on a FOPNL, but also positive (to make sure that consumers can make the informed food choice that reflects their dietary needs).  IFU is of the opinion that FOPNL should be consistent with existing, relevant Codex Guidelines. These include the Codex guidelines on Nutrition Labeling, the Codex General Guidelines on Claims and the Codex Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. Graphics, verbiage or other depictions which could give rise to doubt about the safety of similar food or which could arouse or exploit fear in the consumer should not be adopted. They should also not lead to discrimination of other foods.
3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack <sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods. <sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these <del>guidelines</del> guidelines that provide information on nutrients associated	<b>Consumers International</b> Justification include reference to obesity/NCDs: The rationale for the front-of-pack label derives from the WHO's recognition that such labelling systems are an important tool to prevent obesity and related non-communicable diseases.  For example, the report by the WHO Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity

<p><u>with an increase in the risk of an unhealthy diet, obesity or diet-related non communicable diseases.</u></p>	<p>indicates the need for a clear, interpretive FOPNL with the objective of reducing childhood obesity. Furthermore, the WHO document “Tackling NCDs: 'best buys' and other recommended interventions for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases” similarly note the importance of labelling and in particular front-of-pack labelling to control NCDs. Furthermore, the WHO Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases (2013-2020) also recommends the provision of nutrition facts and labelling standards to reduce common risk factors for NCDs and create enabling environments.</p> <p>Thus, it is important that the Codex guidelines refer to this link in their purpose, scope and definition. This will ensure coherence between Codex and WHO documents and clarify the ultimate objective of FOPNL, which is a public health tool to reduce obesity and NCDs.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide <u>science and evidence-based</u> information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Food Industry Asia</b></p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents <u>national science and evidence-based</u> simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged <del>foods</del> <u>foods sold directly to consumers</u>.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the <u>contribution of a food to the energy and nutrient content of a diet or the overall</u> nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA believes it is important to reinforce that the system should be science- and evidence-based.</p> <p>Additionally, FOP nutrient disclosures should be consistent with existing, relevant Codex Guidelines. These include the Codex guidelines on Nutrition Labeling, the Codex General Guidelines on Claims and the Codex Standard for Labeling of Prepackaged Foods. Graphics, verbiage or other depictions which could give rise to doubt about the safety of similar food or which could arouse or exploit fear in the consumer should not be adopted.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents <del>simplified</del> <u>interpretive</u> nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Canada strongly recommends that all FOPNL systems be interpretive to increase consumer attention to the information and to facilitate understanding among a wide variety of consumers, particularly those with inadequate health literacy.</p> <p>In addition, Canada strongly recommends the exclusion of systems that only repeat the quantitative declaration of nutrients presented elsewhere on the food label (e.g. nutrient declaration or nutrition labelling) without providing additional interpretive value (e.g. use of colours or symbols). Hence, facts-only systems do neither meet the principle that FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by a wide variety of consumers, nor do they meet the evidence-based recommendations from authoritative international health organizations, such as the U.S. National Academy of Medicine (formerly the U.S Institute of Medicine) and the World Health Organization.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, <u>as well as interpretive colour-coding</u>, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>BEUC</b></p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p>

<p>nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p>It is not clear where the nutrients are 'described in these guidelines'</p> <p>Suggest that the guidelines do NOT suggest/include a list of nutrients, but rather refer to what is emerging globally in the evidence and allow countries to retain autonomy to elect which nutrients should be included depending on their national policy objectives.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>WFPHA strongly supports any definition of FOPNL include nutrient-specific warnings now adopted by Chile, Uruguay, Peru, Israel and under consideration in several other jurisdictions.</p> <p>This wording implies that they are, but requires more clarity. It is not clear where the nutrients are 'described' in these guidelines. We believe countries should retain autonomy to decide which nutrients or other food components are appropriate to include in their national settings (for example, trans fats may be relevant in some jurisdictions and not others).</p> <p>We note that some countries already include components other than nutrients in their systems (e.g. French and Australian systems consider fruit and vegetable content, some countries wish to include artificial sweeteners) and they should retain authority to do so if evidence justifies it e.g. Global Burden of Disease Study dietary factors identify these</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is <del>any system</del> a form of supplementary nutrition information that presents <del>simplified</del> <del>simplified</del>, <del>interpretive</del> nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand supports that FOPNL is a form of "supplementary nutrition labelling" as described in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CAC/GL 2-1885). Supplementary nutrition labelling 'is intended to increase the consumer's understanding of the nutritional value of their food and to assist in interpreting the nutrient declaration'. We therefore suggest that the definition of FOPNL be amended as above.</p> <p>We note that which nutrients should be included in FOPNL is not addressed in the guidance to date. We support further discussion on this aspect to further elaborate the guidance in relation to this.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the <u>specific</u> nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>USA</b></p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide <u>factual</u> information on the <u>overall nutritional value contribution of the a food and/ or to the energy and nutrient content of a diet and/or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines</u> <u>nutritional value of the food</u>.</p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p> <p>FoodDrinkEurope does not support the inclusion of "health warning" type labels (ex. "high in salt") in the definition/scope of FOPNL.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on <del>the individual nutrients to be included contained in FOPNL as described in these guidelines</del> <u>the food</u>.</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b></p> <p>We have recommended a suggested edit for the definition, to correct the sentence structure and also noted that there is no discussion of which nutrients should be included elsewhere in the paper.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified</p>	<p><b>ICBA</b></p>

<p>nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide <u>national science- and evidence-based</u> information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p>3.1 ICBA believes it is important to specify that the system should be based on objective science and evidence.</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on <u>energy content and</u> the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>CEFS</b> Energy content remains an important criteria needing to be taken into account</p>
<p>3.1. <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods<sup>7</sup>. It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the <u>nutritional overall nutritional</u> value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador deleted the term "overall" because it has no significance at a nutritional level.</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information <del>on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on</del> the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b> This marked text can lead towards the use of specific <b>FOPNL</b> systems, that studies conducted in the Uruguayan population did not show to be superior to the warning system adopted by the country.</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL <u>to facilitate its understanding</u> as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to include this sentence as one of the objectives of the FOPNL is to facilitate understanding by consumers of the information provided regarding the nutritional value of foods</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the <del>overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients</del> <u>to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines that it contains.</u></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> The crossed-out text could lead to confusion, since these guidelines are not intended to establish nutrient to be declared.</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines. <i>[TN. Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> Additionally, number 7 should be removed from the reference as it is repeated (only in the Spanish version).</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the <del>overall nutritional value of the food</del> <u>overall nutritional value of the food</u> <i>[TN Sic]</i> and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as described in these guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> This could focus on the critical food nutrients as the term "overall" is quite wide. We consider that it should be clearly defined what is meant by simplified nutrition information.</p>
<p>3.1 <i>Front-of-pack nutrition labelling (FOPNL)</i> is any system that presents simplified nutrition information on the front-of-pack<sup>6</sup> of pre-packaged foods.<sup>7</sup> It can include symbols/graphics, text or a combination thereof, that provide information on the overall nutritional value of the food and/ or on the nutrients to be included in FOPNL as</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador indicates that the terms " information on the overall nutritional value", could refer to the information declared in the secondary panel and would be considered as an advertisement for food highlighting its characteristic nutritional value, but would not have</p>

described in these guidelines.	the purpose proposed by the FOPNL.
<b>FOOTNOTE 6 AND 7</b>	
<i>Front-of-pack</i> means the total area of the surface (or surfaces) that is displayed or visible to the consumer under customary conditions of sale or use.	<b>Canada</b> With respect to the proposed definition of “front-of-pack” in footnote 6, Canada suggests that it could be clarified by adding reference “to the consumer”.
Main or front face of container: is the part of the container where it is stated in its most relevant forms the sales denomination and brand or the logo, if any. <del>Front-of-pack means the total area of the surface (or surfaces) that is displayed or visible under customary conditions of sale or use</del>	<b>Uruguay</b> This is the definition used in the legislation of Uruguay
As defined in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985). 8. As defined in the <i>Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims</i> (CXG 23 – 1997)	<b>ICBA</b> Footnote 8: ICBA recommends inserting reference to the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CXG 23 – 1997), where various types of claims, including those above, are defined.
<b>SECTION 3.2</b>	
3.2. This definition excludes:	<b>Canada</b> Canada recommends the text be edited as shown below, with consequential renumbering.  Canada agrees with the exclusion of nutrition and health claims from the definition of FOPNL. However, excluding allergenic labelling is redundant as it is already excluded from the scope of FOPNL and there are existing standards for allergen labelling. We suggest modifying the wording of point iv – “the quantitative declaration of ingredients” to align with the current text in 2.1(c) of the definition of “Nutrition claim” in the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims.
3.2. This definition excludes: <u>v. The mandatory nutrient declaration</u>	<b>New Zealand</b>
3.2. This definition <del>excludes</del> excludes symbols/isolated graphics or isolated textual indications applicable to a limited number of products or nutrients based on the presence, absence, reduction or fortification of a nutrient, food or food category, such as:	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>
3.2. This definition excludes :	<b>EI Salvador</b> According to paragraph 3.2 and its numbers i, ii, iii, iv.
3.2 (i) Nutrition <del>claims</del> claims and Health Claims <sup>[new]</sup>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> We suggest combining Nutrition claims with Health Claims under one bullet point and include a footnote that reference to the relevant Codex guideline that states “As defined in the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997)”
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims; health claims, nutrient content claims, or non-addition claims 8 ; 8 As defined in the <i>Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims</i> (CXG 23 – 1997)	<b>ICGMA</b>
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims;	<b>Australia</b> Could cross reference Codex definition of Nutrition Claims here. Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997) GUIDELINES FOR USE OF NUTRITION AND HEALTH CLAIMS
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims;	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b>

	Should cross-reference Codex definition of nutrition claims. That definition *excludes* mandatory mentions of nutrients, suggesting nutrient-specific warnings are not nutrition claims.
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims;	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Add reference to Codex Guidelines on Claims
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims; <sup>8</sup> ;	<b>Brazil</b> For consistency and clarity, we suggested adding a footnote in nutrition and health claims to refer to the definition in the Guideline for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997). Footnote 8 would read: "As defined in the Guideline for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997)".
3.2 (i) Nutrition claims; health claims, nutrient content claims, or non-addition claims <sup>8</sup>	<b>ICBA</b> ICBA recommends inserting reference to the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CXG 23 – 1997), where various types of claims, including those above, are defined. Further, for the sake of space, ICBA suggests that the types of claims could be combined into one bullet point.  ICBA requests clarity on the inclusion of "allergenic labelling" in this list. If what is meant is the list of nutrients or ingredients included or not included in the product, ICBA recommends adding "nutrient content claims" and "non-addition claims" to the list of claims excluded from the definition as shown above. Point iv is reworded to be harmonized with language in the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims.
i. Nutrition claims	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to include a footnote indicating the corresponding guideline (CAC/GL 23-1997).
i. <del>Nutrition</del> <u>nutritional</u> claims .	<b>Chile</b> We propose to modify it to be in line with the guideline in Spanish.
i. <del>Nutrition</del> Nutritional and health claims	<b>Costa Rica</b> This bullet paragraph should make reference to the Guidelines for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997)
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b>
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del>	<b>ICGMA</b>
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del> and	<b>Canada</b>
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del>	<b>Australia</b> Could footnote the Codex definition.
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del>	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Should this reference the Codex definition of Health claims.
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Add reference to Codex Guidelines on Claims
3.2 (ii) <del>Health claims;</del> <sup>8</sup> ;	<b>Brazil</b> For consistency and clarity, we suggested adding a footnote in nutrition and health claims to refer to the definition in the Guideline for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997). Footnote 8 would read: "As defined in the Guideline for the Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CAC/GL 23-1997)".

<b>3.2 (ii) Health claims;</b>	<b>ICBA</b>
ii. Health claims	<b>Chile</b> Chile propone incluir nota al pie con la directriz correspondiente (CAC/GL 23-1997).
ii. Health claims .[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Chile</b> We propose to modify it to be in line with the guideline in Spanish.
ii. Health claims;	<b>Costa Rica</b> Eliminated as it is now included in point i.
<b>3.2 (iii) Allergenic labelling; and</b>	<b>ICGMA</b>
<b>3.2 (iii) Allergenic labelling; and</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>3.2 (iii) Allergenic labelling; and</b>	<b>ICBA</b>
iii. Allergenic labelling; and .[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Chile</b> Improves the Spanish wording.
iii. Allergenic labelling of ingredients that cause allergenicity; and	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<b>3.2 (iv) The quantitative or qualitative declaration of nutrients or ingredients.</b>	<b>ICGMA</b> ICGMA recommends inserting reference to the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims (CXG 23 – 1997), where various types of claims, including those above, are defined. Further, for the sake of space, ICGMA suggests that the types of claims could be combined into one bullet point. ICGMA requests clarity on the inclusion of “allergenic labelling” in this list. If what is meant is the list of nutrients or ingredients included or not included in the product, ICGMA recommends adding “nutrient content claims” and “non-addition claims” to the list of claims excluded from the definition as shown above. Point iv is reworded to be harmonized with language in the Guidelines for Use of Nutrition and Health Claims.
<b>3.2 (iv) The quantitative or qualitative declaration of nutrients or ingredients.</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>3.2 (iv) The quantitative declaration of ingredients.</b> v. <u>Mandatory labeling information as per country food standards regulations</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> Section 3.2 could also indicate that the mandatory labelling information is excluded from the definition to avoid duplication
<b>3.2 (iv) The quantitative or qualitative declaration of nutrients or ingredients.<sup>g</sup></b>	<b>ICBA</b>
<b>3.2 (iv) The quantitative declaration of ingredients.</b>	<b>Costa Rica</b> Add a reference to the General Standard for Prepackaged Foods to avoid confusion.
<b>SECTION 4 GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b>	
<b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b> An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985):	<b>IFU</b> IFU is of the opinion that harmonized principles that are fact- and science-based shall be applied in developing FOPNL. IFU also strongly supports that collaboration between governments and stakeholders is key in establishing FOPNL systems. Next, FOPNL should not create a barrier to international trade. IFU therefore suggests to consider establishing/applying mutual recognition principles between countries or regions in order to reduce the likelihood of trade barriers that may occur due to the use of different FOPNL Systems in different countries or regions.



**GENERAL PRINCIPLES****Canada**

Canada recommends restructuring section 4 to group similar principles together under 3 main sub-headings as follows:

4.1 – Overarching principles

4.2 – Principles for format and

4.3 – Principles for development, implementation and evaluation of the FOPNL system

Our restructuring recommendations are detailed in Annex 1 to these comments. Specific comments on each principle currently listed in section 4 are provided.

**ANNEX 1: CANADA'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING**

**4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CXS 1-1985):

4.1 Overarching principles for FOPNL

4.1.1 Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country. However, if multiple FOPNL systems coexist, these should not be contradictory to each other. (previously 4.1)

4.1.2 FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration. (previously 4.3)

4.1.3 Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food [ as sold with minimal exceptions]. (previously 4.12)

4.1.4 FOPNL should align with evidence-based national [health and nutrition policies]. (previously 4.6)

4.1.5 FOPNL should be underpinned by evidence-based, objective measures of [nutrients of public health concern as identified by the country where it is implemented]. (previously 4.7)

4.2 Principles for format of the FOPNL

4.2.1 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by [a wide variety of] consumers in the country of implementation. This should be informed by high quality consumer research. (previously 4.2)

4.2.2 FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use [without the need to pick up the food package]. (previously 4.5)

4.2.3 FOPNL should enable consumers to make comparisons [within food categories]. (previously 4.8)

4.3 Principles for development, implementation and evaluation of the FOPNL

4.3.1 FOPNL should be [government lead, but] developed through consultation with all interested parties including [government], the private sector, consumers, academia, and public health associations. (previously 4.9)

4.3.2 (previously 4.11)

4.3.3 FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/information program to increase consumer understanding and use. (previously 4.4)

4.3.4 Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact pre- and

	post-implementation. (previously 4.10)
<b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>We note two important matters missing here that must be included:</p> <p>4.11 Guidance on the reference amount used (per 100g/100mL). Suggested words 'Where countries do not have standard serve sizes, adopt nutrient criteria based on per 100g or 100mL of a food or beverage'</p> <p>4.12.- Recognition of the need to protect FOPNL develop from conflicts of interest. This is particularly important in development of the nutrient criteria/nutrient profiling, as recognized recently in the WHO EURO HEN report. The WHO tool for Conflicts of Interest in setting National Nutrition Policies is also relevant here.</p>
<b>GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b>	<p><b>Guatemala</b></p> <p>Item 4.2 don't agree to include text in brackets. Adding that text is redundant. Delete: "[a wide variety of]". Item 4.4 wrong translation to Spanish. Should be "debería". We ask for text clarification, as it should say who is going to be responsible for implementation of this point. Item 4.5 eliminate brackets text. It's not possible to the producer or distributor applying that point. Delete: "[without the need to pick up the food package]." Item 4.7 Wrong translation to Spanish: in Spanish should be "debería". Translation of "Nutrients of global importance" is "Nutrients de importancia mundial." We don't accept brackets text. Please clarify which nutrients. Item 4.8 Wrong translation to Spanish: in Spanish should be "debería". Agree with the text in brackets including and/or. Item 4.9. Alternative proposal: FOPNL should be developed in collaboration with all interested parties including government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others. Item 4.10 Wrong translation to Spanish: "impact" is "impacto" in Spanish. Item 4.11 agree with the working group, this item needs clarification. Item 4.12 we accept with the following text modification: "Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food as consumed / as sold, as appropriate. Delete: "with minimal exceptions."</p>
<p>An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):</p> <p><u>Because of differences in FOPNL systems resulting from differing national needs, consideration also should be given to establishing mutual recognition/equivalence agreements with other nations so as to reduce the likelihood of trade barriers that may occur due to the use of different FOPNL systems.</u></p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA recognizes and supports the goal of this work in driving harmonizing approaches to FOPNL. However, ICGMA also recognizes the challenge in achieving global harmonization given differing national nutrition needs and health goals. ICGMA suggests that this should be included as part of the introductory section to reinforce the importance of mutual recognition/reciprocity in helping to facilitate trade while respecting national differences. If the Committee agrees with this addition, ICGMA suggests informing CCFICS of the proposal as well, as this will be particularly relevant for import/export purposes.</p>
<p><del>AN</del> FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):</p>	<p><b>Guyana</b></p>
<p><del>AN</del> FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>The general principles of this Standard have not previously been discussed in the Codex e-WG. They include that</p> <p>Prepackaged food shall not be described or presented on any label or in any labelling in</p>

	<p>a manner that is false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its character in any respect.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>This provision has been raised in the TBT Committee in relation to other countries' attempts to implement mandatory FOPNL. We would like to clarify that FOPNL nutrient-specific warnings, would NOT be considered to create an erroneous impression regarding the character of food provided they are based on appropriate health evidence and validated nutrient profiles.</p>
An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>The general principles of this Standard have not previously been discussed in the Codex e-WG. They include that</p> <p>Prepackaged food shall not be described or presented on any label or in any labelling in a manner that is false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its character in any respect.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>We would like to clarify that FOPNL based on appropriate health evidence and validated nutrient profiles, would NOT be considered to create an erroneous impression regarding the character of food.</p>
An FOPNL <u>scheme</u> should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to the general principles in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985): <u>Because of differences in FOPNL systems resulting from differing national needs, consideration also should be given to establishing mutual recognition/equivalence agreements with other nations so as to reduce the likelihood of trade barriers that may occur due to the use of different FOPNL systems.</u>	<p><b>ICBA</b></p> <p>4. ICBA recognizes and supports the goal of this work in driving harmonizing approaches to FOPNL. However, ICBA also recognizes the challenge in achieving global harmonization given differing national nutrition needs and health goals. ICBA suggests that this should be included as part of the introductory section to reinforce the importance of mutual recognition/reciprocity in helping to facilitate trade while respecting national differences. If the Committee agrees with this addition, ICBA suggests informing CCFICS of the proposal as well, as this will be particularly relevant for import/export purposes.</p>
An FOPNL should be based on the following general principles in addition to <del>the general principles</del> <u>those already mentioned</u> in the <i>General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods</i> (CXS 1-1985):	<p><b>Chile</b></p> <p>Mejora redacción en español.</p>
Un FOPNL debe basarse en los siguientes principios generales <del>además de los principios generales de la</del> <u>y concordantes con los principios generales de la Norma general para el etiquetado de los alimentos preenvasados</u> (CXS 1-1985):	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>SECTION 4.1</b>	
Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each <del>country or region</del> <u>country</u> . However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p> <p>Justification to omit "region": Having one FOPNL per region will be challenging in practice. We suggest omitting the word region. Countries should have the ability to develop the FOPNL that is appropriate for their country.</p> <p>It is critical that Codex guidance clearly allows space for national policy making so that countries can achieve a FOPNL label that achieves its public health aims and addresses the nation's public health problems and has a format that is most understandable to</p>

	<p>each country's population.</p> <p>Codex guidance on FOPNL labelling has the potential to both promote innovation by national governments (to address local health concerns using the scientific evidence-base free of conflict of interest) as well as to protect the FOPNL standards and policies that are already in place in various countries. Codex guidelines should enable governments the flexibility to develop a FOPNL that is evidence-based and contextually relevant for their country.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, <del>in case of coexisting a</del>, if multiple FOPNL system with other systems <del>systems coexist</del>, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting FOPNL systems, these should not be contradictory to each other. Where voluntary labeling schemes already exist, national authorities should consider those schemes, including the method of declaration, adoption rate, and consumer research, when developing FOP programs.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each <del>country or region</del> country. However, <del>in case of coexisting a</del> if multiple FOPNL system with other systems <del>systems coexist</del>, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Canada agrees with the principle at the country level for government-led systems. There may be multiple reasons that a regional system may not work, including varying language/literacy needs or country-specific public health issues. However, where these are similar governments in a region they should be encouraged to work together wherever possible, with tailoring as needed, towards a common system for their region. Instead of including this within the principle, the guidance about collaborating on regional systems could be provided in further guidance for selection/development of FOPNL in section 5.1.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended <u>by government authorities</u> in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other. <u>Any private FOPNL should not undermine an official government-endorsed scheme.</u></p>	<p><b>BEUC</b></p>
<p>Only one <u>government led/endorsed</u> FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other <u>FOPNL (?)</u> systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>We recognise the benefits of harmonization but also the need for countries to retain autonomy to develop FOPNL that suit their national contexts</p> <p>This differs to the WHO guiding principles which suggest a single system should be developed.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>The passage 'should not be contradictory to each other' requires clarity.</p> <p>Public health objectives would be best supported by a single national government-endorsed system, with other systems removed (whether led by industry or civil society)</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>We suggest clarity on who is recommending – is this suggesting government endorsement?</p> <p>We recognise the benefits of harmonization but also the need for countries to retain autonomy to develop FOPNL that suit their national contexts. There are already regions (EU, Americas) where there are multiple systems in use. This provision should help to ensure primacy of government policy over other systems.</p>

<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of <del>coexisting</del> introducing a FOPNL system with <del>other systems</del> <u>co-existing systems</u>, these should not be <del>contradictory</del> <u>contradict</u> to each other.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports the intent of this principle to have a single FOPNL system to avoid consumer confusion. However, we agree that the case of more than one system co-existing should be addressed, given that many countries have voluntary systems which are understood and recognized by consumers. The introduction of a new system may sit alongside an existing system if the scientific evidence underpinning both systems are the same. In line with this we suggest the following edits to the second sentence:</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended <del>in by</del> each country or region. However, <del>in case to achieve public health goals, the use of coexisting a more than one type of FOPNL system with other systems may be necessary, in case these systems should not be contradictory</del> <u>complementary</u> to each other.</p>	<p><b>USA</b> We revised the wording of this to allow more flexibility, which is especially important for countries/regions where there are multiple systems which are developed independent of the government. Additionally, it may be appropriate to have multiple systems to target specific populations, which may vary within countries or region.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL <del>system with other</del> systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>Brazil</b> For clarity, we suggested small editorial amendments.</p>
<p>Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in <del>the case of coexisting</del> introducing a <u>recommended FOPNL system with other co-existing systems</u>, these should <del>not be contradictory to not</del> <u>contradict each other</u> <del>and both</del> <u>based on the following general principles</u>.</p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b> We support the intent of this principle to have a single system that avoids consumer confusion and for harmonization and removal of trade barriers. However, if this is not possible, that the case of more than one system co-existing should be addressed, given that many countries have voluntary systems which are aligned with country specific dietary guidelines, understood and recognized by consumers. A secondary FOPNL system should only be considered and introduced, if it can sit alongside the existing system, follow the general principles and if the scientific evidence underpinning both systems are the same. The sentence structure for 4.1 is not clear and requires editing.</p>
<p><b>4.1.</b> Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, <del>in case of coexisting a if multiple FOPNL system with other systems</del> <u>systems coexist</u>, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>ICBA</b> 4.1 ICBA supports this principle but suggests rewording as below.</p>
<p>4.1. Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, <del>in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</del></p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador, regarding the crossed out text, we believe that it is a comment and does not form part of the principle of 4.1.</p>
<p>4.1. Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other</p>	<p><b>Argentina</b> We request further information about what would be the purpose of this paragraph.</p>
<p>4.1. Only one FOPNL system should be used <del>recommended</del> in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b> The term "recomended" s not clear .</p>
<p>4.1. Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be</p>	<p><b>IFU</b> IFU supports the point, however, we are not clear on the term "a wide variety of".</p>

<p>contradictory to each other.</p> <p>4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by [a wide variety of] consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p>Proposed amended wording: FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by and not misleading to consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>
<p>4.1. Only one FOPNL system should be recommended in each country or region. However, in case of coexisting a FOPNL system with other systems, these should not be contradictory to each other.</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b></p> <p>Ecuador considers that the CODEX should issue guidelines to Governments considering the use of a FOPNL system with the recommendations and guidelines of the WHO allowing to raise awareness regarding access to healthy products and the benefits in the acquisition of the same by the consumers, depending on the realities of each country.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 4.2</b></p>	
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand <del>can be correctly interpreted by</del> <b>general [a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Food Industry Asia</b></p> <p>"A wide variety of" is ambiguous. We believe that it can be replaced with "general". In addition, we suggest that the understanding should be common across general consumers, in the correct way intended for, hence proposed the change to "can be correctly interpreted by general consumers".</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>and not misleading to</del> <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>ICGMA</b></p> <p>ICGMA supports this principle but requests the exclusion of the bracketed text "a wide variety of". Science-based consumer research would ensure demographic representation based on census data in the country of implementation. The phrase "wide variety of" could be interpreted as requiring understanding by outlier subpopulations, which would not fit with the goal of Codex or national standards to be applicable to the general population. Further, FOPNL should not mislead consumers, so ICGMA suggests adding the text shown above.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by <del>high quality</del> <b>scientifically valid</b> consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>Canada agrees with the insertion of "a wide variety of consumers". FOPNL should present context-specific information that is easily accessed, understood, and used by those people disadvantaged by risks of limited/marginal health literacy and vulnerable populations who are at higher risks of diet-related NCDs in the country of implementation.</p> <p>In addition, the FOPNL system should be developed using consumer social science research that looks to ensure that a broad cross-section of consumers can easily access, understand and use the FOPNL with ease to make an informed food choice.</p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Jamaica</b></p> <p>The colours used for FOPNL should also take into consideration persons who suffer from colour blindness and the fact that some colours are predisposed to gender bias.</p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way <del>that which is</del> <b>demonstrably and objectively</b> easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> <del>consumers</del> <b>consumers including those from lower-socio economic groups in the country of implementation.</b> The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>BEUC</b></p> <p>FOP nutritional labelling schemes should be developed on the basis of relevant and independent scientific evidence, conducted free from commercial interest, which demonstrates robustly the effectiveness of such schemes in aiding consumers to objectively better understand the nutritional content of food and beverages. Such</p>

	<p>schemes should not solely rely on 'preference' or 'likability' as an indicator of effectiveness but should demonstrate that the scheme actually helps consumers to correctly identify products with better nutritional quality out of a range of product options. Furthermore, it should also be considered as insufficient to rely on asking consumers to agree or disagree with statements regarding the effectiveness of FOP schemes. For example, it is not enough to ask consumers if they believe that a scheme is easy to understand; scientific evidence should be used to accurately demonstrate that consumers actually do effectively understand the scheme. Certain vulnerable groups such as those from lower-socio economic groups can have a lower level of nutritional knowledge and awareness whilst simultaneously being at a higher risk of becoming overweight or obese. Furthermore, certain groups may have lower levels of literacy and/or numeracy which could have important implications for the ability of these consumers to easily understand and use those FOP schemes which are complicated and require the consumer to make calculations. It is therefore important that particular attention is paid to the objective understanding of such groups during the development and assessment of front-of-pack labelling schemes.</p> <p>It is important for any FOPNL to be evaluated for effectiveness based on robust scientific evidence. However, this evidence may not necessarily be on the national level. Governments may decide that the evidence base in another country is sufficient to introduce the scheme. Furthermore, certain less affluent countries may not have the requisite resources to duplicate such consumer research.</p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> Suggest retaining wording or ensuring that the words promote health equity - FOPNL are especially important to those consumers who are not using the nutrient declaration on back of pack, and may have lower nutrition literacy.</p> <p>It is not clear what the definition of 'scientifically valid' is for Codex. It is reasonable for FOPNL to be evidence-informed, but this evidence may also not need to be national if there are rational grounds for a country (particularly low resource) to adopt systems from other settings.</p>
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> it is not clear what is meant by 'scientifically valid' research.</p> <p>We support a meaning which ensures that research has been conducted independently and free from commercial conflicts of interest.</p> <p>It is reasonable for FOPNL to be evidence-informed, but this evidence may not need to be national if there are rational grounds for a country (particularly low resource) to adopt a FOPNL from another similar setting.</p>
<p>FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> We support keeping the text in brackets to promote health equity.</p> <p>Consumers with the lowest nutritional literacy stand to gain the most from FOPNL.</p>
<p>FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports discussion on the words in square brackets. 'Most' may be a suitable replacement for 'wide variety'. The intent of this principle is that consumer research should be undertaken in the country where the FOPNL system is being</p>

	implemented to ensure those consumers are able to correctly use the FOPNL.
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>the general consumer population</u> <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by <del>in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by</del> scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>USA</b> Further discussion is needed on what constitutes, “scientifically valid consumer research.” This is one area that could be expanded upon in Section 5, “Other Aspects to Consider.”
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of <del>implementation</del> implementation and which is <u>not misleading the consumer</u> . The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> - The concept of 'not misleading the consumer' is a critical concept to be added in the General Principles section, either in the way suggested or as stand-alone.
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country <u>or region</u> of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be <del>informed</del> <u>supported</u> by scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>Brazil</b> We support the deletion of the text in square brackets as it does not provide additional clarity to this principle. Besides, it is possible do tailor FOPNL to the needs of specific populations. In addition, we suggest replacing the word 'informed' by 'supported' and adding the words 'or region' after country.
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a wide variety of]</del> <u>most</u> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be <del>informed</del> <u>supported</u> by scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> Support the removal of the square brackets as these schemes needs to be easily understood by a diverse group of consumers.
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand <del>by</del> <del>[a wide variety of]</del> <u>and not misleading to</u> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>ICBA</b> 4.2 ICBA supports this principle but requests the exclusion of the bracketed text “a wide variety of”. Science-based consumer research would ensure demographic representation based on census data in the country of implementation. The phrase “wide variety of” could be interpreted as requiring understanding by outlier subpopulations, which would not fit with the goal of Codex or national standards to be applicable to the general population. Further, FOPNL should not mislead consumers, so ICBA suggests adding the text shown above.
FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>[a wide variety of]</u> consumers in the country of <del>implementation</del> implementation and which is <u>not misleading to consumers</u> . The format of the FOPNL <del>should</del> <u>must be informed by based on sound and</u> scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>CEFS</b> The purpose to not mislead the consumer needs to be added as it is key
4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid <u>consumer</u> research..[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>El Salvador</b> We observed that the English document mentions a consumer research and we suggest therefore a change in the wording.
4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a wide variety of]</del> the consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.	<b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic does not accept the inclusion of the terms “wide variety of” and suggest replacing it by “the consumers”
4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>[a</u>	<b>Argentina</b>



<p><b>wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p>It is considered that the text in brackets should be maintained. On the other hand, it is considered that in the document in English, the word "informed" should be replaced by "supported".</p>
<p><b>Argentina</b> It is considered that the text in brackets should be maintained. On the other hand, it is considered that in the document in English, the word "informed" should be replaced by "supported".</p>	<p><b>Uruguay</b></p>
<p>4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>una a wide diversity of consumer taking into account the different levels of literacy and education in the country of implementation . The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research</u> <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to modify this wording as it gives more clarity to what is meant in the beginning. In addition, the different levels of literacy and education should be considered when implementing a FOPNL, to favor its understanding by the population. ¶</p>
<p>4.2.FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research...<i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term “Debe” by “Debería” as a more adequate translation of the English term “should”.</p>
<p>4.2. FOPNL should <del>Should</del> present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>the</u> <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid <u>local or regional</u> consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p>
<p>4.2. FOPNL should <del>Should</del> present information in a way that is easy to understand by <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation.</p> <p>4.3 The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b> We suggest to delete the bracketed text, since this may indicate implicitly that the system is not understood by some segment. Additionally, we propose to separate the beginning and to indicate in a foot note that it is a scientifically valid market research. ¶</p>
<p>4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <u>the</u> <del>[a wide variety of]</del> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research.</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> The general principle of protection for the consumers indicates that the information provided should be clear, timely, reliable etc. for all consumers in general. We consider that a “wide variety” should not be included as it tends to segment incorrectly a group of consumers.</p>
<p>4.2. FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation. The format of the FOPNL should be informed by scientifically valid consumer research</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> We agree with the text in brackets .</p>
<p><b>SECTION 4.3</b></p>	
<p>FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient <u>declaration or any other required declaration, e.g health claims, allergic labeling, genetically modified notice, etc.</u></p>	<p><b>Guyana</b></p>
<p>FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration.</p>	<p><b>BEUC</b> This is important to be retained. Consumers should still have access to more detailed information on the back-of-pack. A simplified nutritional labelling system may not give details on the front-of-pack for specific nutrients which are important for certain</p>

	consumers e.g. those who suffer from hypertension would be especially interested in knowing the proportion of salt content in the products they intend to purchase for which they would use the nutritional declaration.
<u>Mandatory nutrient declarations on food packages are a prerequisite for FOPNL systems.</u>  4.4 FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration.	<b>Australia</b> As per WHO guidance however – is this duplicative of the dot point below.
FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> This is not consistent with Codex Guidelines on Supplementary Nutrition Information which allow this to be used in target populations with high illiteracy or low nutrition literacy. In these cases, food group symbols or other pictorial or colour presentations may be used without the nutrient declaration. This may be important for some LMICs who do not currently have mandatory nutrient declarations. Alternatively, provisions on Supplementary Nutrition Information should be updated.
<del>FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration.</del>	<b>Brazil</b> As already pointed out by Brazil during the e-WG discussions, the work on FOPNL must guarantee consistency with the provisions of supplementary nutrition information in the Guidelines for Nutrition Labelling as defined in the with the project document approved by CCFL (Appendix III of REP 18/FL).  In this sense, the second paragraph of section 5 of the Guidelines of Nutrition Labelling already states that supplementary nutrition information might be provided without the nutrient declaration for target populations that have a high illiteracy rate or comparatively little knowledge of nutrition.  Thus, we do not support restricting the scope of FOPNL to pre-packaged foods that include nutrient declaration. We suggest deleting this section.
FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> support this principle
4.3. FOPNL should <del>only</del> be <b>provided in addition to</b> , and not in place of, the nutrient declaration .	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador suggests returning to the previous principle, when the document was circulated by the Chair of the eWG, as we consider it was more understandable
4.3. FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration. <u>In cases in which the declaration of nutrients is not available, countries may include a FOPNL according to their national public health policies in accordance with Guideline CAC/GL2/1985 "</u> .	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to add this sentence, as it is considers the FOPNL as complementary nutritional information. The Guideline CAC/GL2/1985, in point 5 regarding complementary nutrition information, provides this possibility as it mentions that " The use of supplementary nutrition information on food labels should be optional and should only be given in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration, except for target populations who have a high illiteracy rate and/or comparatively little knowledge of nutrition".
4.3. FOPNL should only be provided in addition to, and not in place of, the nutrient declaration. <i>..[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term "Debe" by "Debería" as a more adequate translation of the English term "should".
4.3. <del>FOPNL should only be</del> <u>Should be provided</u> in addition to, and not in place of,	<b>Costa Rica</b>

the nutrient declaration	
4.34. FOPNL <u>Should only not</u> be provided in isolation; must be provided as <u>addition to, and not in place of a supplement</u> of the nutrient declaration	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua suggests modifications in the wording to improve understanding .
<b>SECTION 4.3</b>	
FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program <u>developed and produced by public authorities</u> to increase consumer understanding and use.	<b>BEUC</b>
FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and <del>use</del> <u>use of the system</u> .	<b>Australia</b>
FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and use.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> support this principle
4.4. -. FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and use	<b>El Salvador</b> We agree with principle 4.4
4.4. . FOPNL should be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and use. [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term “Debe” by “Debería” as a more adequate translation of the English term “should”..
4.4. FOPNL <u>s-Should</u> be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and use <u>by the consumer</u> .	<b>Costa Rica</b>
4.4. <del>FOPNL s-Should</del> be accompanied by a consumer awareness and education/ information program to increase consumer understanding and use	<b>Nicaragua</b>
Section 4.5	
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without</del> <b>without the need to pick up the food package]</b> <del>package and formtting specifications for graphic design, minimum type and image size, and colour contrast should be mandated by national authorities.-</del>	<b>Consumers International</b> It is important that it is clear here that the FOPNL needs to be on the front-of-pack and without the need to be picked up in order to ensure maximum visibility
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>use</del> <del>[without the need to pick up the food package]</del> .	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> Suggest to remove the wordings in bracket as it would complicate the use of FOPNL, particularly this parameter adds an additional dimension to how food products should be displayed on the retailers’ shelf. In addition, there might not be sufficient consumer behavior study to show the correlation between without the need to pick up food package and the likelihood to choose a product.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package]</del> .	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA proposes not to retain the addition between brackets [“without the need to pick up the food package”], since the current expression “clearly visible” is already sufficient and easy to understand. Unnecessary repetitions, especially in multiple foreign languages, should be avoided.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal	<b>Canada</b>

conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b> .	Canada agrees with the intent of this principle, however it may already be implicit in the definition of front-of-pack outlined in footnote 6.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b> .	<b>BEUC</b> This is essential to be retained. FOPNLs must be on the food package and should never be replaced by online sources of information accessed electronically or only be written on the shelf. Consumers make purchasing decisions in a matter of seconds, so it is vital that they are able to glean this information at-a-glance from the package. Furthermore, the label on the package can also prove useful to consumers consuming the purchased product at home.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b> .	<b>Australia</b> This may be unnecessarily restrictive for supermarkets.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b> .	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports this principle. We agree that the FOPNL should be easily visible at point of purchase and that this principle should allow for the display of the FOPNL on the surface most likely to be seen by the consumer e.g. the lid may be the appropriate placement for foods displayed in a chest freezer. We are happy to delete the words in square brackets if this intent can be captured in another way.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b></del> <b>package</b> .	<b>USA</b> We prefer to keep the bracketed text to allow flexibility.
<del>FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b>.</del>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This principle is considered problematic as it is impossible to ensure its compliance given that food manufacturers do not control how a product is displayed in store (e.g. the same product could be stacked flat in some stores & stacked on its side in other stores). Therefore, this principle is difficult to implement and enforce consistently. The possibility to use other ways (e.g. digital media, website, shelf-tags...) should be highlighted as indicated in our previous comments. If this is nevertheless decided to be kept, we propose not to retain the addition between brackets ["without the need to pick up the food package"], since the current expression "clearly visible" is already sufficient and easy to understand. Unnecessary repetitions, especially in multilateral fora language, should be avoided.
FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b></del> .	<b>Brazil</b> We support the deletion of the text in square brackets as the additional text does not improve clarity.
FOPNL should be clearly visible <del>on the package</del> at the point of purchase <del>or on the package</del> under normal conditions of sale and use <del><b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b></del> .	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We suggest the following changes to the principles 'FOPNL should be clearly visible at the point of purchase or on the package under normal conditions of sale and use.' This is in line with the text in italics in 2. Scope with regard to other situations where these guidelines can be used and also mentioned in 5.2 to see the FOPNL broader than just labelling. We recommend that the last part of the sentence be deleted as it is unnecessarily restrictive and impractical e.g. checking packages on top and bottom shelves in supermarkets may require handling them to read the labels. Additionally this is covered

	<p>in 5.3 Addition of a principle.</p> <p>It should also be noted that food manufacturers have no control over how or where a product is displayed at retail (e.g. in what type of display case).</p>
<p>FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>ICBA</b></p> <p>4.5 ICBA suggests that this principle can be removed, because this guidance is already effectively included in 5.4 of the "Other Aspects to Consider in the Development of FOPNL Systems" section. Additional comments and text edits are included there. Should the Committee choose to retain this principle, ICBA respectfully suggests that the bracketed text be deleted, as the manufacturer may not have control over whether the product is displayed as expected.</p>
<p>FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p> <p><u>We agree with the comments 44 and 45 mentioned in page 5.</u></p>	<p><b>Kuwait</b></p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del> <b>without the need to pick up the food package.</b></p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b></p> <p>We agree with the text in square brackets in principle 4.5,</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and <u>use</u>. <del>use [without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>Dominican Republic</b></p> <p>Dominican Republic considers the information in brackets should be deleted as it is unnecessary.</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>Argentina</b></p> <p>We propose to eliminate the crossed out texts as it is not appropriate, in a labelling standard, to make reference to the disposition of the food at the point of sale.</p> <p>In addition, the inclusion of the sentence "without the need to pick up the food", is not suitable as the way the product is exhibited and its visibility could depend on many factors at the point of sale outside the responsibility of the manufacturer. Additionally, the term "pick up" could create confusion.</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package] ...</del></p> <p><i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p> <p>Chile proposes to eliminate the sentence in square brackets as it is not always possible for the main container face to be visible, as this depends on the place where it is displayed.</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package] ...</del></p> <p><i>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>Chile</b></p> <p>Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term "Debe" by "Debería" as a more adequate translation of the English term "should".</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and <u>use</u>. <del>use [without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>Colombia</b></p> <p>We propose to delete the text</p>
<p>4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del></p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p> <p>Food manufacturers do not control the way in which foods are presented at points of sale and therefore we propose to delete the text in brackets.</p>

4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the front part of the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>use [without the need to pick up the food package].</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <del>[without the need to pick up the food package].</del>	<b>Peru</b> Delete the text in brackets
4.5. FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use [without the need to pick up the food package].	<b>IFU</b> IFU proposes to delete this point. It seems unnecessary since this subject is covered under 5.3.
<b>SECTION 4.6</b>	
FOPNL should align with evidence-based <del>national national, as well as regional and international WHO dietary guidance /health and nutrition policies]</del> <b>nutrient profile systems based in the scientific evidence and free of conflict of interest.</b>	<b>Consumers International</b> In regard to the phrase “national dietary guidance,” we reiterate that some countries may lack such guidelines. We also emphasize the importance that FOPNL promoted by the Codex are coherent with those recommended by WHO and its regional offices. Thus, we recommend the importance of referencing regional and global dietary guidelines generally, such as those designed by the WHO, PAHO, or other WHO regional offices.  Furthermore, we suggest that the FOPNL is based not only dietary guidance but also nutrient profile models that are evidence-based. Nutrient profile models could be considered distinct from dietary advice because they involve “the science of classifying or ranking foods according to their nutritional composition for reasons related to preventing disease and promoting health” (WHO-Europe Nutrient Profile Model). A nutrient profile model that is free of conflict of interest and industry interference is essential for an effective FOPNL. Therefore, we suggest that it is mentioned in this principle.  It is important to add a note about conflict of interest because scientific research should be independently conducted free from commercial interest and be able to show objective consumer understanding of a scheme (especially for consumers from lower-socio economic groups who in general have lower levels of nutritional knowledge and are more at risk of becoming obese or overweight).
FOPNL should align with evidence-based <del>national national or international dietary guidance /and/or health and nutrition policies]</del> <b>policies.</b>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> To allow for flexibility in countries where there is little or no national dietary guidance and/or health and nutrition policies during the time of FOPNL implementation.
FOPNL should align with <del>science and evidence-based national dietary dietary guidance /health and nutrition policies]</del>	<b>ICGMA</b> ICGMA Feedback • ICGMA proposes to retain the reference to “evidence-based dietary guidance”, as this is much more coherent with the following point 4.7 concerning “sound scientific valid evidence”, with respect to the much less scientific concept of “health and nutrition policies”.
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>dietary guidance /health [health and nutrition policies]</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests use of the term “health and nutrition policies” instead of “dietary guidance”. This will align with the overall Purpose which refers to FOPNL as consistent with the “national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation”.

FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <b>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b> .	<b>Australia</b> As suggested in the purpose, 'national, regional, or global dietary guidance' would be more appropriate
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <b>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b> .	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> As suggested in the purpose, 'national, regional, or global dietary guidance' would be more appropriate
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>[dietary dietary guidance / and/or health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>policies.</b>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand suggests both terms in the square brackets should be retained as countries may have one or the other.
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>[dietary guidance / [ health and nutrition policies]</b></del> .	<b>USA</b> We believe "dietary guidance" should be removed to be consistent with the Purpose section. Some countries do not have established dietary guidance.
FOPNL should align with evidence-based international and/or national <del><b>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>dietary guidance.</b>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> We propose to retain the reference to "evidence-based dietary guidance", as this is much more coherent with the following point 4.6 concerning "sound scientific valid evidence", with respect to the much less scientific concept of "health and nutrition policies".
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>policies.</b>	<b>Brazil</b> We support the deletion of square brackets. We understand that FOPNL should be align with national health and nutrition policies to make this section aligned with Section 1 that deals with purpose of the document.
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>[dietary dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>aim to facilitate consumer understanding of te nutritional value of the diet and support consumption of core food groups. Consideration should be given to positive nutrients and foods for which the consumption is encouraged by country national guidance to support consumption of whole foods and a balanced diet.-</b>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> It is important that FOPNL systems align with evidence based National Dietary Guidelines as they are the overarching evidence based recommendations. Foods are a complex matrix of nutrients, which interact in a multitude of ways to influence health outcomes. A nutrient focus has the potential to classify some foods as 'unhealthy' or 'less healthy' than otherwise classified in Dietary Guidelines. While dietary guidelines take a food-based approach, FOPNL systems may use specific nutrients criteria including total energy, saturated fat, sugar and sodium to assess the 'healthiness' of foods in a defined food or beverage category. The utilization of nutrient criteria in the FOPNL systems has the potential to misrepresent the association between some food and health outcomes and is not consistent with broader health strategies designed to reduce the risk of diet related chronic disease. Consumers should be directed to the full nutrition information provided on the package
FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>guidance].</b>	<b>ICBA</b> 4.6 ICBA suggests that this principle is not necessary, as a similar statement is incorporated into the Purpose. However, if the Committee overall agrees that it should remain, ICBA suggests the following changes to the text. Also, if the principle is retained, but previous principles are deleted or added, numbering should be adjusted.
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del><b>or regional [dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</b></del> <b>dietary and nutritional policies.</b>	<b>El Salvador</b> In principle 4.6, the sentence in brackets "dietary guidance" is selected and we suggest adding the word "and nutritonal" to complement the principle. We also add the term "or regional".

4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> <u>health and nutrition policies</u> .	<b>Dominican Republic</b> Dominican Republic requests that the information in brackets be replaced by "health and nutrition policies" as we consider them relevant
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Argentina</b> We consider that front labeling should be in accordance with the Government nutrition guidelines (dietary guidelines), based on scientific evidence.
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance – dietary directives or guidances / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Chile</b> Improves the Spanish wording.
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> . [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term "Debe" by "Debería" as a more adequate translation of the English term "should".
4.6. FOPNLs Should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Costa Rica</b>
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Colombia</b> FOPNL should align with health and nutrition policies .
4.6. FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica supports to keep the text in brackets as part of the text of the guideline.
4.6. FOPNLs Should align with evidence-based national <del>[dietary dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> .	<b>Nicaragua</b>
4.6. FOPNL should align with national <del>[dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies]</del> based.	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>SECTION 4.7</b>	
4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of [nutrients of global importance] as supported by sound scientific valid evidence. Proposed amended wording: <u>FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</u>	<b>IFU</b> IFU kindly asks for the clarification of the term "nutrients of global importance". Without the definition, IFU suggests to delete this term.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <u>common nutrients that are important to many countries in general</u> <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> Suggest to refine it to "common nutrients that are important to many countries in general" for better clarity.
FOPNL should be underpinned by <u>transparent</u> objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>ICGMA</b> ICGMA agrees that any underlying basis for FOPNL should be "supported by sound scientific evidence." However, it is unclear how "nutrients of global importance" is defined. Without a definition, we recommend removing the bracketed text.
FOPNL should be underpinned by <u>evidence-based</u> objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> <u>public health concern as supported-identified by sound scientific valid evidence</u> <del>the country where it is implemented</del> .	<b>Canada</b> If this principle is retained, Canada suggests modifications.  This principle may be redundant as it appears to be already covered under principle 4.6 by aligning with evidence based national dietary guidance which should take into account the latest science on nutrient and food intakes. In addition, it is unclear how



	“nutrients of global importance” is defined. Canada recommends replacing this with “nutrients of public health concern”, as identified by the country of implementation”.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> <b>national/global importance and analysis of diet related non-communicable diseases and population dietary patterns]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>Australia</b> Essential for greater clarity here – in substance and drafting.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Greater clarity is required of the term 'sound scientific valid evidence'
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> These are not defined anywhere. This provision could more appropriately refer to having evidence-based, and validated nutrient profiling models to underpin FOPL. There are already a variety of WHO Nutrient Profiles developed that could be adapted for FOPNL. The new WHO EURO HEN report on evidence for FOPNL highlights that nutrient profiles are typically developed by independent or government authorities. This is because of the significant risk of industry interference and difficulty of removing conflict of financial interests if industry involved in this process particularly. Governments should retain authority on which nutrients or other food components they want to include. In practice, there is already considerable global consistency. Nutrients and other food components (e.g. fruit and vegetable content) included should be able to be updated with emerging evidence and recommendations e.g. WHO Guidelines on Sugars.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence. <u>Additional principle: FOPNL should be underpinned by nutrient profiling that considers nutrients and foods to be encouraged and nutrients and foods to be limited which are agreed at a global level taking into account both scientific evidence and capabilities for obtaining labelling data</u>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand suggests an amendment to this principle (as shown above). The evidence to be considered is broader than consideration of nutrients – it includes nutritional risk, the practicality of measuring specific nutrients, consumer understanding and the overall nutritional value of the food. These could be given as examples. We also suggest an additional principle is added regarding the nutrients to be considered when developing a FOPNL. These nutrients should be based on recommendations in dietary guidance of nutrients and foods to be encouraged and nutrients and foods to be limited, and should be agreed at a global level taking into account both scientific evidence and capabilities for obtaining data.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>USA</b> We propose to strike 4.7 in its entirety. The text in brackets appears to be outside of the Purpose section (1), which emphasizes, “national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.” We believe countries and regions are in the best position to set public health priorities which can be addressed by FOPNL systems.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence. <u>It aims to facilitate consumer understanding of the contribution or importance of the food to the energy and nutrient content of a diet.</u>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> We suggest to delete the reference in square brackets given that it is not clear what is meant by this (no definition at Codex level).
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients-nutrients of global</del>	<b>Brazil</b>

<del>importance]</del> <b><u>national importance</u></b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	We support the deletion of square brackets and suggest replacing the word 'global' by 'national' to make the section aligned with Section 1 that deals with purpose of the document.
FOPNL should be underpinned by <del>objective measures of [nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence <u>evidence including that relating to nutritional risk, the practicality of measuring specific nutrients, consumer understanding of labelling, the overall nutritional value of the food and evidence-based health outcomes from consumption of the food.</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We recognise the importance and intent of this objective, however this general principle should not be disconnected to nor misrepresent the association between some foods and health outcomes that are not consistent with broader health strategies designed to reduce the risk of diet related chronic disease. The evidence which needs to be considered is broader than consideration of nutrients – it includes nutritional risk, the practicality of measuring specific nutrients, consumer understanding and the overall nutritional value of the food and evidence-based health outcomes from consumption of the food. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>off [nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>ICBA</b> 4.7 ICBA agrees that any underlying basis for FOPNL should be “supported by sound scientific evidence.” However, it is unclear how “nutrients of global importance” is defined. Without a definition, ICBA recommends removing the bracketed text.
FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>CEFS</b> The meaning of “nutrient of global importance” is unclear. Most importantly, only science must be the basis of the development of any FOPNL. This would avoid political exploitation of consumers' fear as prohibited by the Codex General Guidelines on Claims
4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> <b><u>nutrients of global importance</u></b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence	<b>El Salvador</b> We agree with principle 4.7 and the text in brackets
4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> <b><u>nutrients of global importance</u></b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>Dominican Republic</b> Dominican Republic accepts the adoption of the information in brackets
4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence	<b>Argentina</b> We propose to replace this text with the following: "Reflect the importance of a varied, balanced and healthy diet that promotes the health and well-being of consumers in accordance with the Government nutritional guidelines"
4.7.FOPNL should be underpinned by objective <b><u>public health</u></b> measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>Chile</b> The public health concept better reflects the meaning of this principle and is also aligned with principle 4.6.
4.7.FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence. <i>.[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term “Debe” by “Debería” as a more adequate translation of the English term “should”.
4.7. FOPNL Should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	<b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica considers that this principle needs to be clarified, since there are no criteria in Codex to establish nutrients of global importance.
4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <del>[nutrients of global importance]</del>	<b>Colombia</b>

<p><del>importance] as supported by sound scientific valid evidence..4.7 FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of [nutrients of global and national importance] as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</del></p> <p><i>(TN, New English wording proposed was offered already in English by Colombia)</i></p>	<p>In addition to the nutrients of global importance, the FOPNL can be supported by public policies for health and nutrition .</p>
<p>4.7. <del>FOPNL should be underpinned</del> <u>Should be consistent with</u> objective measures of <del>[nutrients nutrients of global importance]</del> <u>of global importance</u> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p>
<p>4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> We suggest to delete this point and that, according to comment 48, there is no list available of nutrients of global or world significance established on Standard CAC/GL 2 – 1985.</p>
<p>4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> Alternative proposal: It is not yet clear what are the nutrients of world importance referred to in this paragraph. Comments: Not all regions have the same nutritional needs.</p>
<p>4.7. FOPNL should be underpinned by objective measures of [nutrients of global importance] as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.</p>	<p><b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requestes that the FOPNL be based on the recommendations and guidelines of the WHO allowing to raise awareness regarding access to healthy products taking into account the nutrients associated with reducing the risk of diet-related non-communicable diseases and the benefits in the acquisition of the same by the consumers, depending on the realities of each country.</p>
<b>SECTION 4.8</b>	
<p>FOPNL should <del>allow</del> <u>enable</u> consumers to make comparisons <del>[within categories and/or between food categories]</del>.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b> Canada believes that the primary use of FOPNL is to compare foods within a category – so choosing a healthier option within the category of yogurts or salad dressings, rather than comparing yogurts to snack bars. Choosing across categories is the objective of food-based dietary guidelines, and FOPNL is meant to be a tool that is in line with and supports dietary guidance, and not replacing it. Furthermore, comparison between categories is challenging when the nutrient criteria/thresholds that underpin FOPNL and general nutrition labelling are based on a per serving, rather than on a per 100 g, basis.  Canada also suggests replacing the term “allow”, with “enable”. The term “allow”, which in the grammatical construction of the current principle means to “permit someone to do something”, is technically correct. However, the term “enable” gives the authority of the final choice to the consumer, which is more aligned with the intent of this principle.</p>
<p>FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b>.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> Australia notes this is up to the individual country to decide, but suggests that comparing foods and beverages across categories can be confusing.</p>
<p>FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b>.</p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> WFPHA recognises that there are already a variety of approaches taken to this, and it</p>

	should be a matter for countries to decide.
FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b> .	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand's experience is that it is very difficult for a FOPNL system to achieve meaningful discernment both within categories and between categories. It is likely that countries will have to determine which of these two objectives is most important for their consumers. We therefore suggest the 'and' is removed from the text in square brackets and that this is further discussed by the CCFL.
FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> <b>categories.</b>	<b>USA</b> We believe the bracketed text should stay. FOPNL systems are valuable for consumers because they can allow comparisons both within and between categories.
FOPNL should allow consumers to <del>make comparisons</del> <u>increase their understanding of the nutritional value of foods and assist them in interpreting the content of the nutrient declaration</u> <del><b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> .	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This is coherent with the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (CXG 2-1985)
FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <u>among foods.</u> <del><b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> .	<b>Brazil</b> We support replacing the text in square brackets by a general amendment to make it clear that comparisons should be among foods. Some FOPNL allow comparisons within food categories, while others allow comparisons within and between food categories. So, both situations need to be recognized.
FOPNL should allow consumers to make appropriate comparisons <del><b>[within within categories and/or and between categories]</b></del> <b>categories.</b>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> FOPNL will only be beneficial if it helps consumers to make healthier food and beverage choices. A FOPNL system must take into account the overall benefit of consuming a food. Otherwise, comparing foods and beverages across categories with differing ingredients, inherent nutrients and nutrient profiles will neither be meaningful nor enable healthier food choices. For example comparing plain milk with a diet soft drink will lead consumers to believe that diet soft drinks are healthier than plain milk, unless the positive attributes and inherent nutritional value of dairy consumption is built into the system. FOPNL must be designed to allow consumers to quickly compare the general nutritional profile of foods within the same category and/or between categories.
FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> .	<b>ICBA</b> 4.8 ICBA respectfully suggests that this principle can be deleted. The essence of this principle is already stated in the document's Purpose: FOPNL is a tool that enables the consumer to identify foods that are aligned with national dietary guidance.
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> <u>within categories and/or between categories.</u>	<b>El Salvador</b> In accordance with principle 4.8 and the text in brackets .
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> <u>Categories.</u>	<b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic does not agree with the sentence "between categories" as it would be a cause of misinterpretations by consumers. Therefore, we accept keeping "within categories"
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b></del> <u>foods.</u>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
4.8. - FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del><b>[within categories</b></del>	<b>Argentina</b>

<del>and/or between categories].</del>	We propose the following wording: “Should allow consumers to make significant comparisons between foods ”.
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons between foods <del>[within categories and/or between categories].</del>	<b>Chile</b>
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <b>[within categories and/or between categories]</b> . [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes changing, for all the principles, the term “Debe” by “Debería” as a more adequate translation of the English term “should”.
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del>[within categories and/or between categories].</del> <b>within categories to allow them to make a decision according to their needs and preferences</b>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposed adjustments to the wording for this principle. Supports the option "within the categories", because this will help to make a comparison between foods of the same category and allows to adjust consumption decisions in a better way.
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del>[within categories and/or between categories]</del> .	<b>Honduras</b> We suggest to further extend the discussion of this principle
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <del>[within categories and/or between categories]</del> .	<b>Peru</b> We consider that comparison between categories could lead to confusion because of the different compositions of the food and the different roles in the diet .
4.8. FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons [within categories and/or between categories].	<b>IFU</b> IFU suggests to delete this point. It is already stated in the chapter “Purpose” that FOPNL is meant as a tool to facilitate the consumer’s choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.
<b>SECTION 4.9</b>	
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> <b>government led</b> <del>but]</del> <b>but</b> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including public health experts, academia, civil society and consumers that are free of conflict of interest. <del>[government], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</del>	<b>Consumers International</b> Government-led as a Guiding Principle: It is important to acknowledge that front-of-pack labelling standards should be implemented through the development of statutory, government-led policy and not through self-regulatory measures. Self-regulatory measures to combat obesity have been proven ineffective. Effective regulations are those implemented by governments that are based on scientific evidence, best practices, international recommendations and free of conflict of interest. Importantly, the WHO has increasingly encouraged government-led action to improve nutrition and combat obesity and NCDs. In the Report of the WHO Commission for Ending Childhood Obesity it is stated that government commitment and leadership is necessary. It is underscored that “governments need to accept primary responsibility” and “take leadership”. Furthermore, the UN Independent High-Level Commission on NCDs declared in Time to Act that “Governments must take the lead in creating health-protecting environments through robust laws.” The mention of industry should be removed. Consultation with the industry in the development of a FOPNL presents various problems and could lead to hinder or block a FOPNL and thwart its objective of informing consumers. Thus, industry consultation should not be mandated nor highlighted in the Codex principle, indeed it should be

	highly discouraged. The development of a FOPNL involves activities such as the design of the format of the FOPNL, the determination of the nutrient profile on which it is based, the review of the evidence-base that will inform the FOPNL and the evaluation of the FOPNL. None of these developmental aspects should involve consultation with the industry.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> developed in collaboration <del>but</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> <b>government</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> To allow for flexibility in some countries the development of FOPNL, we suggest removal of [government lead but] and keep [government] as part of the interested parties.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> developed in collaboration <del>but</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA recommends allowing for the process to happen either via a collaborative or consultative process. What is most important is giving all interested parties a voice in the process. Also, we recognize that Codex guidelines are intended for use by governments, but because the work may or may not be government-led, we propose rewording as shown above in bold text.
FOPNL should be <b>[government lead but]</b> developed in collaboration <del>through consultation</del> with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , the private sector, consumers, <del>academia, academia and</del> public health <del>associations among others</del> <u>associations</u> .	<b>Canada</b> Canada agrees with the intent of this principle, however, we recommend replacing “in collaboration” with “through consultation”.
FOPNL should be <b>[government lead but]</b> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, <del>academia</del> <u>academia (including national universities and regional food research institutes)</u> , public health <del>associations</del> <u>associations</u> , among others.	<b>Guyana</b> In absence of a strong research support in this area it would limit the functional output of a country. This addition would act as a catalyst to foster support and collaborative effort nationally and regionally.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but]</del> and developed in collaboration <u>an open and transparent manner with consultation of with</u> all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>BEUC</b> It is of crucial importance that any front-of-pack nutritional label is government-led. Given that the central purpose of such schemes – to help consumers make more informed and healthier choices – and the responsibility of governments is to protect and promote the health of their citizens, it is essential that steps are taken to ensure that conflicts of interest are safeguarded against during the front-of-pack label development process. Stakeholder input should be carefully managed by government oversight.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> <b>led but</b> developed in collaboration <del>consultation</del> with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>Australia</b> Australia supports a government led system and suggests including a reference to safeguarding against possible conflicts of interest
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> <b>government led</b> and developed in consultation <del>but</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>private sector, consumers, academia, public health stakeholders among others</del> with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b>
FOPNL should be <b>[government lead but]</b> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> WFPHA strongly support retaining this clause that FOPNL should be government-led. There is increasing evidence that consumers trust FOPNL government-led systems more (see WHO EURO HEN report)
FOPNL should be <b>[government lead but]</b> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Consultation is the more appropriate term here, and the standard term used in good

associations among others.	regulatory practice – it is up to governments to determine and appropriate process for engaging stakeholders, but there should be recognition of the risk of industry's financial conflict of interest to any kind of FOPNL that warns consumers about food, and it may not be appropriate for industry to be a collaborator in policy setting (c.f. a partner in implementation).
FOPNL should be <del>[government government lead but]</del> but -developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports this principle and recommends the text in square brackets is retained.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>USA</b> We believe that FOPNL systems should be developed consistent with national legislation, independent of how they are developed. However, in some instances, it may not be feasible for the government to develop such a FOPNL system. We would not want to discourage the development/use of a system, if it cannot be done by the government. We agree that input of all interested parties in the development of such a system is important.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead -developed in collaboration]</del> but] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> As the FOPNL guidelines are also suggested to be addressed to other stakeholders, we believe that FOPNL schemes can also be industry/stakeholder-lead. Collaboration with stakeholders, in particular the industry, is crucial to ensure feasibility and uptake of the FOPNL scheme.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>Brazil</b> We suggest excluding the text 'government lead but' in the first square brackets and deleting the square brackets from 'government'.
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead]</del> government supported and -developed in collaboration]but] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We feel that government does not necessarily have to lead but definitely should be part of any implementation of FOPNL schemes
FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>ICBA</b> 4.9 ICBA agrees that collaboration between all stakeholders is essential. Further, it is understood that Codex guidelines are intended for use by governments. However, FOPNL work may not always be government-led. As a result, ICBA suggests the wording shown below. Also, if the previous principle is deleted, the numbering may need to be adjusted.
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[ government lead but ]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including { <del>government</del> }, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>El Salvador</b> We are in agreement with the proposed text as well with the text in brackets in Principle 4.9 of the FOPNL
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but ]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including { <del>government</del> }, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others..	<b>Dominican Republic</b> Dominican Republic considers acceptable the information within the first bracket and to delete the second bracket as unnecessary.
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[government lead but]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <del>[government]</del> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>Argentina</b> We propose replacing "Public health" with "civil society, among others". Drafting proposal: "should be led by the Government, but developed in collaboration with all interested parties, including the private sector, consumers, academia, civil

	society, among others.
4.9.FOPNL should be <del>[ <b>government lead but</b> ]</del> <b>but</b> developed in collaboration with all <del>academia, public health associations and consumers and in consultation with all interested parties including industry. [ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</del>	<b>Uruguay</b> We believe that the role of Government is to establish the regulatory measures to modify the environment and encourage the selection of foods with a nutritional profile that is consistent with national dietary guidelines or health and nutrition policies. The private sector can participate in the case of public consultation. Our suggestion, during the previous review of this principle, was: "but developed in collaboration with academia, public health and consumers, and in consultation with all interested parties , including industry.
4.9. <del>FOPNL should be [ <b>government lead but</b> ] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including [ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</del>	<b>Chile</b> Chile proposes deleting this text as a principle. The reason for this change is that it is not Codex work, according to the manual of procedure, to become involved in the governance of the countries and on how do they implement their policies. However, Chile considers that this text could be incorporated into point 5 "Other aspects to be considered in the development of the FOPNL system", with the following wording: "In the event that the FOPNL is mandatory, the governments, in the use of their powers, will lead in the development of the FOPNL seeking technical collaboration and consultations with stakeholders such as industry, consumers, academia and public health".
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[ <b>government lead but</b> ]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties <u>including [ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</u> <i>[TN: Additional comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
4.9. <del>FOPNL should be [ <b>government lead but</b> ] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including [ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others. 4.9 FOPNL should be government lead but developed in collaboration with all interested parties including government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others</del>	<b>Colombia</b> According to the information presented in brackets, as it is the Government who has the competence as health authorities and the ability to establish these measures.
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[ <b>government lead but</b> ]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <u>[ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</u>	<b>Costa Rica</b> The Codex by definition is aimed primarily at Governments. However, the intention of these principles is to be useful for the development of systems that are not necessarily led by the Government in all countries. For this reason, we support the second text placed in brackets.
4.9 FOPNL-s <u>Should be prepared in a transparent manner and developed in conjunction [ <b>government lead but</b> ] with all interested parties including industry, consumers, academia and public health. [ <b>government lead but</b> ] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including [ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.</u>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposes to reformulate this principle, considering that not in all cases will the Government make the decision, according to its public policy, to develop FOPNL by compulsory mandate
4.9. FOPNL should be <del>[ <b>government lead but</b> ]</del> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <u>[ <b>government</b> ], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others. <b>under the principles of good practice for standardization and technical regulations .</b></u>	<b>Honduras</b>
4.9. FOPNL should be <b>[ <b>government lead but</b> ]</b> developed in collaboration with all	<b>Peru</b>



interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others..	We agree with the text in brackets
4.9. FOPNL should be [government lead but] developed in collaboration with all interested parties including [government], private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	<b>IFU</b> IFU strongly supports that collaboration between governments and stakeholders is key in establishing FOPNL systems. IFU finds it important to give all interested parties a voice in the process. IFU is ready to actively participate in the process. However, FOPNL work may not always be government-led. We believe that there is a need for the voluntary FOPNL continuity until national/regional level FOPNL led by Government in collaboration with all stakeholders is progressed. Proposed amended wording: FOPNL should be developed in collaboration with all interested parties including government, private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.
<b>SECTION 4.10</b>	
<del>Should FOPNL should</del> be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>ICGMA</b> ICGMA proposes the following editorial comment for clarity.
Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact <del>effectiveness/impact</del> pre- and post-implementation.	<b>Canada</b> Canada agrees with this principle. We would suggest indicating that pre-and post-implementation research in the country of implementation be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of a FOPNL to influence outcomes along the pathways of effect (consumer understanding, consumer food decision-making, and consumer consumption). Monitoring of the food environment should be conducted to better understand uptake and use of a FOPNL approach in the country of implementation.
Should be monitored and evaluated <u>on an independent basis</u> to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>BEUC</b>
Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>Australia</b> Clear uptake or compliance targets should be established prior to implementation.
Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>IDF/FIL</b> support this principle
<del>Should FOPL should</del> be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>ICBA</b> 4.10 ICBA supports this principle and proposes a minor edit for consistency with the preceding principles.
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>EI Salvador</b> We agree with the text of principle 4.10
<del>4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.</del>	<b>Argentina</b> We propose the following wording: "Should be feasible to be measured to determine its effectiveness or impact".
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>Chile</b> It is suggested that, for the purpose of this guideline, the monitoring and evaluation should consider at least the following aspects: what to measure, whom to measure and how to measure and analyze which would be the objective evaluation indicators in the short, medium and long term of the FOPNL.

	This work should be developed immediately after or in parallel with the consensus of the purpose, scope, definition and principles of this guideline.
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine <u>its effectiveness and</u> impact.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine <u>effectiveness/impact</u> the <u>achievement of the expected objectives.</u>	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua proposed to modify the wording for the purposes of aligning the terminology with the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement. Additionally, what is important is to determine if the measure has contributed to the to the legitimate objective determined .
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact.	<b>Peru</b> All health policy must be submitted to a follow-up and evaluation of its effectiveness and impact
4.10. Should be monitored and evaluated to determine effectiveness/impact. [TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]	<b>Peru</b>
<b>SECTION 4.11</b>	
<del>Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.</del>	<b>ICGMA</b> ICGMA respectfully suggests that this principle be removed. The principle could be interpreted as meaning that the FOPNL is mandatory, and it is outside the scope of these guidelines to make that determination
<del>Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests that is not necessary to retain this principle as it is only applicable to voluntary systems. We suggest removing as it is already included as an additional consideration in section 5 under Implementation of FOPNL.
Should be implemented <u>by authorities</u> in a way that <del>encourages use</del> <u>maximises uptake</u> on food labels, <u>ideally by making the FOPNL mandatory. In situations where the FOPNL is voluntary however, it should, at a minimum, be a requirement that food manufacturers who opt to use it are mandated to use it on all of its products.</u>	<b>BEUC</b> FOPNL should ideally be made mandatory to ensure that all products are covered so that consumers can make more informed choices. However, in situations where the FOPNL is not made mandatory, it should be obligatory for any participating food or drink manufacturer to use the FOPNL on all of its products, to avoid a situation where such companies could opt to only use the FOPNL on their 'healthiest' and best scoring products.
Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.	<b>Australia</b> Suggest previous wording 'maximises uptake' – encourages use is vague. Does this refer to just manufacturers or consumer use as well.
Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> WFPHA would support going back to previous drafting 'which maximises uptake', and add including consideration of whether FOPNL should be mandatory.  This reflects increasing evidence that voluntary schemes are not effective in achieving their public health outcomes, while leaving it a decision of countries about whether to make mandatory.  We note that the WHO ECHO Report specifically recommends that countries implement mandatory FOPNL.
Should be implemented in a way that encourages <del>use</del> <u>uptake of the FOPNL</u> on food	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports the intent of this principle but feels the wording could be clarified

labels.	as above to ensure it is clear that this principle is referring to the uptake of the system by food businesses.
Should be implemented in a way <del>that that</del> <u>facilitates application of FOPNL by industry and encourages use on food labels by consumers.</u>	<b>USA</b> We have revised 4.11 to convey that FOPNL should be implemented in a way that encourages manufacturers to include it on their product labels, and consumers to understand it and use it when shopping.
Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This could be misread as understanding that FOPNL is by definition mandatory, whereas we strongly believe it should be voluntary.
Should be implemented in a way that encourages <u>uptake by the manufacturers and consumer use on food labels and should be voluntary and supported with adequate implementation and training resources for all audiences - industry, health professionals/educators.</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> This principle was not clear whether it referred to uptake by food businesses or use by consumers. Therefore we suggest the above edits.
<del>Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.</del>	<b>ICBA</b> 4.11 ICBA respectfully suggests that this principle be removed. The principle could be interpreted as meaning that the FOP system is mandatory, and it is outside the scope of these guidelines to make that determination.
4.11. Should be implemented in a way <del>that encourages use on food labels</del> that <b><u>encourages the interpretation of the food labels by the consumer.</u></b>	<b>El Salvador</b> Partially in agreement with principle of 4.11 of the FOPNL, according to the understanding of this principle, it is suggested to add the following text in bold and underline. Nevertheless, we request clarification whether this principle refers to the text proposed by El Salvador.
4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels..	<b>Argentina</b> More information is requested to clarify this point. Do not understand the concept that it wants to transmit, may perhaps be associated with the translation of paragraph
4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels	<b>Colombia</b> The FOPNL should be implemented in a way that will encourage consumers to use food labelling as a source of information. We propose clarifying whether it refers to the incentive for consumers to read the labels. If so, it should be added, at the end ". use of food labels by consumers as a source of information".
<del>4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels</del>	<b>Costa Rica</b> Costa Rica considers that this principle is confusing so it suggests to remove it or develop it better. In the way that is worded, it would apply if the system was mandatory and, therefore, we consider that it falls out of the scope.
4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels	<b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua considers that this principle is not clear, the promotion of the use of the label goes beyond the scope of this document
<del>4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels	<b>Peru</b> The intent of this principle should be clarified, i.e. Does it refer to the understanding and

	use of consumers or to the number of labels that use FOPNL?
4.11. Should be implemented in a way that encourages use on food labels.	<b>IFU</b> IFU is unclear on the meaning of this point and kindly suggests its deletion unless further clarified.
<b>SECTION 4.12</b>	
4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food [as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].	<b>IFU</b> We are of the opinion that FOPNL shall be consistent with the nutrition declaration on the label. IFU can support labeling “as consumed” or “as sold” so that it is consistent with the nutrition declaration on the label.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the <del>food</del> <sup>food<sup>[new]</sup></sup> <del>[as as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del> <u>whenever appropriate.</u>	<b>Food Industry Asia</b> We agree that both as sold and as consumed are important and they should be included in the general principles. This principle clearly states that declaration using either format depends on the nature of the food. Suggest that a footnote can be added to nature of food – to clarify that as consumed is applicable to foods which usually requires reconstitution such as powder beverages while as sold applies to general prepackaged foods.
<del>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner FOPNL should be consistent with the corresponding the nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents and accurately represent the nature form of the food [as consumed or / as (packaged) sold with minimal exceptions].</del>	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA believes it is important to ensure that the FOPNL is consistent with the nutrient declaration on the product label. It also should take into account any instructions for further preparation if such instructions are provided. ICGMA can support labeling “as consumed” or “as sold”. For clarity, ICGMA also proposes the consideration of “packaged” instead of “sold” in parentheses above within the square brackets, because it is more descriptive. ICGMA also proposes a minor edit at the beginning of the sentence for consistency with preceding principles.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada generally agrees that consistency between how the nutrient declaration is provided and how the FOPNL is calculated and applied is important. In most cases, nutrient declaration is provided for the food as sold (per 100 g/100 mL or per serving). For this reason, we recommend the proposed wording, “as sold with minimal exceptions”. However, in situations where nutrition information is provided as sold on a per 100 g/mL basis, it may be necessary to consider exceptions for the application of an FOPNL system. For example, foods that require reconstitution (e.g. condensed or dehydrated foods). If one was to compare 100 g of a condensed/dehydrated juice mix with 100 mL of the same ready-to-consume juice, the calculation of the FOPNL on the “as sold” basis may result in the concentrated/dehydrated juice appearing to be less healthy than its ready-to-consume counterpart. This could provide misleading information to the consumer about the nutrient composition of these similar foods. There may be other situations like this, where “as consumed” values may be more appropriate for application of the FOPNL criteria, therefore there should be flexibility for

<p>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</b>.</p> <p>4.13. FOPNL should apply nutritional criteria using a uniform reference amount</p>	<p>governments to make exceptions when required.</p> <p><b>BEUC</b> In general, FOPNLs should be calculated on an 'as sold' basis with limited exceptions. In any case, whether a product's FOPNL is based on an 'an sold' or (in limited cases) 'as consumed' basis, it is essential that all other products in that product category should be treated the same, so that consumers can compare these products.</p> <p>In order to avoid consumer confusion and to facilitate comparison of products, the reference amount used in FOPNLs should be uniform (eg. per 100g or per 100ml) and not based on serving sizes. Not only are serving sizes by food and drink companies often unrealistically small but they can vary considerably according to the producer, even within the same product category.</p>
<p>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</b>.</p>	<p><b>BEUC</b></p>
<p>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</b>.</p>	<p><b>Australia</b> Australia through the HSR system has changed to 'as sold with minimal exceptions' – research shows people don't often follow instructions and 'as consumed' is confusing (as well as a source of distrust), any divergence from the instructions may have significant effects on the hypothetical 'as consumed' HSR, the displayed HSR may therefore be misleading</p> <p>Our experience shows that guidance needs to be very carefully considered and clear</p> <p>Potentially include guidance on the reference amount used (per 100g/100mL). Suggested words 'Where countries do not have standard serve sizes, adopt nutrient criteria based on per 100g or 100mL of a food or beverage'</p> <p>Recognition of the need to protect FOPNL develop from conflicts of interest. This is particularly important in development of the nutrient criteria/nutrient profiling, as recognized recently in the WHO EURO HEN report on FOPNL.</p> <p><a href="http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/384460/Web-WHO-HEN-Report-61-on-FOPL.pdf">http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/384460/Web-WHO-HEN-Report-61-on-FOPL.pdf</a></p>
<p>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</b> <u>as sold with minimal exceptions.</u></p>	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> WFPHA strongly supports 'as sold with minimal exemptions' based on Australia's experience implementing FOPNL, but notes that other countries may have had different experiences.</p> <p>As consumed has potential to damage the integrity of FOPNL with consumers.</p>
<p>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent 'as sold' except for <u>foods which must be rehydrated with water, diluted with water, drained of water or drained of brine. For these foods the corresponding nutrient declaration for that FOPNL should be based on the final food such that it represents 'as consumed' per the nature recommendation of the food manufacturer.</u></p> <p><u>Additional Principle: FOPNL should encourage manufacturers to reformulate products in line with national dietary guidelines.</u></p> <p><b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</b>.</p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> We recommend that the FOPNL is calculated for the food as it is sold with limited exemptions for foods which must be prepared prior to consumption and where that preparation does not alter the nutritional profile of the food. Broader application of FOPNL on an 'as consumed' basis is subject to misuse since mixing with other components may improve the overall nutrient content of the food.</p> <p>New Zealand recommends the additional principle is added to the guidance. FOPNL systems that encourage positive reformulation of products can result in overall adjustments to the nutrient composition of the food supply, in line with dietary guidance.</p>

Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del> <b>exceptions.</b>	<b>USA</b> We propose to keep bracketed text, which adds flexibility and will allow consistency with the nutrient declaration, which seems the least confusing to the consumer.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / or as sold with minimal exceptions]</del> <b>sold, as appropriate.</b>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> The current wording is too vague. The calculation should be done as consumed when relevant for products that need to be reconstituted for the consumption to give a useful information for consumers in an aligned ways with their diet. In these cases, sufficiently detailed preparation instructions have to be given by the food business operator.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</b>	<b>International Special Dietary Food Industries</b> ISDI considers that the FOPNL guidelines should clearly identify the need for some flexibility in certain cases, as FOPNL systems should accommodate the situation of “food as consumed/as reconstituted”, or expressions “per portion” or “per 100g”/“per 100ml” where the application of the FOPNL on “food as sold” would be misleading or would not make sense.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>declaration</del> <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</b>	<b>Brazil</b> We suggest deleting the last part of the sentence as this issue is not even addressed in the Guidelines for Nutrition Labelling.
Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent as sold except for <del>foods which must be rehydrated with water, diluted with water, drained of water or drained of brine. For these foods the corresponding nutrient declaration for that FOPNL should be based on the final food such that it represents as consumed per the nature recommendation of the food manufacturer</del> <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</b>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We recommend that only foods which must be prepared according to a narrow range of procedures should be exempted from having the FOPNL apply to the nutrient content as sold, for example milk powder. This is because a broader application to all foods, as prepared, is subject to misuse since the recommendations may refer to mixing with other components which improve the overall nutrient content of the food.
Should <del>FOPL should be</del> calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the <del>corresponding</del> nutrient declaration for that food such that it <del>represents and accurately represent the nature form of</del> the food <b>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]or (packaged) sold.</b>	<b>ICBA</b> 4.12 ICBA believes that most important is ensuring that the FOPNL is consistent with the nutrient declaration on the product label. ICBA can support labeling “as consumed” or “as sold”. For clarity, ICBA also proposes the consideration of “packaged” instead of “sold” in parentheses above within the square brackets, because it is more descriptive. ICBA also proposes a minor edit at the beginning of the sentence for consistency with preceding principles. Finally, if the previous principle is removed, the numbering may need to be adjusted.
4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</del> <b>as sold with minimal exceptions</b>	<b>EI Salvador</b> We are partially in agreement with the text of principle 4.12 and we choose the term in brackets "as sold" because the FOPNL is focused on the formulated product, without additions of other ingredients; considering that the food preparation can significantly modify the contribution of nutrients. We request clarification what are the minimal exceptions mentioned in the principle.
4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del> <b>as consumed.</b>	<b>Dominican Republic</b> The Dominican Republic accepts to keep the first sentence in brackets “as consumed” and suggests to delete the second one “as sold with minimal exceptions”.
4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the <del>corresponding</del> nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the	<b>Argentina</b> We propose to replace "as sold" by "ready to offer to the consumer". We also request

<p>food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>.</p>	<p>further information about the expression "minimal exceptions". In addition, the following wording is proposed: Proposal: "It should be calculated and applied to food ready to offer to the consumer, prepared according to the instructions of reconstitution and/or preparation given by the manufacturer".</p>
<p>4.12. <del>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food [as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions].</del> 4.12 <del>Should be applied to the food as sold or ready for consumption, as appropriate, and be consistent with the declaration of nutrients. In foods consumed drained, reconstituted or prepared, FOPNL should inform according to the instructions for reconstitution, preparation or drainage.</del></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile proposes this new wording, since it provides more clarity to what the principle wants to express.</p>
<p>4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>.</p> <p>[TN: Comments apply only to the Spanish version]</p>	<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p>
<p>4.12 <del>Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food as consumed / as sold.</del></p> <p>4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>.</p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> It is not clear In the paragraph to whom would the minimum exceptions apply</p>
<p>4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>.</p>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b> Nicaragua requests clarification on this principle .</p>
<p>4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>.</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> Need to expand the discussion, unable to establish a clear understanding of what does this principle says</p>
<p>4.12. Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <del>[as consumed / as sold with minimal exceptions]</del>. <u>as consumed</u> with minimal exceptions</p>	<p><b>Peru</b> We would be in agreement with the term "as consumed"</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5 - OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b></p>	
<p><b>OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b></p>	<p><b>Canada</b> Canada agrees that this document should aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approaches to FOPNL. However, Section 5 introduces many aspects that are not requirements, but considerations. Canada strongly recommends removing section 5 from the proposed document as considerations are duplicative of previous</p>

sections or outside the scope outlined for the CCFL.

We feel that the considerations included are important but need to be expanded upon significantly in order to provide the most useful information to competent authorities wishing to develop a FOPNL system. We recommend this work be undertaken by a separate group with a mandate to provide more comprehensive guidance. One such opportunity might be the WHO Global Action Network on Nutrition Labelling.

Canada has provided specific comments on each consideration and in Annex 2 below to these comments. These may be helpful if section 5 is retained by the Committee, or to inform the development of a more comprehensive guidance document outside of CCFL.

## ANNEX 2: CANADA'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON FRONT-OF-PACK NUTRITION LABELLING

### 5. OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS

While the purpose, scope and principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approach to FOPNL, there remains a need for flexibility in order to tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.

Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. Many of the considerations for national authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the national level.

Some considerations for national authorities could include the following:

#### 5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System

5.1.1 The system must meet the definition, scope and global principles for a FOPNL

5.1.2 To consider whether the FOPNL should provide either a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or interpretive information on separate nutrients of public health concern in the country of implementation.

5.1.3 (new) Consideration of the type of system may be determined by many factors. Some of these are listed below:

5.1.3.1 (new) the legislation and regulations of the country of implementation

5.1.3.2 potential trade impacts (moved from 5.2, bullet 4)

5.1.3.3 whether the system will be mandatory or voluntary (moved from 5.2, bullet 4)

5.1.3.4 results from high quality consumer research that is relevant in the country of implementation (concept moved from 5.1, bullet 1)

5.1.3.5 (new) recommendations from recognized authoritative scientific bodies

5.1.4 (new) Consideration whether there are foods where modification of nutrient criteria may be required, such as:

5.1.4.1 Foods consumed in small amounts

5.1.4.2 Prepackaged meals and combination dishes that provide more energy to the daily diet than do individual foods



- 5.1.4.3 Beverages or other liquid foods
- 5.2. Presentation of the FOPNL Information (previously 5.3)
- 5.2.1 Consumer research including in populations with limited/marginal health literacy, should underpin decisions regarding presentation aspects of the FOPNL, such as size and location/placement.
- 5.2.3 Consider if there are occasions where the FOPNL might have to be displayed on multiple surfaces of the package due to how the product may be displayed for sale.
- 5.2.4 (new) To achieve consumer trust and credibility, an FOPNL system should retain a similar look to other regulated nutrition labelling information in the country of implementation.
- 5.2.5 Consider whether to include more flexible requirements for Foods in small packages or for foods with other packaging limitations, such as those labelled with retail scales. (moved from 5.2, bullet 1)
- 5.3. Implementation of the FOPNL System (previously 5.2)
- 5.3.1 Consideration may be given at national level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:
- 5.3.1.1 Non pre-packaged foods
- 5.3.1.2 Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)
- 5.3.1.3 Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)
- 5.3.1.4 Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospital
- 5.3.1.5 (new) Restaurant foods
- 5.3.2 Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style guides, nutrient profile calculators, etc.) and the key stakeholders to be involved in the development of these documents. (moved from 5.2, merged bullets 3&5)
- 5.3.3 Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake of the FOPNL system, such as including incentives for the uptake of voluntary systems.
- 5.4. Education Programmes to support the FOPNL system
- 5.4.1 Consumer research, including in populations with limited/marginal health literacy, should inform development of a consumer education programme. This research could inform:
- 5.4.1.1 The type of media that is best suited for specific populations
- 5.4.1.2 Messaging that resonates best with specific populations
- 5.4.2 Additional education considerations to help consumers use FOPNL successfully include:
- 5.4.2.1 (new) Going beyond awareness to include components related to understanding and use of the FOPNL (e.g. educate on how the FOPNL complements existing nutrition labelling practices)
- 5.4.2.2 (new) Components related to who is responsible for the implementation of the FOPNL in order to increase trust
- 5.4.2.3 (new) Components that could be included at point of purchase, such as information at grocery stores or on online purchasing platforms

	<p>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPNL system</p> <p>5.5.1 Monitoring and evaluation should focus on intended outcomes such as consumer behaviour and the food environment.</p> <p>5.5.2 Consideration of what baseline data is needed to measure the impact of FOPNL, including:</p> <p>5.5.2.1 (new) Consumer competencies with current nutrition labelling to make food choices to meet dietary goals/needs</p> <p>5.5.2.2 (new) Current nutrient intake of consumers using up-to-date dietary survey data</p> <p>5.5.2.3 (new) Current nutrient composition of the food supply focusing on the identified nutrients of public health concern</p> <p>5.5.3 Consideration of what data will be required for post-implementation monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>5.5.3.1 Uptake of the label by industry for voluntary systems</p> <p>5.5.3.2 Consumer appraisal, understanding and use of the FOPNL in order to make food choices to meet dietary goals/needs</p> <p>5.5.3.3 Composition of the food supply focusing on the identified nutrients of public health concern</p> <p>5.5.3.4 Impact on nutrient intake of consumers</p> <p>5.5.3.5 (new) Post-implementation trends in innovation and reformulation</p> <p>5.5.3.6 How to balance continuous improvement without constant change.</p>
<p><b>OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b></p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b></p> <p>The overall objective should be to encourage global harmonisation aligned with WTO recommendations and as such the principles should be broad enough to encourage a high level of global consistency and to minimise trade barriers.</p> <p>It is reasonable to allow authorities a certain amount of flexibility in the development of systems that best support the needs of the average consumer in the country(ies) of use, but this should not create barriers to trade. Also, a FOPNL cannot take the place of consumer education programmes which should address specific consumer needs/deficiencies on a national/regional basis.</p> <p>As a minimum, it is suggested to include reference, e.g. in the General Principles, to the importance of mutual recognition/reciprocity in helping to facilitate trade while respecting national differences. If the Committee agrees with this addition, we suggest informing CCFICS of the proposal as well, as this will be particularly relevant for import/export purposes.</p>
<p><b>OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b></p>	<p><b>Guatemala</b></p> <p>All Codex norms and guidelines are voluntary. No Codex norm specifies this type of addressing for the countries. Please delete whole item 5.</p>
<p><b>5. OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS.</b>  <i>[TN: Additional comments apply only to the Spanish version]</i></p>	<p><b>EI Salvador</b></p> <p>EI Salvador considers that there are aspects of section 5 that are redundant (5.1 and 5.2) to what is already considered in paragraphs 1 to 4; However, we are providing our opinion about the text addressed in 5.1 and 5.2 so that this information reinforces the FOPNL principles of proposed in paragraph 4.</p> <p>EI Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5</p>

	since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn go deeper into each of the aspects of implementation.
<b>5. OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b>	<p><b>Argentina</b> GENERAL COMMENTS:</p> <p>Although we agree that a proposal for FOPNL must be accompanied by criteria relating to the implementation and control, these points should not form part of this document given that they exceed the scope of the topic, as well as the mandate of the Labelling Committee and the purpose of the Electronic Working Group.</p> <p>However, we recognize that, for proper implementation, the development of the issues raised in this point are considered very important and would deem appropriate, for some working group, to take the task of developing them. In that case, the criteria or recommendations would necessarily keep a direct correlation to the present document.</p>
<b>5. OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b>	<p><b>Nicaragua</b></p> <p>Nicaragua suggests that that this entire section be redesigned. Although the dispositions are intended to provide flexibility to the application, in many cases contradict the scope and the purpose of the document, which does not help in terms of harmonization.</p>
<b>5. OTHER ASPECTS TO CONSIDER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOPNL SYSTEMS</b>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p> <p>We consider that in this section emphasis will be on other aspects to be considered, not in redundancies or to mention again those aspects which are already covered or mentioned in the document, in paragraphs 1 through 4.</p>
While the purpose, scope and principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approach to FOPNL, there remains a need for flexibility in order to tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>Is it appropriate here to reference Codex's dual mandate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To protect consumer health</li> <li>- Promote fair trade practices</li> </ul> <p>This means that harmonization is a goal, but also that countries retain autonomy to regulate in the name of legitimate public health objectives.</p>
While the purpose, scope and principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approach to FOPNL, there remains a need for flexibility in order to tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>WFPHA would suggest that the aim is to provide 'high level guidance' on the approach to FOPNL – not to minimize trade barriers at all costs.</p>
While the purpose, scope and principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approach to FOPNL, there remains a need for flexibility in order to tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.	<p><b>New Zealand</b></p> <p>New Zealand agrees with the initial drafting of section 5 however we consider this section of the guidance could be elaborated significantly by the CCFL to aid countries in their consideration of the points made. This elaboration could form part of the next steps for this work.</p>
While the purpose, scope and <u>general</u> principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in the approach for the FOPNL, there remains a need for flexibility in order to tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.	<p><b>Chile</b></p>
While the purpose, scope and principles for FOPNL aim to provide a high level of global consistency in approach to FOPNL, there <u>There</u> remains a need for flexibility in order to	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>

tailor a FOPNL system to the needs of the specific population/s in the country or region of implementation.	
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national <u>or regional</u> level to meet specific requirements of consumers in <u>regions or individual countries</u> . Many of the considerations for national <u>or regional</u> authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the national level.	<b>BEUC</b>
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. Many of the considerations for national authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the national level.	<b>Australia</b> Refer to WHO guiding principles for development of FOPL systems. Epidemiology analysis of diet-related NCDs and population dietary patterns; legal framework and nutrition policies.
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national <u>or regional</u> level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual <del>countries</del> <u>countries or regions</u> . Many of the considerations for national <u>and/or regional competent</u> authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the <del>national</del> <u>national/regional</u> level.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Consistent with other Codex texts
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national <u>or regional</u> level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. Many of the considerations for national <u>or regional</u> authorities relate to <del>the implementation of</del> the scope and global principles at the national <u>or regional</u> level.	<b>El Salvador</b> We agree to the paragraphs of the numeral 5 regarding the FOPNL and suggest expanding the vision of the issues raised in the text to the regional level. Therefore we present the added text, in bold and underlined, "or regional" and delete the terms "to the application of the" considering redundancy of terms.
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. Many of the considerations for national authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and <del>global</del> <u>general</u> principles at the national level.	<b>Chile</b>
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. <del>Many of the considerations for national authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the national level.</del>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Therefore, there are a number of other aspects to consider in the development and implementation of a FOPNL system. Many of these may be decided at national level to meet specific requirements of consumers in individual countries. <del>Many of the considerations for national authorities relate to the implementation of the scope and global principles at the national level.</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
<del>Some considerations for national authorities could include the following:</del>	<b>Brazil</b> We understand that the considerations for the national authorities do not provide practical guidance and many are repetitive in relation to the content of the sections of purpose, scope and general principles. In this way, we propose its exclusion.
Some considerations for national authorities could include the following:	<b>Chile</b>

<p><u>"In the event that the FOPNL system is mandatory, the governments, in the use of their powers, will lead in the development of the FOPNL seeking for technical collaboration and consultations with stakeholders such as industry, consumers, academia and public health".</u></p>	<p>Chile proposes deleting this text as a principle. The reason for this change is that it is not Codex work, according to the manual of procedure, to become involved in the governance of the countries and on how do they implement their policies. However, Chile considers that this text could be incorporated into point 5 "Other aspects to be considered in the development of the FOPNL system", with the following wording:</p> <p>"In the event that the FOPNL is mandatory, the governments, in the use of their powers, will lead in the development of the FOPNL seeking technical collaboration and consultations with stakeholders such as industry, consumers, academia and public health".</p>
<p>Some considerations for national authorities could include the following:</p>	<p><b>Honduras</b></p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Selection of the FOPNL System</b></p>	
<p><b>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</b></p>	<p><b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> We are concerned that this section may result in more trade barriers and wonder what can be done to avoid a plethora of labelling systems worldwide which may confuse consumers and create burdens for global food business operators.</p>
<p><del>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</del></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p>
<p><b>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</b></p>	<p><b>El Salvador .</b> El Salvador considers that there are aspects of section 5 that are redundant (5.1 and 5.2) to what is already considered in paragraphs 1 to 4; However, we are providing our opinion about the text addressed in 5.1 and 5.2 so that this information reinforces the FOPNL principles proposed in paragraph 4</p>
<p><del>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</del></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, as the text is redundant with the text of the general principles.</p>
<p><b>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</b></p>	<p>Ecuador requests that the FOPNL be based on the recommendations and guidelines of the WHO to make it possible to raise awareness of gaining access to healthy products taking into account the nutrients associated with the reduction of the risk of non-communicable diseases related to diet and the benefits in the acquisition of the same by consumers, depending on the reality of each country.</p>
<p><u>In the implementation of the FOPNL returnable containers should be taken into account, which have a positive impact on the reduction of waste to the environment, and for them a more flexible system may be considered that takes into account the date of manufacture as container and its useful life.</u></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> Chile proposes to incorporate this text in point 5 "Other aspects to be considered in the development of the FOPNL". We believe that this issue is of interest and stakeholders in implementing an FOPNL may need to take this in consideration.</p>
<p><b>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</b></p>	<p><b>Colombia</b></p>
<p><del>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</del></p>	<p><b>Colombia</b> Proposes to eliminate all the paragraphs of point 5, leaving only the initial paragraphs.!</p>
<p><b>5.1. Selection/Development of the FOPNL System</b></p> <p>The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.</p>	<p><b>Canada</b> Canada suggests including the words "definition" and "scope" in the first bullet, and removing "the exact form of the system should be informed by local research". We suggest including this concept as part of a more comprehensive list of additional factors as proposed in a new bullet three. In addition, we suggest modifying the language from</p>

	"local research" to "high quality consumer research that is relevant in the country of implementation".
5.1.1 The system must meet the <del>definition, scope and</del> global principles for a FOPNL, <del>but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.</del>	<b>Canada</b>
The system <del>must</del> should meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>BEUC</b>
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>Australia</b> The language of 'must' and 'should' here contradicts the introductory statement that national authorities 'could include' these things in their considerations. It should be clear that these are not compulsory Unclear whether 'global principles for a FOPNL' intends to refer to this Guideline? Important to recognise here that countries (particularly those with limited resource) may reasonably choose to adapt or adopt systems that have been researched and shown effective in other jurisdictions for their own purposes.
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Important to recognise here that countries (particularly those with limited resource) may reasonably chose to adapt or adopt systems that have been researched and shown effective in other jurisdictions for their own purposes.
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Unclear whether the 'global principles for a FOPNL' intends to refer to this Guideline?
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> The language of 'must' and 'should' here contradicts the introductory statement that national authorities 'could include' these things in their considerations. It should be clear that these are not compulsory.
The system must meet <del>the global</del> the principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.	<b>USA</b> The language of 5.1 should be consistent with 4.1. This language allows flexibility for different approaches.
The system must meet the global principles for a <del>FOPNL</del> FOPNL as defined in Section 4 (General Principles), but the exact form of the system should be informed by <del>local</del> local/regional research.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> - Cross-reference for clarity - Inclusion of "regional" evidence (e.g. EU)
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system <del>should be informed by local research.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local <b><u>or regional</u></b> research/ <b><u>scientific recommendations</u></b> .	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador considers that there are aspects of section 5 that are redundant (5.1 and 5.2) to what is already considered in paragraphs 1 to 4; However, we are providing our opinion about the text addressed in 5.1 and 5.2 so that this information reinforces the FOPN principles proposed in paragraph 4 In the text, in the first indent of 5.1, we add "scientific recommendations", "or regional", as those texts complete the sentence.
The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system <del>should be informed by local research.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles .

<p><del>The system must meet the global principles for a FOPNL, but the exact form of the system should be informed by local research.</del></p>	<p><b>Honduras</b> We suggest to delete this paragraph as it is covered in principles 4.2 and 4.7</p>
<p><u>5.1.2 To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or <del>interpretive</del> information on separate <del>nutrients</del> nutrients of public health concern in the country of implementation.</u></p> <p>• <u>5.1.3 (new) Consideration of the type of system may be determined by many factors. Some of these are listed below:</u></p> <p><u>5.1.3.1 (new) the legislation and regulations of the country of implementation</u></p> <p><u>5.1.3.2 potential trade impacts (moved from 5.2, bullet 4)</u></p> <p><u>5.1.3.3 whether the system will be mandatory or voluntary (moved from 5.2, bullet 4)</u></p> <p><u>5.1.3.4 results from high quality consumer research that is relevant in the country of implementation (concept moved from 5.1, bullet 1)</u></p> <p><u>5.1.3.5 (new) recommendations from recognized authoritative scientific bodies</u></p> <p>• <u>5.1.4 (new) Consideration whether there are foods where modification of nutrient criteria may be required, such as:</u></p> <p><u>5.1.4.1 Foods consumed in small amounts</u></p> <p><u>5.1.4.2 Prepackaged meals and combination dishes that provide more energy to the daily diet than do individual foods</u></p> <p><u>5.1.4.3 Beverages or other liquid foods</u></p>	<p><b>Canada</b> In bullet two, Canada suggests to include the word “interpretive”. As stated in Section 3 of this document, facts-only systems neither meet the principle that FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by a wide variety of consumers, nor do they meet the evidence-based recommendations from authoritative international health organizations. In addition, we stress that the focus of FOPNL should be on nutrients of public health concern as identified by the country of implementation. Therefore, the addition of this is suggested.</p> <p>There are many additional factors that may play into a country’s decision to adopt a specific FOPNL system type. Canada suggests to provide a third bullet that gives more information on these additional factors. Certain concepts related to the selection of the type of FOPNL system were moved from other areas of Section 5 to be included here. For example, the consideration of potential trade impacts and whether the system will be implemented in a mandatory or voluntary manner. The suggested wording for bullet three is listed.</p> <p>Canada suggests the addition of a new bullet to focus on foods that are intended to carry FOPNL, however modification of the nutrient criteria may be required to appropriately evaluate these foods. Example could include foods consumed in small amounts, prepackaged meals and combination dishes, or liquid foods and beverages. The suggested wording for this new bullet is shown</p>
<p>To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate <del>nutrients</del> nutrients including which <u>nutrients to include (considering risk increasing and risk reducing nutrients).</u></p>	<p><b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand considers the second dot point to be a very important consideration. We support expanding on the guidance with regard to this point. This could initially be expanded within the current dot point as follows:</p>
<p><del>To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate nutrients.</del></p>	<p><b>Brazil</b></p>
<p>To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate <del>nutrients</del> nutrients including which <u>nutrients to include(considering risk increasing and risk reducing nutrients). A summary label provides a means to represent positive nutrient value and should represent the overall nutritional value of the food through evidence based health outcomes.</u></p>	<p><b>IDF/FIL</b> Foods are a complex matrix of nutrients, which interact in a multitude of ways to influence health outcomes. A nutrient focus has the potential to classify some foods as ‘unhealthy’ or ‘less healthy’ than otherwise classified in Dietary Guidelines. While dietary guidelines take a food-based approach, FOPNL systems use specific nutrients criteria including total energy, saturated fat, sugar and sodium to assess the ‘healthiness’ of foods in a defined food or beverage category. The utilization of nutrient criteria in the FOPNL systems may misrepresent the association between some food and health outcomes that is not consistent with broader health strategies nor country specific dietary guidelines, designed to reduce the risk of diet related chronic disease. FOPNL systems should be to encourage consumers to purchase and consume a variety of everyday/core nutrient dense foods — easily recognized as preferred food choices by consumers over and above discretionary foods.</p>
<p><del>To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication an indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate <del>critical</del> critical nutrients.</del></p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador is partially in agreement with the second sentence of paragraph 5.1, as it considers that the text "summary indication of the nutritional quality of the food" goes</p>

	beyond the scope of the FOPNL. In addition, the information to be presented at the FOPNL should be about critical nutrients content or the nutrients profile of the product.
<del>To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate nutrients</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles .
To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate nutrients.	<b>Costa Rica</b>
To consider whether the FOPNL should provide a summary indication of the nutritional quality of the whole food or information on separate nutrients.	<b>Honduras</b> Based on what definitions will the nutritional quality of the food be established? We need to have this paragraph expanded.
<b>Section 5.2 - Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	
<b>5.2.3. Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand agrees that this section of the guidance has outlined the key considerations for countries looking to implement a FOPNL system. We recommend these points of consideration be elaborated where appropriate to assist countries in their considerations.
<del>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<b>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador considers that there are aspects of section 5 that are redundant (5.1 and 5.2) to what is already considered in paragraphs 1 to 4; However, we are providing our opinion about the text addressed in 5.1 and 5.2 so that this information reinforces the FOPNL principles proposed in paragraph 4
<b>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	<b>Uruguay</b> We believe that the implementation of the FOPNL should be mandatory. Therefore this point should adjusted.
<del>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</del>	<b>Colombia</b> We propose to eliminate all the paragraphs of point 5, leaving only the initial paragraphs.
<b>5.2. Implementation of the FOPNL System</b>	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
Consideration whether <del>there are additional foods that are not be intended to have FOPNL such as:</del> include more flexible requirements for	<b>Canada</b>
Consideration whether there are additional foods that are <del>not be not</del> intended to have FOPNL such as:	<b>Guyana</b>
Consideration <u>of</u> whether there are additional foods that are <del>not be intended</del> unique to <u>have a particular country or region for which</u> FOPNL <del>such as:</del> may not be appropriate..	<b>USA</b> This section has a lot of overlap with 2.3 so we recommend removing the listed items



	and revising the overarching principle.
<del>Consideration whether there are additional foods that are not be intended to have FOPNL such as:</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Consideration whether there are additional foods that are not be intended to have FOPNL such as:</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador suggests changes in the wording of the following statement of 5.2, in order to make it more consistent with what is stated in the scope of this FOPNL document
<del>Consideration whether there are additional foods that are not be intended to have FOPNL such as:</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
Consideration whether there are additional foods that are not be intended to have FOPNL such as:	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
<del>Foods with minimal nutritional value</del>	<b>Canada</b> The first bullet of this section addresses points related to foods that are exempted or not intended to carry FOPNL, which is already covered in Section 2 of the Guidelines, therefore we suggest removing this bullet.
Foods with minimal nutritional value	<b>USA</b> This section has a lot of overlap with 2.3 so we recommend removing the listed items and revising the overarching principle.
<del>Foods with minimal nutritional value</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Foods whose nutritional contribution is very low</del> <del>o — Foods with minimal nutritional value</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador suggests changes in the wording of the following statement of 5.2, in order to make it more consistent with what is stated in the scope of this FOPNL document.
<del>Foods with minimal nutritional value</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
Foods with minimal nutritional value	<b>Colombia</b> We propose to clarify what is meant by "minimal nutritional value"
Alimentos con valor nutricional mínimo	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
<del>Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed</del>	<b>Canada</b>
Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed	<b>USA</b> This section has a lot of overlap with 2.3 so we recommend removing the listed items and revising the overarching principle.
Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed	<b>Iran</b> Foods with known nature e.g. oil, sugar
<del>Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>o Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador suggests changes in the wording of the following statement of 5.2, in order to make it more consistent with what is stated in the scope of this FOPNL document.

	Therefore, we delete this statement.
<del>O Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>O Foods where a nutrient declaration is not needed</del>	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
<del>Foods/foods in small packages or for foods with other packaging limitations, such as those labelled with retail scales.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada also recommends moving the last sub-bullet about foods in small packages and other packaging limitations to Section 5.3 (Presentation of the Information). For foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations, there may be the option to provide more flexibility with the format requirements for the symbol rather than just exempting or excluding them from the FOPNL entirely. This may allow the FOPNL to be present on more foods, increasing its effectiveness. We suggest the following wording for this bullet
<del>Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>Australia</b> While there is a general exemption for nutrition labelling on small packets at Codex, some countries have also found work-around this for FOPNL e.g. Chile allows display not on the front if package space doesn't allow.
<del>Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> WFPHA note that Codex does allow exemptions for small packs for nutrient declarations, but for FOPNL some countries have gotten around this by letting FOPNL be displayed on other sides of small packages. It is essential that this requirement not be used by companies to repackage items into smaller packs to avoid displaying FOPNL
<del>Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>USA</b> This section has a lot of overlap with 2.3 so we recommend removing the listed items and revising the overarching principle.
<del>Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del> <u>The two points listed above need to be clarified as there is confusion regarding intention of the implementation of the FOPNL system; does it refer to quantitative or qualitative nutritional value of the food or drink?</u>	<b>Kuwait</b>
<del>O Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del> <del>Foods in small packages</del> <del>Processed foods without the addition of ingredients containing critical nutrients.</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador suggests changes in the wording of the following statement of 5.2, in order to make it more consistent with what is stated in the scope of this FOPNL document. We add text as expressed in document No.2.  We also add an additional category of foods to which the FOPNL is not applied "foods processed without the addition of ingredients containing critical nutrients."
<del>e — Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>e — Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the

	general principles
o Foods in small packages or with other packaging limitations	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
<del>Consideration may also be given at national level to potential application of a . apply FOPNL system more broadly principles to foods other than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether, consistent with the principle that FOPNL be extended to include: is supplementary to, and does not replace, required nutrition information.</del>	<b>USA</b> We understand the concept of FOPNL could be used to support overall national public health initiatives. However, we note that any application of FOPNL should be supplementary to, and not replace, required nutrition information.
<del>Consideration may also be given at national/regional level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:</del>	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b>
<del>Consideration may also be given at national level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Consideration may also be given at national level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Consideration may also be given at national <b>or regional</b> level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include::	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador esta de acuerdo con el segundo enunciado del numeral 5.2
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consideration may also be given at national level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consideration may also be given at national level to of the potential application of a FOPNL system in a more broadly manner, than not only limited to pre-packaged foods. This way, competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include:</del>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Consideration may also be given at national <b>or regional</b> level to potential application of a FOPNL system more broadly than pre-packaged foods. Competent authorities may also wish to consider whether FOPNL be extended to include::	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
<del>Unpackaged foods</del>	<b>ICGMA</b>
<del>Unpackaged Non pre-packaged foods</del>	<b>Canada</b>
<del>Unpackaged foods</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Unpackaged foods</del>	<b>ICBA</b> Please see related comments provided in the Scope section above as well as the following proposed edits. ICBA suggests that this information is not needed in both the Scope and in this section.
e Unpackaged foods	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles

<del>o</del> Unpackaged foods	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> We note that in the EU, websites need to comply to the same standards as in store (e.g. nutrient declaration)
Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This should generally be in scope of this guidance (as per above comments in definitions section)
<del>Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Food [Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites) websites];</del>	<b>ICBA</b>
<del>o</del> Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
o Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
o Food sold via online sales (e.g. information available at point of purchase on websites)	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador considers that the declaration of the FOPNL is important on the labels of foods that are marketed through web sites
Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This should generally be in scope of this guidance (as per above comments in definitions section)
<del>Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>o</del> Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles.
o Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
Point of purchase information not on the label (e.g. shelf signposting)	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requested that the FOPNL must be declared on the label as a mandatory requirement and, optionally, the shelf signposting.
<del>Food</del> o <u>Prepacked food</u> sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals	<b>ICGMA</b> Please see related comments provided in the Scope section above as well as the following proposed edits. ICGMA suggests that this information is not needed in both the Scope and in this section.
Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals - <u>Restaurant foods</u>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests adding restaurant foods to the list.

Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> This should generally be in scope of this guidance (as per above comments in definitions section)
<del>Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We recommend the above point be removed as we do not consider this relevant for the development of a FOPNL system. However it is relevant to consider whether such a system when developed for packaged foods is appropriate to be applied to other settings, where nutritional needs may be different.
<del>Food-Prepackaged food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals</del>	<b>ICBA</b>
<del>o Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
o Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals	<b>Honduras</b> This is an exception from the scope and, therefore, we do not believe it suitable to remain in this section
o Food sold or otherwise provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requests that the FOPNL must be declared on the label as a mandatory requirement in foods provided in food service institutions such as schools or hospitals.
Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style guides, <u>nutrient profile calculators etc.</u> , and the key stakeholders to be consulted in the development of these documents.	<b>Canada</b> For the third bullet, Canada suggests merging this with the fifth bullet as they are both related to the development of guidance documents. We suggest the following modification
<del>Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style guides, calculators etc.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style guides, calculators etc. <u>* The costs and benefits of introducing a FOPNL system, including the impacts of transition times</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> add an intentent
Consider the need for guidance documents such as <del>style guides</del> <u>guide documents</u> , calculators, etc.	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador requests clarification for this third statement in 5.2 and also to clarify the style guides, calculators and other documents being considered when writing "etc"; a substantial difference from the version found in English that only makes mention of "guidance documents "  (TN. Actually the English version also mentions <b>guidance documents such as style guides, calculators etc.</b> )
<del>• Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style guides, calculators etc.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
• Consideration of the need for supporting guidance documents such as style	<b>Honduras</b>

guides, calculators etc.	These calculators refer to what type of calculators or calculations, and style guides, We request it be expanded.
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the of FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory system considering public health context, including consideration of diet-related disease burden and trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation impacts.	<p><b>Consumers International</b></p> <p>Suggest the removal of the discussion of whether the FOPNL should be mandatory or voluntary. As indicated above the FOPNL should be mandatory and government led as we know that voluntary measures have not been effective, see comment above regarding “Government-led initiatives”</p> <p>Additionally, Trade barriers are not the only nor the primary consideration that countries must take into account when developing their FOPNL system. They need to consider the public health context and diet-related disease burden that the country is facing in order to develop an effective FOPNL system.</p>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether uptake of the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory system, such as including consideration of trade impacts particularly incentives for mandatory implementation the uptake of voluntary systems.	<p><b>Canada</b></p> <p>For the fourth bullet, Canada suggests to move the concepts of whether the system will be mandatory or voluntary, as well as consideration of trade impacts, to Section 5.1. This information is integral to what type of FOPNL system is ultimately chosen by a specific country. We also suggest to modify this bullet to focus more on maximizing uptake of voluntary FOPNL systems.</p>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.	<p><b>Australia</b></p> <p>If trade impacts are to be mentioned, it is necessary to balance this with similar explicit recognition that states can adopt public health measures such as FOPNL that impact trade provided they pursue a legitimate health objective. So it must be a balancing of trade impacts and achievement of the health and consumer objectives.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.	<p><b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b></p> <p>WFPHA believes this wording should be clarified.</p> <p>Yes, consideration should be given on how to maximise uptake, including whether FOPNL should be mandatory.</p> <p>If trade impacts are to be mentioned, it is necessary to balance this with similar explicit recognition that consideration must also be given to which form of FOPNL (voluntary or mandatory) will best achieve the desired public health objective. Countries have the right to adopt public health measures such as FOPNL that impact trade provided they pursue a legitimate health objective and are not more trade restrictive than necessary.</p>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the assure that FOPNL is widely adopted. Trade impacts should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation considered	<p><b>USA</b></p> <p>We have revised the wording of this point but have kept the meaning the same. We moved consideration of trade impacts to a separate bullet point.</p>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.	<b>Brazil</b>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including	<b>El Salvador</b>

<del>whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.</del>	El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.2.4 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation.
<del>• Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>• Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.</del>	<b>Colombia</b> The objective of the FOPNL is to facilitate consumers' decisions.
• Consideration will need to be given as to how to maximise uptake including whether the FOPNL should be voluntary or mandatory, including consideration of trade impacts particularly for mandatory implementation.	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requests that the FOPNL must be declared as a mandatory requirement on the label, due to the impact and repercussions on health that is wanted to avoid
Key stakeholders <del>to should</del> be involved in the <del>developing reviewing</del> guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the <del>development review</del> of the <del>guidance</del> guidance) through a transparent process with conflict of interest safeguards in place.	<b>Consumers International</b> Need to clarify what is meant by "guidance documents". If conflict of interest safeguards are put in place (see comment above on "Conflict of Interest") and if a transparent process is followed, it is reasonable to allow stakeholders free of conflict of interest, such as consumers and public health experts, to review guidance documents and submit comments on these documents.
<del>Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests merging this with the third bullet as they are both related to the development of guidance documents. We suggest the following modification
Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents <u>under the leadership of government authorities and independent experts</u> (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).	<b>BEUC</b>
Key stakeholders to be <del>involved consulted</del> in the <del>developing guidance documents</del> <u>guidance documents</u> (important to have end users involved in the development of the <del>guidance</del> guidance) documents.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> Again, this is an area where consultation is appropriate, but consideration of conflicts of interest should occur, and the process should be government led. Key stakeholders include both industry and consumer end-users of the FOPNL.
<del>Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents <del>(important documents. It is important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance)guidance.</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<del>• Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.2.5 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/> Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to	<b>Uruguay</b>

have end users <u>to be</u> nvolved in the development of the <u>guidance) guideline.</u>	Translation error
<del>• Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>• Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>Costa Rica</b> This has been already considered in the principles
<del>Key stakeholders to be involved in the developing guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance). <u>Incorporate key</u> stakeholders involved in the developing of the guidance documents (important to have end users involved in the development of the guidance).</del>	<b>Honduras</b>
<del>What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests removing bullets six and seven related to the consideration of what type of oversight would be required to develop and implement a particular FOPNL system and how compliance will be managed. For government led FOPNL systems, there will already be a legislative or regulatory framework in place for how regulations or policies are developed, implemented and enforced and the parties responsible. This principle is not unique to FOPNL.
What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Question should either be answered or be removed from the text.
<del>What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.2.6 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles.
<input type="checkbox"/> What governance and oversight will be required to develop and implement the system.	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador considers that the government authority in charge of public health should lead the development and implementation of the FOPNL system.
<del>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada suggests removing bullets six and seven related to the consideration of what type of oversight would be required to develop and implement a particular FOPNL system and how compliance will be managed. For government led FOPNL systems, there will already be a legislative or regulatory framework in place for how regulations or policies are developed, implemented and enforced and the parties responsible. This principle is not unique to FOPNL.
How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.	<b>FoodDrinkEurope</b> Question should either be answered or be removed from the text.
<del>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>



* <u>How the system should be applied to foods with specified compositional requirements such as sports foods and foods for infants and young children (e.g. toddler snacks, yoghurts etc)</u>	A system developed for general purpose foods could be inappropriate for these specialized foods but there should be some accountability for these types of foods
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.</u>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.2.7 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary.</u>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary</u>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>How will compliance with the system be managed particularly if voluntary</u>	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requests that the FOPNL system be mandatory in order to reduce the critical nutrients that contribute to the presence of Non Transmissible Diseases.
<b>Section 5.3 Presentation of the Information</b>	
<b>5.3.2. Presentation of the Information</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>5.3. Presentation of the Information</b>	<b>USA</b> Further discussion and clarification are necessary on what type of consumer research is appropriate to best underpin FOPNL systems.
<del>5.3. Presentation of the Information</del>	<del><b>Brazil</b></del>
<del>5.3. Presentation of the Information</del>	<del><b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.3 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation</del>
<del>5.3. Presentation of the Information</del>	<del><b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles</del>
<del>5.3. Presentation of the Information</del>	<del><b>Colombia</b> We propose to eliminate all the paragraphs of point 5, leaving only the initial paragraphs</del>
<del>Consumer Evidence-based research in the target population free of conflict of interest as well as international and regional recommendations and best practices should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation of information in the FOPNL.</del>	<del><b>Consumers International</b> Consumer research is one among many types of evidence that should underpin the presentation of the FOPNL. In developing policy it is more accurate to say that scientific research (which includes consumer research) free of conflict of interest as well as WHO and regional WHO documents/recommendations must serve as guidelines for FOPNL presentation.</del>
<del>Consumer research—research, including in the target population—populations with limited/marginal health literacy, should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation aspects of information in the FOPNL, such as size and location/placement.</del>	<del><b>Canada</b> Consumer research among people disadvantaged by limited/marginal health literacy and vulnerable populations who are at higher risks of diet-related NCDs, should underpin decisions on regulatory specifications for a FOPNL, such as size, location and</del>

	proximity of other label information. Canada suggests modifying the text of this bullet.
Consumer research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best <del>for form</del> of presentation of information in the FOPNL.	<b>Guyana</b>
<del>Consumer</del> <u>Independent consumer</u> research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation of information in the FOPNL.	<b>BEUC</b>
Consumer research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best <del>for of presentation of way to present</del> information in the FOPNL.	<b>Australia</b>
<del>Consumer research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation of information in the FOPNL.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
Consumer research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best <del>for of presentation of way to present</del> information in the FOPNL.	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Investigación de mercado en la población objetivo debe estar a la base de las decisiones sobre la mejor forma de presentación de información en el ENPFE.</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proponemos eliminar desde la sección 5.3, ya que hace referencia a lineamientos de implementación que exceden el alcance de esta directriz. Por lo que se considera de ser pertinente que los lineamientos expresados en la sección 5 deben contemplarse en otra directriz y a su vez profundizar en cada uno de los aspectos de implementación.
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consumer research in the target population should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation of information in the FOPNL</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consumer research</del> <u>Research</u> in the target population must <del>should underpin decisions regarding the best for of presentation of information in the FOPNL</del> have as its goal to <u>identify the most effective FOPNL system in terms of visualization, understanding and use intention.</u>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
PROPOSED TEXT: The market research, in the target population-consumers, will allow to have the base <u>information for decision making about the appropriate for the presentation of the FOPNL</u>	<b>Ecuador</b>
<del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Canada recommends removing bullet two on the monitoring and evaluation of consumer understanding and use as it is covered in Section 5.5 (Monitoring and Evaluation).
Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and <u>evaluated</u> after implementation.	<b>Guyana</b> Evaluated indicates that a system of evaluation should be in place to accompany the monitoring of consumer understanding of the FOPNL for the presentation of information.
Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at <del>baseline</del> <u>baseline, during implementation</u> and after implementation.	<b>Australia</b>
Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> It is worth noting that many forms of research which test consumers self-reported preference or use of labels are prone to desirability bias.  An alternate term could be 'performative research' to test whether they are actually understanding and using it.
<del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline</del>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand suggests the second dot point referring to consumer understanding is

<del>and after implementation.</del>	better placed within section 5.5 Monitoring and evaluation of the FOPNL system. As above further elaboration is recommended. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
<del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> We feel that this point is out of place and better placed within section 5.5 Monitoring and evaluation of the FOPNL system. It should refer to consumer use of and understanding of FOPNL to assess the nutritional value of a food.
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.3 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Consumer understanding and use of the FOPNL used should be monitored at baseline and after implementation.</del>	<b>Honduras</b> To improve wording
<del>Consider if there are occasions when</del> <del>• Manufacturers should ensure that FOPNL is clearly visible on the top or other primary display surface may be of the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example package, when it which is displayed in a horizontal freezer any side or in a container in which surface of the consumer looks down container that is displayed or visible under normal or customary conditions of sale or use</del>	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA suggests clarifying that the FOPNL may be appropriately placed on the primary display surface, as this may not always be the "front" of the package
<del>Consider if there are occasions when where the top or other surface may FOPNL might have to be displayed on multiple surfaces of the appropriate place for package due to how the FOPNL. For example, when it is product may be displayed for sale.</del>  <del>• To achieve consumer trust and credibility, an FOPNL system should retain similar look/optics to other regulated nutrition labelling information in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down country of implementation.</del>	<b>Canada</b> Bullet three includes very specific wording and examples that focus on one specific scenario of package orientation. Canada suggests modifying the wording of this bullet to focus on general marketing practices for the packaging, labelling and display of products that may impact the most appropriate location for the FOPNL To achieve consumer trust and credibility a FOPNL system should retain a similar look/optics to other regulated nutrition labelling information in the country of implementation. Canada suggests including a new bullet to reflect this consideration: " To achieve consumer trust and credibility, an FOPNL system should retain similar look/optics to other regulated nutrition labelling information in the country of implementation."
<del>Consider if there are occasions when the top or other surface may be the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example, when it is displayed in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Consider if there are occasions when Manufacturers should ensure that FOPNL is clearly visible on the top or other primary display surface may be of the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example package, when it which is displayed in a horizontal freezer any side or in a container in which surface of the consumer looks down container that is displayed</del>	<b>ICBA</b> 5.3 ICBA suggests clarifying that the FOPNL may be appropriately placed on the primary display surface, as this may not always be the "front" of the package. ICBA further recommends deletion of the text in square brackets, because the shelving of

<u>or visible under normal or customary conditions of sale or use.</u>	products is typically out of the control of the food manufacturer.
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider if there are occasions when the top or other surface may be the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example, when it is displayed in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down.	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.3 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider if there are occasions when the top or other surface may be the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example, when it is displayed in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down.	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider if there are occasions when the top or other surface may be the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example, when it is displayed in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down.	<b>Honduras</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider if there are occasions when the top or other surface may be the appropriate place for the FOPNL. For example, when it is displayed in a horizontal freezer or in a container in which the consumer looks down.	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador considers that the front top right of the package would cover the requirements and characteristics of the FOPNL.
<b>Section 5.4 - Education Programmes</b>	
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Canada</b>
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Australia</b> Awareness and recognition of a trustworthy and credible FOPNL system is critical to ensure not only long-term use, but also improved dietary behaviours of consumers. Education and communication strategies should address these concerns. It is also important that marketing and education strategies emphasise that the FOPNL systems be used as a supporting tool to help guide food choice, including how it fits into the wider nutritional context of country specific dietary guidelines.
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Brazil</b>
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.4 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation.
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Colombia</b> We propose to delete all numbered points from point 5, leaving only the initial paragraphs.
<b>5.4. Education Programmes</b>	<b>Honduras</b> We suggest further discussions to expanded this aspect, as it is one of the most important, State policies, in conjunction with the sectors involved, and information on food and nutrition education, and include it in the basic curriculum of the institutions for basic, pre basic and superior education

Consumer <del>research on the target/intended population research, including in populations with limited/marginal health literacy</del> should inform development of a consumer education programme. This research could inform:	<b>Canada</b> Similar to presentation of the FOPNL, consumer research among people disadvantaged by limited/marginal health literacy and vulnerable populations who are at higher risks of diet-related NCDs, should underpin formulation of education campaigns. Canada suggests the following modifications to the text in bullet one to include focus on this population.
Consumer research on the target/intended population should inform development of a consumer education programme	<b>Australia</b> Our experience shows that government leadership lends credibility to education/marketing – government leadership is referenced in draft WHO guiding principles and framework manual for FoPL  Could be more emphasis on developing/maintaining consumer trust Communication materials should particularly target at-risk groups (as per draft WHO guiding principles and framework manual for FoPL)
<del>Consumer research on the target/intended population should inform development of a consumer education programme</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Consumer research on the target/intended population should inform development of a consumer education programme</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.4 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation
<del>Consumer research on the target/intended population should inform development of a consumer education programme</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>What-The type of media that is the best media to use?suited for specific populations</del>	<b>Canada</b>
<del>What is the best media or communication tool to use?</del>	<b>Australia</b>
<del>What is the best media communications to use?</del>	<b>New Zealand</b>
<del>What is the best media to use?</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>What is the best media and/or communication to use?</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> It is critical that education be spread more broadly than just through media
<del>o What is the best media to use?</del>	<b>El Salvador</b>
<del>o What is the best media to use?</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>o What is the best media to use?</del>	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador considers that the mandatory declaration of the FOPNL in the upper right front of container is of great help.
<del>What will make the message most likely to be seen and taken on boardcommonly understood?</del>	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA believes the wording above will be more widely understood
<del>What will make the message most likely to be seen and taken on board? Messaging that resonates best with specific populations</del>	<b>Canada</b>
<del>What will make the message most likely helpful to be seen and taken on boardthe</del>	<b>USA</b>

<u>intended consumer?</u>	We have re-worded this point for clarity.
<del>What will make the message most likely to be seen and taken on board?</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
What will make the message most likely to be seen and <del>taken on board</del> <u>commonly understood?</u>	<b>ICBA</b> 5.4 ICBA believes that the proposed wording below will be more widely understood.
<del>e</del> <del>What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5..4
<del>e</del> <del>What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
o What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador indicates that with the FOPNL being declared at the top front right, there would be more visibility for consumers. Its application must be accompanied by information programmes for the consumer indicating the purpose of the FOPNL and its importance in health.
<del>What do Additional education considerations to help consumers need use FOPNL successfully include:</del> o <del>Going beyond awareness to know include components related to understanding and use of the FOPNL successfully?(e.g. educate on how the FOPNL complements existing nutrition labelling practices)</del> o <del>Components related to who is responsible for the implementation of the FOPNL in order to increase trust</del> o <del>Components that could be included at point of purchase, such as information at grocery stores or on online purchasing platforms</del>	<b>Canada</b> What consumers need to know about the FOPNL will depend on the approach chosen. One key point that will likely apply to any FOPNL approach is that it should be complementary to other nutrition labelling information on the package (i.e. the nutrition information, list of ingredients, etc.). Canada suggests modifying the wording of the third sub-bullet and include it as a new second bullet.
What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully? • <u>A communication and education strategy should be underpinned by national dietary guidance</u>	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand recommends an edit and an additional consideration is added to this section as shown above. Further elaboration of each consideration is also recommended.
<del>What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully? * <u>The communication and education strategy should be underpinned by national dietary guidelines</u> * <u>The education strategy accompanying FOPNL should:</u> 1. <u>Enable consumers to use the FOPNL system as intended</u> 2. <u>Promote consumption from core/everyday food groups (as recommended by national Dietary Guidelines) over discretionary foods</u> 3. <u>Communicate the FOPNL systems is a Government led initiative</u> 4. <u>Make product choices easier in the context of a balanced diet</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b> Awareness and recognition of a trustworthy and credible FOPNL systems is critical to ensure not only long-term use, but also improved dietary behaviours of consumers. Any education and communication strategies must critically address these concerns. It is also important that marketing and education strategies emphasise that the FOPNL systems be used as a supporting tool to help guide food choice, including how it fits into the wider nutritional context of country specific dietary guidelines.
<del>e</del> <del>What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5..4
<del>e</del> <del>What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?</del>	<b>Chile</b>

	We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
o What do consumers need to know to use the FOPNL successfully?	<b>Ecuador</b> Ecuador requests that the FOPNL system be mandatory in order to reduce the critical nutrients that contribute to the presence of Non Transmissible Diseases.
<b>Section 5.5 - Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</b>	
<b>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</b>	<b>USA</b> We agree with the intent of this section, but believe further discussion is necessary to define the principles.
<del>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> El Salvador proposes to remove from the section 5.5 since it refers to implementation guidelines that exceed the scope of this directive. For which reason we consider, if appropriate, that the guidelines expressed in section 5 should be considered in another directive and in turn deepen in each of the aspects of implementation.
<del>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>5.5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the FOPL system</del>	<b>Colombia</b> Proposes to eliminate all the numbered paragraphs of point 5, leaving only the initial paragraphs.
<del>Type of monitoring and evaluation possible to be undertaken should focus on intended outcomes such as consumer behaviour and the food environment.</del>	<b>Canada</b> An evaluation and monitoring framework should be developed with the focus on two intended outcomes: consumer behaviour and the food environment. Canada suggests to modify this bullet to include this information.
<del>Type of monitoring and evaluation possible to be undertaken.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Type of monitoring and evaluation possible to be undertaken.</del>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
<del>Type of monitoring and evaluation possible to be undertaken.</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
<del>Type of monitoring and evaluation possible to be undertaken.</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>What? What? Consideration of what baseline data is needed to measure impact of the FOPNL?, including: - Consumer competencies with current nutrition labelling to make food choices to meet dietary goals/needs - Current nutrient intake of consumers using up-to-date dietary survey data - Current nutrient composition of the food supply focusing on the identified nutrients of public health concern</del>	<b>Canada</b> Baseline (pre-implementation) consumer behaviour evaluation should include consumer competencies with nutrition labelling to identify foods high in nutrients of public health concern and make food choices to meet dietary goals or needs. Baseline monitoring should be conducted to describe the nature of the food supply with a focus on nutrients of public health concern. Canada suggests to modify bullet two to capture some of these considerations.
<del>What baseline data is needed to measure impact of the FOPNL?</del>	<b>Brazil</b>

<del>•</del> What baseline data is needed to measure impact of the FOPNL?	<b>EI Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
<del>•</del> What baseline data is needed to measure impact of the FOPNL?	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
Consideration <del>should of what data will be given to monitoring</del> required for post-implementation monitoring and evaluation:	<b>Canada</b>
Consideration should be given to monitoring:	<b>Canada</b> Post-implementation evaluation should include consumer awareness of a FOPNL, perceptions and understanding of a FOPNL, appraisal and use of a FOPNL to identify foods high in nutrients of public health concern and to make food choices to meet dietary goals/needs. Post-implementation trends in innovation and reformulation should be conducted. Canada suggests to modify bullet three to include these considerations.
<del>Consideration should be given to monitoring:</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>•</del> Consideration should be given to monitoring:	<b>EI Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
<del>•</del> Consideration should be given to monitoring:	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles.
Uptake of the label by industry	<b>IFU</b> IFU kindly asks the clarification of this point "Uptake of the label by industry"
<del>Uptake-Application of the label-FOPNL</del> by industry	<b>ICGMA</b> • ICGMA Feedback ICGMA proposes this change for clarity
Uptake of the label by industry/industry for voluntary systems	<b>Canada</b>
Uptake of the label by industry - Close monitoring of changes in the food composition	<b>BEUC</b>
Uptake <u>and compliance</u> of the label by industry	<b>Australia</b>
<del>Uptake of the label by industry</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>Uptake-Application of the label-FOPNL</del> by industry	<b>ICBA</b> 5.5 ICBA suggests the following changes for clarity.
<del>e</del> Uptake of the label by industry	<b>EI Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
<del>e</del> Uptake of the label by industry	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
<del>O</del> <u>Uptake-Use of the label by the industry</u>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Consumer <del>use of and appraisal, understanding and use of the FOPNL</del> FOPNL in order to make food choices to meet dietary goals.needs	<b>Canada</b>
<del>Consumer use of and understanding of the FOPNL</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
<del>e</del> Consumer use of and understanding of the FOPNL	<b>EI Salvador</b>



	See comment in 5.5
e <del>Consumer use of and understanding of the FOPNL</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
Composition of the food supply <del>supply</del> focusing on the identified nutrients of public health concern	<b>Canada</b>
Composition of the food supply	<b>Brazil</b>
Composition of the food supply	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
e <del>Composition of the food supply</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
e <del>Composition of the food supply</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
o <del>Composition of the offer for the food supply of food</del>	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Impact on nutrient intake of consumers	<b>World Federation of Public Health Associations</b> This is very resource intensive and likely to be unfeasible for many countries. The terms here are only that 'consideration' should be given to doing this, which appears reasonable – but we would strongly suggest this not be made a requirement. This would be consistent with WHO Draft Guidance on FOPNL
Impact on nutrient <del>intake</del> <u>intake/food choices</u> of consumers	<b>New Zealand</b> New Zealand supports this section of the guidance. As above further elaboration is recommended.
Impact on nutrient intake of consumers	<b>Brazil</b>
Impact on nutrient intake of consumers <u>* Impact of food availability and cost of relabeling and variable labeling requirements to conform to multiple national systems</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
Impact on <del>nutrient</del> <u>food</u> intake of consumers	<b>IDF/FIL</b>
e <del>Impact on nutrient intake of consumers</del>	<b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5
e <del>Impact on nutrient intake of consumers</del>	<b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles
How to balance continuous improvement without constant change. <u>- Consumer understanding of FOPNL to assess the nutritional value of a food and use of the FOPNL system should be monitored at baseline and after implementation</u>	<b>Australia</b>
<del>How to balance continuous improvement without constant change.</del>	<b>Brazil</b>
How to balance continuous improvement without constant change. <u>* Consumer understanding of FOPNL to assess the nutritional value of a food and use of the FOPNL system should be monitored at baseline and after implementation</u>	<b>IDF/FIL</b>

<p>How to balance continuous improvement without constant change.</p> <p><b>Other comments from the PAFN (Community Nutrition Sector) - Kuwait</b></p> <p><u>Regarding foods or drinks with a major nutrient such as sugar beverages containing sugar only, we propose to include only calorie and sugar content without applying the full FOPNL.</u></p>	<p><b>Kuwait</b></p>
<p><del>How to balance continuous improvement without constant change.</del></p>	<p><b>El Salvador</b> See comment in 5.5</p>
<p><del>How to balance continuous improvement without constant change.</del></p>	<p><b>Chile</b> We suggest to delete from paragraph 5.1, since the text is redundant with the text of the general principles</p>

## COMMENTS OF PHILIPPINES

The Philippines supports the Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Use of Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling (for comments at Step 3 through CL 2019/14OCS-FL). Philippines believes that this document will provide guidance for the regulatory agency to come up with their own national legislation for an alternative and simplified nutrition information.

**REASON**

Relevant to the draft posed for consideration of the Committee, we are pleased to submit our recommendations:

GUIDELINES	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<p><b>1. Purpose</b> Provide general guidance to assist in the development of front-of-pack nutrition labelling, as a tool to facilitate the consumer's choice of food consistent with the national health and nutrition policy of the country of implementation.</p>	
<p>Scope 2.2. Alcoholic beverages and certain foods for special dietary uses [ <b>including infant formula, foods for infants and young children, sports foods or drinks</b>], foods for special medical purposes are excluded.</p>	<p>The Philippines supports the exclusion of the specified food in Scope 2.2. but suggest to revise and specify "foods for infants and young children, food for special medical purposes and formula foods for use in weight control diets" in square bracket to encompass those products under the scope of the Codex on Food for Special Dietary Uses which has its own required nutrient labelling declaration. Meanwhile, the "Foods for infants and young children" encompass infant formula and follow on formula thus deletion of "infant formula" is recommended.</p> <p>It is also requested to clarify and define Sports foods or drinks and the word "certain" foods for special dietary uses before this be included in the exemption list.</p> <p>To read as: <b>"Alcoholic beverages, foods for special dietary uses, foods for infants and young children, food for special medical purposes and formula foods for use in weight control diets are excluded."</b></p> <p>We also propose the addition of footnote for General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CODEX STAN 146-1985) which defines FSDU.</p>
<p><b>4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES</b></p>	
<p>4.2 FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by <b>[a wide variety of]</b> consumers in the country of implementation.</p>	<p>The Philippines propose to delete the phrase in square bracket as the information is already clear without this.</p> <p>To read as: FOPNL should present information in a way that is easy to understand by consumers in the country of implementation.</p>

GUIDELINES	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
4.5 FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use <b>[without the need to pick up the food package]</b> .	The Philippines proposes to delete the information in square bracket as the information is already clear without adding this phrase. To read as: FOPNL should be clearly visible on the package at the point of purchase under normal conditions of sale and use.
4.6 FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <b>[dietary guidance/health and nutrition policies]</b>	The Philippines supports this provision with the proposed wordings in square bracket but with amendment to include 'international' to read as: FOPNL should align with evidence-based national <b>or international</b> dietary guidance / health and nutrition policies.
4.7 Should be underpinned by objective measures of <b>[nutrients of global importance]</b> as supported by sound scientific valid evidence.	The Philippines would like to seek clarification and request example to better understand the phrase in square brackets.
4.8 FOPNL should allow consumers to make comparisons <b>[within categories and /or between categories]</b>	The Philippines supports the inclusion of the words in the square bracket to complete the provision.
4.9 FOPNL should be <b>[government lead but]</b> developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>[government]</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others.	The Philippines supports the proposed inclusion of the words in the first square bracket (government lead) but suggest to replace "but" with "and", and revise the word in second square bracket (government) to "other concerned government agencies". To read as: "FOPNL should be <b>government lead</b> and developed in collaboration with all interested parties including <b>other concerned government agencies</b> , private sector, consumers, academia, public health associations among others."
4.12 Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed/as sold with minimal exceptions]</b>	Philippines proposes the revision to read as: "Should be calculated and applied to the food in a manner consistent with the corresponding nutrient declaration for that food such that it represents the nature of the food <b>[as consumed/as sold as appropriate.]</b> " However, seeking clarification if the words 'as consumed' is interpreted based on a per serving/portion basis or per 100g/per 100mL.