

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE:

Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME: Tel. 5797 Cables Foodagri

ALINORM 79/22

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION Thirteenth Session, 1979

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING Ottawa, July 16-20, 1979

INTRODUCTION

1. The 13th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, hosted by the Government of Canada, was held in Ottawa, Canada, 16-20 July, 1979. The Session was opened by Dr. G. Post, Deputy Minister, Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Mr. R.S. McGee, Director, Consumer Fraud Protection Branch, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada was Chairman.
2. Representatives from 23 countries and from FAO were present. Observers were present from 6 countries and International Organizations (see Appendix I for List of Participants).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. In view of the complex nature of certain items to be considered, the Chairman proposed to establish working groups on the General Guidelines on Claims, the Guidelines on Labelling of Bulk Containers and the General Standard for Irradiated Foods. It was agreed that the above working groups should be set up to examine the working documents concerned, propose appropriate amendments to them and report back to the plenary. The reports of the three working groups are contained in Appendices III, V and VI. The Committee unanimously adopted the Provisional Agenda for the Session.

MATTERS ARISING FROM REPORTS OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OF CODEX COMMITTEES

4. The Committee had before it document CX/FL 79/2 dealing with matters of interest arising from the report of the 12th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and of other Codex Committees.
5. The Chairman drew attention to the revision of the programme of work and working procedures of the Codex Alimentarius Commission which had been carried out by its 12th Session. The Committee noted the view expressed by the Commission that the work of the General Codex Committees, including that of the Committee on Food Labelling, were ongoing and essential to the aims of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
6. The Committee further noted that the Commission had accepted the Guidelines on Date Marking for the use of Codex Commodity Committees (Alinorm 78/22 Appendix II) and had agreed in principle with the General Guidelines on Claims, referring them back to this Committee for clarification of some aspects related to Sections 1, 2.3 and 4.2 (see also paragraphs 85 to 94).
7. The Chairman outlined the major subjects which awaited consideration by this Committee including nutrition labelling and a revision and updating of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CAC/RS 1-1969).

8. The Committee was informed by the Secretariat that the Codex Alimentarius Commission had endorsed the Committee's views that the phrase "in accordance with the law and custom of the country in which the product is sold" should be used sparingly and had requested the Codex Committee on General Principles to recommend how information pertaining to the above phrase should be requested from countries accepting Codex standards which contain this phrase.

9. The Committee noted that many Commodity Committees had considered the need for date marking provisions in standards elaborated by them and had either introduced the relevant new sections or were elaborating a concept on their specific requirement for date marking. The Committee stressed the need to harmonize as much as possible the wording used in identical provisions by the different Committees. The Secretariat indicated that, for the next Session, a progress report on date marking would be prepared which would summarize the work undertaken by Commodity Committees and outline divergencies in the actual wording of the provisions. The Committee agreed that the best approach to this would be on a Committee-by-Committee basis. The delegation of Australia indicated that they had prepared an information paper on date marking and the Committee decided that it would be considered under "Other Business" (see paragraph 129).

10. The delegation of Sweden, supported by the delegation of Australia, expressed the view that it was of fundamental importance to establish agreed definitions for principal terms in food standardization work to ensure that countries attributed the same meanings to these terms. The delegation of Australia drew attention to a list of definitions in the food hygiene field which it had elaborated, and which had been discussed in general terms at the recent (25th) Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

11. The Secretariat informed the Committee that WHO's Technical Terminology Service was preparing glossaries of terms in various fields and that a glossary of terms and definitions, in the food hygiene and food safety fields, was under preparation in WHO. The Committee agreed that the delegation of Sweden should indicate to the Codex Secretariat what terms and concepts required defining, and that the Codex Secretariat should pass this request to the WHO Technical Terminology Service. In due course, the results of WHO's work could be put before the Codex Committee on General Principles.

12. The delegation of Norway enquired on the progress of work on the elaboration of a Code for the Advertising and Marketing of Infant Foods which had been referred to the Committee on Food for Special Dietary Uses by this Committee at its 12th Session. The Committee agreed to defer discussion to agenda item "Other Business" (see paragraph 128).

13. Under the above item, the Committee agreed also to discuss a revision of class titles for food additives and food ingredients to ensure consistency between class titles incorporated into the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and those used by, for example, the Committee on Food Additives (see paragraphs 130 and 131 and Appendix IX).

14. The Committee noted that the Codex Committee on Food Additives had been requested by the 12th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to advise on the practical application of the carry-over principle to Codex standards (paragraphs 445, 446 of Alinorm 79/41). The Committee on Food Additives had agreed with the proposal by this Committee that additives carried over in accordance with Section 4 of the principle would be treated like food additives. The Committee on Food Additives had indicated that additives carried over into a food in accordance with Section 3 of the principle, that is, in very small quantities and without technological function in the food, would not need to be declared in the list of ingredients (paragraphs 13-27 of Alinorm 79/12). The Committee on Labelling endorsed the above view.

15. The Committee was informed that, at its 11th Session, the Committee on Food Additives had considered a definition of processing aids and the status of processing aids in Codex standards (paragraphs 112-118 of Alinorm 79/12). The Committee noted the recommendation made by the Committee on Food Additives that processing aids should be treated, for the purpose of labelling, as contaminants and should not be recorded on the label.

16. Taking into account that the definition of processing aids, as proposed by the Committee on Food Additives, had not yet been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, this Committee endorsed in principle the recommendation of the Committee on Food Additives concerning the labelling of processing aids and indicated that it would review its decision after the Commission had adopted a definition for processing aids. The delegation of Finland considered the action taken by this Committee premature and reserved its position on the Committee's decision.

NUTRITION LABELLING

17. The Committee had before it document CX/FL 79/5, consisting of a working paper on the above topic and draft guidelines on nutrition labelling and written comments on it from several countries. The document had been prepared by three consultants, namely Dr. S.J. Darke, Principal Medical Officer (Nutrition), Department of Health and Social Security, United Kingdom; Mrs. J. Hayfron-Quaye, Scientific Officer, Ghana Standards Board, Ghana; and Dr. J.E. Vanderveen, Director, Nutrition Division, Office of Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, Bureau of Foods, Food and Drug Administration, U.S.A. The consultants had discussed this topic with a number of FAO staff members and had been assisted in their work by Dr. D.G. Chapman, Scientist, Food Safety, Environmental Health Criteria and Standards, Environmental Division, WHO, and by the Codex Secretariat. The consultants had considered that the term "nutritional labelling" should be replaced by the term "nutrition labelling".

18. The Committee wished to place on record its appreciation of the excellent document which had been prepared by the consultants and of the very thorough and comprehensive way the subject had been treated in the document.

19. Several general comments were made by various delegations on different aspects of the paper. The view was expressed by a number of delegations that the paper was timely as several countries in the world had now either introduced nutrition labelling or were in the process of, or contemplating, doing so and thus, it would be useful to try and harmonize the different approaches to this topic. This would be of benefit to consumers and would facilitate international trade. On the other hand, one delegation expressed doubts concerning the validity of some of the advantages of nutrient labelling, as set forth in the paper, and recommended the exercise of great caution in any work of this subject at the international level, lest such work result in the disruption of trade or create non-tariff barriers to trade.

20. Several delegations stressed the importance of the need for simplicity in the presentation of nutrition information on labels, in order to avoid confusing the consumer, whose knowledge and appreciation of this subject varied not only from country to country but within a country. Some delegations pointed out that it was important that nutrition labelling of foods should not lead the consumer to confuse ordinary foods with foods for special dietary uses. Another view put forward was that it was premature, at this point in time, to proceed with nutrition labelling at the international level and that it would be more advisable to await the development of better consumer education in the nutrition field before proceeding. The Secretariat informed the Committee of comments on document CX/FL 79/5 which had been made by officers in the Food Policy and Nutrition Division of FAO working in the field of nutrition in developing countries. The comments were to the effect that nutrition labelling would have to take account of the existence of certain limitations in many developing countries, and this would be a constraining factor in terms of the significance of this subject in those countries. The Secretariat also informed the Committee that the view had been expressed that energy should be expressed in kilocalories and kilojoules.

21. The International Organization of Consumers Unions (IOCU) indicated that there was wide variation in the knowledge of consumers on this subject and also wide variation in demands from the public for information. Even though there might be a lack of consumer education generally in this field, it would be useful to try and reach common agreement on how nutrition information should be presented to the consumer.

22. The Committee did not discuss in detail the part of CX/FL 79/5 containing the working paper as it considered that the document reflected the views of the consultants on the subject and should therefore not be reviewed by the Committee. After a further exchange of opinions, the majority view of the Committee was to proceed to consideration of the draft guidelines for nutrition labelling, as contained in Appendix I to CX/FL 79/5, with the general understanding that it was important to aim at simplicity in the presentation of information concerning the nutrient content of foods.

23. An exchange of view took place concerning the status which might be given to the draft guidelines on nutrition labelling. Some delegations preferred to proceed with the development of the guidelines on an informal basis, i.e. outside the Procedure for the Elaboration of World Wide Codex Standards, which applied also to the elaboration of codes of practice and, as determined by the Commission, to other texts of a non-mandatory nature. Given the importance of the subject dealt with by the guidelines and the need for ensuring the widest possible consideration of this subject by the many countries which could not be represented at this Committee's sessions, the majority view was that it would be better for the guidelines to be developed within the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards. The Committee noted that in paragraph 2 of the Introduction to the Procedure, it was stated that the procedure applied "mutatis mutandis to the elaboration of codes of practice, and, as determined by the Commission, to other texts of a non-mandatory nature". The Committee agreed to request the Commission to determine that the relevant provisions of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards apply to the draft guidelines for nutrition labelling, since this is the wish of the Committee and since the draft guidelines fall within the ambit of "other texts of a non-mandatory nature". In anticipation of the agreement of the Commission that the draft guidelines be developed within the Procedure, the Committee agreed to regard its present first consideration of the draft guidelines as consideration at Step 2, it being understood that a request for government comment on the draft guidelines at Step 3, would need to await the Commission's decision concerning their status at its forthcoming session in December, 1979.

24. The Committee discussed the Draft guidelines on Nutrition Labelling as contained in Appendix I to CX/FL 79/5 and decided that, in order to facilitate government comments on the subject the above text should also be appended to this report (see Appendix VIII). (Secretariat Note: Appendix VIII will be issued separately from this report).

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR NUTRITION LABELLING

(References to particular sections given below would apply to the draft guidelines as contained in Appendix I to CX/FL 79/5).

Purpose

25. Some delegations thought that Section 1 (a) (ii) should be listed first, since they considered this to be the main objective of the guidelines. Another suggestion was the Sections 1 (a) (ii) and 1 (a) (iii) should be combined and the other two sections deleted. A further view was that the four Sections were correctly placed and that the reference in Section 1 (a) (i) to public health justified this Section being listed first. The delegation which expressed this view referred to the importance attached to health protection in the Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Another delegation referred to the importance given in the Statutes of the Commission to the need for ensuring fair practices in the food trade and, in the current discussion, to the need for ensuring that nutrition labelling was not misleading. The Committee agreed to place the four Sections 1 (a) (i) to 1 (a) (iv) in square brackets and to request government comments on how these Sections should be drafted and on their order of priority.

26. Section 1 (b) was amended in response to the view that information which was not significant should not appear on the label.

DEFINITION

27. During the discussion of the definition in Section 2.1, it was proposed that the main or significant nutrient content should be mentioned rather than the nutrient content unqualified and also that there should be a specific reference to energy content. After some discussion in which attention was drawn to the problem of who would decide what constituted significant nutrient content, the Committee agreed to replace the definition in Section 2.1 by a definition which had been proposed by the delegation of Denmark in its written comments.

28. Concerning Section 2.2, the Committee's attention was drawn to the French translation of 2.2 (b) - "educational nutrition information" - which was considered to be in need of improvement. The suggestion was made that this text might read as follows: "Informations nutritionnelles de caractère éducatif".

SCOPE

29. Concerning Section 3.2, the Committee decided to delete the third sentence which reads as follows: "This optional educational information, if given, would vary from one country to another, depending on national economic and educational policies, and within countries would vary from one target consumer group to another, depending on the nutritional knowledge of these particular groups". The Committee thought that the commentary contained in the above sentence was more appropriate to the body of the report rather than to the guidelines themselves. In this connection, the Secretariat indicated that some of the material in the guidelines, more especially material which was in the nature of commentary or amplification of other provisions, had been left in the guidelines by the consultants, in order that the Committee and governments would have a better appreciation of the thinking of the consultants concerning certain aspects. The Committee agreed to amend the first sentence of Section 3.2 to provide for the inclusion of reference to energy content. One delegation proposed the deletion of the second sentence of Section 3.2, but this proposal was not accepted by the Committee.

30. Concerning Section 3.3 a number of delegations wished to see a specific statement in the guidelines which would indicate that they do not apply to prepackaged foods for special dietary uses. Other delegations, however, were of the view that the guidelines should be considered to be basic and applicable to all foods. Thus, for example, the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses could develop more detailed provisions in the case of foods for special dietary uses. After some discussion, the majority view in the Committee was that the guidelines should apply to all foods, prepackaged and non-prepackaged. In line with this decision, Section 3.3 was amended to read as follows: "These guidelines apply to all foods. For foods for special dietary uses, more detailed provisions may be elaborated". There was an alternative proposal made by the delegation of the United States aimed at expressing the Committee's decision in a different way. That proposal, which received the support of the delegation of Italy, was to delete Section 3.3, so that by implication the guidelines would then apply to all foods. The view which prevailed, however, was that it would be preferable to amend Section 3.3 in the way indicated above. The delegation of the United States and Italy wished to be recorded as having been in favour of the deletion of Section 3.3.

NUTRIENT LABELLING

31. Concerning Section 4.1.1 "Principles for Nutrient Labelling", the Committee agreed to adopt, with some modification, a text which had been prepared by the delegation of the United States, in place of the existing text of Section 4.1.1. The Committee thought that, on the whole, the proposed text by the United States was more suitable, but it deleted reference in the proposed text to the concept of recommended minimum and maximum quantities of nutrients because that concept was not universally accepted.

32. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that nutrient labelling should not be presented in a manner which would imply that a particular food, as such, had a slimming effect.

33. The Committee agreed to delete the first sentence of Section 4.1.2, on the grounds that it was in the nature of commentary and not essential to the text. As regards Section 4.1.3, the Committee decided to delete this Section in its entirety, taking the view that it was a combination of commentary and exhortation. In connection with the above two decisions, the Secretariat recalled what the consultants had in mind in providing such material (see also paragraph 29 above).

34. Concerning Section 4.1.4, the Committee also had before it alternative wording for this Section prepared by the delegation of the United States. One delegation questioned the philosophy and order of priorities in the text of Section 4.1.4, as it appeared in the document prepared by the consultants. A number of delegations thought that neither the original version of Section 4.1.4 nor the alternative version proposed by the delegation of the United States should appear in the guidelines. The delegation of the Netherlands, however, was not in favour of the deletion, as it considered that there was some useful information in Section 4.1.4 and furthermore, there were composite or novel foods the nutrient contents of which were not known to the consumer. After further discussion, it was decided to delete Section 4.1.4 from the guidelines.

35. It was also decided not to include in the guidelines the United States alternative wording of Section 4.1.4 proposed by the delegation of the United States, but to indicate in the report of the session, majority support for the basic idea in the proposed revision which read as follows:

"4.1.4 Labelling of the nutrient content of processed foods should take precedence over the nutrient labelling of minimally processed foods or unprocessed traditional foods. This would provide nutrient information on food products whose composition is affected most by the food processor. There should be no prohibition of labelling for any foods even though experience should tell consumers that the nutritional value of traditional foods is assured even when these foods are not labelled. Nutrient labelling of all foods should, therefore be permitted on a voluntary basis".

36. The observer from IOCU stated that it was important to ensure that the provision of more information about nutrients in processed foods to consumers did not lead to a situation where there might be a tendency for consumers to move away from traditional foods. The observer from IOCU pointed out that Section 4.1.4 took cognizance of this consideration.

SECTION 4.2 APPLICATION OF NUTRIENT LABELLING

37. Doubts were expressed as to whether it was appropriate to use the term "mandatory" in a guideline, i.e. in a text which was of an advisory nature. The delegation of Sweden felt the term per se should not be used in guidelines because of its specific legal connotations and proposed to substitute the wording "in the first hand".

38. It was pointed out, however, that the meaning of the first sentence in Section 4.2.1 was of an advisory nature and represented a recommendation concerning the type of foods for which nutrient labelling should be obligatory. The delegation of Canada proposed to place the term in brackets. The majority of the Committee agreed to retain the term "mandatory" in Section 4.2.1, but to place it in brackets in order to draw attention of governments specifically to this provision. The delegation of New Zealand suggested that the view of governments also be sought on whether Section 4.2.1 should be obligatory.

39. A number of delegations expressed the view that they could agree with Section 4.2.1 (a), i.e. that it should be recommended to apply always nutrient labelling to foods for which a nutritional claim was made. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany proposed to amend provision 4.2.1 (a) to include energy claims.

40. Several delegations stated that they would agree in principle with Section 4.2.1 (a) but felt that there was a need to define the term "nutritional claims" to give a more precise guidance to users of the guidelines.

41. The Committee decided to introduce a definition for nutritional claims into Section 2 - Definitions. It was agreed that the Secretariat should elaborate the above definition, taking into account the General Guidelines on Claims and government comments which would be requested specifically on this matter.

42. The Committee further agreed to amend Section 4.2.1 (a) to include a reference to energy claims in brackets and to request government comments on the above amendment.

43. The Committee discussed at length whether the guidelines should recommend application of nutrient labelling of a mandatory nature to foods covered by the provisions of Sections 4.2.1 (b) and (c). The majority of delegations expressed the view that, for the present time, addition or deliberate removal of nutrients should not trigger the obligatory application of nutrient labelling, as this would place an undue burden on small food manufacturers and national food control and inspection authorities.

44. It was further pointed out that there was currently no need to prescribe the declaration of the full nutrient profile if one micro nutrient had been added to a food.

45. Several delegations expressed the view that voluntary nutrient labelling was sufficient for foods covered under 4.2.1 (b) and (c).

46. The Committee decided to retain Section 4.2.1 (b) but to place it in brackets to indicate that governments should comment specifically on the matter and to delete Section 4.2.1 (c).

47. The Committee considered that, in the light of changes made to Section 3.3, there was no need anymore for Section 4.2.2 and decided, therefore, to delete Section 4.2.2 entirely.

48. The view was expressed that the statement contained in Section 4.2.3 of the guidelines could be deleted since it could be deduced by implication that the nutrient content of all foods not covered by Section 4.2.1 could be declared on a voluntary basis. The Committee agreed, however, that Section 4.2.3 contributed to the better understanding of the guidelines and retained Section 4.2.3 unchanged.

SECTION 4.3 - NUTRIENTS WHICH MUST BE LISTED WHEN NUTRIENT LABELLING IS APPLIED

49. The Committee agreed that the term "must" was not an appropriate wording for the purpose of a guideline and amended the title to read "Nutrients to be Listed".

50. The Chairman pointed out that Section 4.3.1 contained criteria for the selection of nutrients which, in his opinion, should not appear in the guidelines itself but should be included in the report. It was recognized that the consultants had included these criteria in the document to provide information on the rationale which led to the selection of nutrients in Section 4.3.2.

51. The Committee agreed in principle with the criteria set out in Section 4.3.1 which read as follows:

"The criteria for selection of nutrients are:

- (i) nutrients which are known to be of concern to public health in relation to world food consumption patterns;
- (ii) consumer demand for information about nutrients where this is based on accepted scientific hypothesis;
- (iii) economic considerations.

52. It was pointed out, however, that in addition to world food consumption patterns mentioned in Section 4.3.1 (i), also regional data were of importance and that Section 4.3.1 (ii) should be amended to refer to consumer needs.

53. The Committee decided to delete Section 4.3.1 from the guidelines.

54. In discussing Section 4.3.2 of the draft guidelines, the Committee noted that the document contained five essential factors. The first was that ten specified macro and micro nutrients and total food energy must be declared. Secondly, when a food made a significant contribution to fat intake, certain detailed additional information relating to fatty acid composition and cholesterol content should be declared. Thirdly, when a food made a significant contribution to carbohydrate intake, certain detailed information, relating to sugars, sugar alcohols, starch and other complex carbohydrates, should be declared. Fourthly, the amount of protein, was to be listed using certain quality factors in its calculation. Finally, if a claim was made for any other essential nutrient, that nutrient must also be declared.

55. Concerning the declaration of the ten essential nutrients and energy, the Committee agreed that only the macro nutrients (protein, carbohydrate, fat), and energy value needed to be declared on a mandatory basis if nutrient labelling was applicable.

56. The delegation of Switzerland, supported by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, expressed the view that declaration of micro nutrients should only be mandatory when claims pertinent thereto were made.

57. The delegation of Denmark expressed the view that the declaration of any vitamin and mineral should be optional with the exception of those for which a claim was made, but could accept the proposition that the issue of mandatory vs. optional declaration be subject to additional government comments.

58. The majority of delegations supported the view of the delegation of Denmark concerning the non-mandatory nature of vitamin and mineral declaration.

59. The delegations of the United States of America and the Netherlands were of the view that due account should be taken of the fact that expert consultants had identified ten nutrients of importance in human nutrition and had recommended that these nutrients be subject to mandatory declaration. The delegation of the Netherlands also expressed the view that it would be necessary to proceed with great caution in deviating from the guidelines drafted by the expert consultants before inviting the first round of government comments.

60. The delegation of the Netherlands, supported by the delegation of the United States expressed the view that, in addition to the ten identified nutrients, government comments should be invited with respect to declaration of sodium. The Committee decided to invite comments on the list of micro nutrients.

61. Following a discussion of what the declared value for a nutrient should represent, the Committee agreed that it should refer to the average value of a lot of the product in question. It was made clear that this was not meant to be the average value of an entire year's production. It was agreed to include this provision under Section 4.3.4.

62. With regard to the proposed detailed declarations relating to fat and carbohydrates several delegations felt that the degree of detail was far in excess of consumer need or understanding. The observer from the IOCU was in general agreement with this view, but thought that caution should be exercised, lest this view discourage further initiatives, which might, in time, produce a simplified scheme of benefit and use to consumers.

63. The majority in the Committee did not share the view of the expert consultants that the mere fact that a food was a "significant" source of fat, carbohydrates or protein should trigger detailed information regarding these nutrients. The Committee concluded that such detailed information was only pertinent when certain claims were made.

64. Furthermore, the Committee concluded that merely listing nutrients in accordance with Section 4.3.1 (a) did not constitute a claim.
65. In order to clarify the issues, the Committee requested that a working document be drafted outlining those amendments to Section 4.3 which had been agreed upon up to that point in time.
66. The Committee reviewed in detail the document which was presented to the Committee by the Chairman and the revised version as agreed to by the Committee was included in Section 4.3 of Appendix VII.
67. In reviewing the document, the Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Chairman to amend the title of Section 4.3.1 to "If nutrient labelling is applied the following should be declared". Similarly, the Committee agreed with a suggestion to remove the adjective "total" which was used to modify the worlds "food energy".
68. The Committee also agreed to amend the title of Section 4.3.2 to "If nutrient labelling is applied, the following ~~should~~/~~may~~ also be listed in accordance with Section 4.3.4".
69. Concerning the question of special labelling relating to fat or carbohydrate, the Committee agreed to delete the statements relating to "food making a significant contribution" of these substances and replace them with statements relating to claims made about these substances.
70. Regarding protein calculations, a number of delegations agreed with the view expressed by the delegation of Norway that the reference to the method involving biological assessment be deleted. The delegation of Australia questioned the adherence to the single nitrogen factor of 6.25 in determining protein content. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reserved its position on the whole matter.
71. The Committee agreed to reposition Section 4.3.2 (d) into Section 4.3.4.
72. The Committee further agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that all matters in Section 4.3.2 relating to micro nutrients, fat, carbohydrate and protein, be placed in square brackets.
73. The Committee agreed to delete the entire Section 4.3.3 as it was considered to be redundant.
74. At the request of the Chairman the Committee did not discuss Sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 and went directly to Section 4.4.

SECTION 4.4 - PRESENTATION OF NUTRIENT CONTENT

75. The Committee agreed that nutrient content should be expressed on a numerical basis in metric units per 100 grams for solids and per 100 ml for liquids. Any other method of declaring nutrient content (e.g. related to household measures) should be supplementary and not a substitute for the mandatory metric declaration.
76. With regard to declarations of nutrient content per "convenient household standardized measure", the Committee recognized the imprecision of such a statement. Such measures might vary from country to country. The delegation of Switzerland suggested that Section 4.4.1 (c) to be placed in square brackets to reflect this fact.
77. Several delegations noted that the basic declaration per 100 grams or 100 ml should relate to the product as sold and any reference to servings should be on the basis of product as ready to consume.
78. The delegation of the United States of America suggested that the terms "servings or portions in standardized household measure" be added to Section 4.4.1 (b) (ii).

79. The delegation of the United States stated that with regard to portion sizes, they subscribed to the concept of nutrient content expressed as a percentage of Recommended Daily Allowances (RDA). The delegation of Denmark supported the delegation of the United States on this position, but suggested it be a declaration made in addition to the numerical disclosure.

80. The observer delegate from the IOGU agreed that the numerical approach might be sufficient for developed countries, but was concerned that rigid adherence to this policy might impede development of alternative methods such as graphic disclosure. The delegation of Switzerland supported this viewpoint. The Committee agreed that Section 4.4.1 (a) should be amended to incorporate the principle that the use of graphics should not be excluded as a means of presentation.

81. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany suggested that a new Section, 4.4.1 (b) (iii), be added as follows:

"For products contained in portion packs or where portion quantities are mentioned, the indications shall be related to one portion of the food ready for consumption".

82. The majority of the Committee agreed that further discussion of these guidelines would profit from additional government comments and agreed to terminate the discussion at this point. In particular, reference was made to the need for government comments on Section 5, "Educational Information in Nutrition Labelling".

83. The guidelines, as amended, are contained in Appendix VII. The sections indicated by an asterisk are those that have not yet been discussed by the Committee. (Secretariat Note: Appendix VII will be issued separately from this Report).

84. The observer from the International Dairy Federation indicated the intention of his organization to become more active in the work of the horizontal Codex Committees. He outlined the long association between IDF and the FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles concerning Milk and Milk Products and drew particular attention to the fact that the "Code of Principles for Milk and Milk Products" had been accepted by 72 countries. He then noted that his organization had established a working group to study nutrient labelling and would forward substantive comments to the Secretariat of the Committee as they become available. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the International Dairy Federation and other international organizations for their continuing interest in the work of the Committee and the constructive assistance they continued to provide.

RECONSIDERATION OF DRAFT GENERAL GUIDELINES ON CLAIMS

85. The Committee had before it the above guidelines as contained in Appendix III to Alinorm 78/22, government comments on these guidelines in document CX/FL 79/3 and the report of a working group (see Appendix III). (Secretariat Note: Appendix III will be issued separately from this Report).

86. The Committee noted that the 12th session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had examined the General Guidelines on Claims and had agreed with most of its provisions with the exception of sections 1, 2.3 and 4.2 for which clarification was being sought from this Committee. Furthermore, the Commission had requested this Committee to consider the question of responsibilities for substantiating claims.

87. The Committee had agreed to the proposal by the Chairman to establish a working group which should examine comments received on the above sections and revise the relevant provisions of the guidelines in the light of these comments. Members of the delegations of Australia, Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States and the observers of ISDI and the EEC participated in the working group which appointed Dr. C. Hudson of Australia as Chairman and Dr. M.C. Cheney of Canada as Rapporteur. The report of the Working Group, as contained in Appendix III, was discussed by the Committee.

88. The Committee confirmed its decision taken at the previous session that the General Guidelines on Claims should apply to all foods and agreed with the amended text of Section I as proposed by the working group and contained in paragraph 5 of its report.

89. With regard to Section 2.3 dealing with health related claims, the Committee agreed in principle with the proposal of the working group that the use of such claims should be prohibited in general but that provision should be made to permit deviations from this rule in the case of either foods for special dietary uses or of foods which, in the absence of Codex standards or guidelines, were subject to specific national laws and regulations. It was noted that the amended Section 2.3 represented, in fact, a merger with the provisions contained in Section 4.2 (see paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report of the working group). Several delegations were of the opinion that the philosophy pertaining to provision (b) of Section 2.3 was contrary to the aims of the Codex Alimentarius Commission as it permitted countries to stipulate requirements different from those contained in the General Guidelines on Claims and was also contrary to the Committee's view endorsed by the Commission concerning reference to national laws in Codex documents (see paragraph 8). The representative of the EEC recalled the declaration made by his organization at the Twelfth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission with respect to claims concerning properties of natural mineral waters which are favourable to health (paragraph 171 of Alinorm 79/41).

90. The Committee concluded that the revised provision reflected the present situation concerning the availability of regulations and standards and agreed to the amended text of Section 2.3 and the consequential deletion of Section 4.2 of the guidelines.

91. The delegation of Norway, supported by the delegation of Australia, expressed concern about the increasing use of negative claims. Several delegations agreed that this was a matter of concern. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany considered that there could not be a complete prohibition on such claims as some were justifiable. Furthermore, it proposed that negative claims were already covered by the definition of claims in the general guidelines and this was agreed by the Committee.

92. The delegation of Sweden was of the opinion that the matter concerning responsibility for controlling claims was of a general nature and could be looked into by the Committee on General Principles.

93. The Committee considered the matter of responsibility for substantiating claims and decided that this matter should be left to countries themselves since the legal set-up in different countries involved different authorities in the control mechanisms for claims.

94. The Committee expressed its appreciation for work carried out by the working group and decided to submit the amended text of the General Guidelines on Claims for adoption to the 13th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The General Guidelines on Claims are contained in Appendix II to this Report.

DRAFT GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE LABELLING OF BULK CONTAINERS

95. The Committee had before it document CX/FL 79/4 entitled "Consideration of Draft General Guidelines for the Labelling of Bulk Containers". The document recalled the historical background to the subject of developing the general guidelines, and included the views of certain countries on this subject, which had been made available in response to circular letter CL 1977/25. The document also included two alternative versions of the general guidelines, contained in its Appendices I and II.

96. The Committee decided to have a general exchange of views on this subject in plenary before asking the working group which it had established to consider the subject in depth. Some delegations thought that, just as there was a general standard for the labelling of prepackaged foods, it would be appropriate to have a general standard for the labelling of bulk containers. These delegations considered that the proper labelling of bulk containers of food was no less important than the proper labelling of prepackaged foods. Other delegations were opposed to having a general standard, but could accept the idea of developing guidelines. Still others questioned the need even for guidelines, taking the view that manufacturers and processors were capable of making their own arrangements without the need of statutory intervention. The delegation of Denmark drew attention to the need to identify

for whom the information on labels of bulk containers were intended since the receivers of such information would have widely different needs. The point was also made that, as there was no evidence of difficulties in the international trade in bulk containers of food, there seemed to be no reason for developing the guidelines.

97. One delegation pointed out that many of the Codex standards contained, in their labelling sections, provisions relating to bulk containers and that this was a factor which had led to a demand for guidelines for the labelling of bulk containers. Another delegation made the point that most food moved in international trade in bulk containers and that, therefore, it was important to lay down some guidelines which would lead to an agreed international approach to the labelling of bulk containers and facilitate food control procedures. Another delegation referred to the risk of loss of accompanying documents as a factor in favour of appropriate labelling of bulk containers. The majority view in the Committee was that there was a need for some international rules or guidelines for the labelling of bulk containers.

98. There was also discussion in the Committee regarding the term "bulk container". A number of delegations indicated that the meaning of the term was not self evident and clear, especially for countries whose mother tongue was not English. Attention was also drawn to the fact that there had been some difficulty in conveying the intended meaning of this term in French. The suggestion was put forward that "non-retail containers" might be a more suitable term than "bulk containers".

99. The Committee requested the working group to examine the above matters further and to prepare a report for consideration by the Committee. Members of the delegations of Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States participated in the working group which appointed Mr. L.J. Erwin (Australia) as Chairman and Mr. P. Maydom (United Kingdom) as Rapporteur.

100. The report of the working group on Guidelines for the Labelling of Bulk Containers, which was attached as Appendix V to this report, was introduced by the Chairman of the working group. He drew the Committee's attention to the main features of the report. The majority of the working group had agreed that it would be more appropriate, at this stage, to develop guidelines rather than a standard and that Version 2 of the proposed guidelines, given in document CX/FL 79/4, should form the basis of the discussion. The working group had agreed to substitute the term "non-retail containers" for "bulk containers". Other amendments agreed to by the working group included the incorporation in Version 2 of the four definitions of bulk containers in Version 1.

101. Another point drawn specifically to the Committee's attention by the Chairman of the Working Group was the recommendation that, in revising the General Standard for Prepackaged Foods, consideration should be given to the labelling of containers of food to retailers for the purpose of re-sale in smaller quantities, since such sales would appear to be more appropriate to that standard.

102. Details of the amendments agreed to by the working group are set forth in the revised version of the draft guidelines.

103. The Committee took note of the report of the working group. Concerning Section 5.9 of the revised draft guidelines, the delegation of Sweden drew attention to the fact that freight containers should not be exempted from the labelling provisions for handling and storage instructions.

104. The Committee agreed that the draft Guidelines for the Labelling of Non-Retail Containers, as they appear in Appendix IV to this report should be sent to governments for their comments. (Secretariat Note: Appendices IV and V will be issued separately from this Report).

ENDORSEMENTS OF LABELLING PROVISIONS ON CODEX STANDARDS

DRAFT GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF FOOD ADDITIVES WHEN SOLD AS SUCH AT STEP 8 (Alinorm 79/12, Appendix IX)

105. The Committee endorsed the above draft standard.

DRAFT GENERAL STANDARD FOR IRRADIATED FOODS AT STEP 8 (Alinorm 79/12, Appendix X)

106. The Committee established a working group to examine the labelling provisions contained in the above standard and matters related to it as set forth in paragraphs 139 to 152 of Alinorm 79/12. Members of the delegations of Australia, the Netherlands and the United States and the Canadian Secretariat participated in the work of the group which was chaired by Mr. A. Feberwee (Netherlands). The Canadian Secretariat acted as Rapporteur. The Committee received the report of the working group on the labelling provisions in the Draft General Standard for Irradiated Foods (see also paragraph 3) and thanked the working group for its excellent work.

107. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the working group to amend Section 5 - Labelling - of the above standard as set out in paragraph 10 of the report of the working group. The proposal was to include into Section 5 (a) more precise wording indicating the nature of the treatment to which the foods had been subjected.

108. It was further agreed that the proposed wording "processed by ionizing irradiation" or "processed by _____ radiation" were meant to be examples only and did not preclude the use of other appropriate terms.

109. The Committee endorsed the labelling provisions in the Draft General Standard for Irradiated Foods as amended. The amended text of the above provision is contained in paragraph 10 of the report of the working group (see Appendix VI). (Secretariat Note: Appendix VI will be issued separately from this Report).

110. The Chairman of the working group informed the Committee that the group had also considered the need for labelling provisions for irradiated foods which were destined for further processing or which were used as ingredients (paragraph 144 of Alinorm 79/12).

111. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the working group concerning labelling provisions of ingredients which had been subjected to irradiation treatment which are set forth in paragraph 11 of the report of the working group.

PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF AND CLAIMS FOR PREPACKAGED FOODS FOR SPECIAL DIETARY USES AT STEP 5 (Addendum to Alinorm 79/26 - CX/FSDU 80/3).

112. Taking into account the linkage between the General Guidelines on Claims and Section 5 - Claims - of the above standard, the Committee had requested the working group on Claims to examine also the provisions on claims in the standard for foods for special dietary uses. (See also paragraph 87 for composition of Working Group).

113. The Chairman of the working group informed the Committee that the working group had examined the provisions of Section 2 on Definitions and Section 6 on Claims and had made proposals for amendments to these sections.

114. The Committee agreed with the amendments proposed by the working group as set forth in paragraph 8 of the report of the working group except for the recommendation contained in the last sentence of the paragraph. With regard to Section 6.1.4 it was agreed that a recommendation be made that this section be deleted. It was agreed that the last sentence of paragraph 8 should be reworded to read as follows: "If the section is to be retained, it is recommended that the concept of the words in brackets should be retained. If the concept is not retained, the section presents a total restriction on the claims covered". Furthermore, it was agreed to include "particular" physiological conditions in Section 6.1.4.

115. The Committee pointed out that in case the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses would wish to retain the section on Definitions, this could be done by reference to the relevant section of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. In any case, the definition for claims should be consistent with the definition contained in the General Guidelines on Claims.

116. The Committee endorsed the proposed draft General Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged Foods for Special Dietary Uses subject to the modifications outlined in paragraph 8 of the working group report as amended in paragraph 114 above.

HARMONIZATION OF NON-TECHNICAL DETAILS ON A LINGUISTIC BASIS

117. The Committee had before it a document on the above topic which had been prepared by the delegation of Norway. The document was introduced by the delegation of Norway, which drew attention to difficulties being encountered in the international food trade by exporting countries as a consequence of various countries developing unilaterally detailed labelling regulations, which contain requirements additional to those, or amplified in more detail than those, set forth in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. These detailed regulations related mainly to how labelling information should be presented. The delegation of Norway inquired whether other countries had been encountering difficulties in this way and requested that the Committee give consideration as to how best to deal with this problem. The delegation of Norway also indicated that this topic had been raised at the recent 11th Session of the Coordinating Committee for Europe.

118. A number of delegates agreed that the problem to which the delegations of Norway had drawn attention was a real one and that these additional detailed labelling requirements, several examples of which were given in the Norwegian paper, did indeed constitute non-tariff barriers to trade. A suggestion was made that perhaps a first attempt at dealing with this problem could be made at the regional level within the framework of the Regional Coordinating Committees. Another suggestion was that guidelines to the implementation of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods be developed. The observer from IOCU also considered that action should be taken to deal with this problem. The view was also expressed that it might be possible to tackle the problem in the course of the work of revising the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. The observer from the EEC drew attention to Section 4.1 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods relating to presentation of mandatory information on the label. The observer from the EEC thought that governments should be invited to comment on how Section 4.1 could best be amended or expanded with a view to the development of a revised Section 4.1 which would help to resolve some of the difficulties brought to attention by Norway.

119. In conclusion, the Committee expressed its concern about the difficulties for international trade in food arising from unilateral development and imposition of detailed food labelling regulations, additional to the requirements set forth in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. The Committee hoped that these difficulties could be dealt with to some extent during the course of the revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. The Committee recognized, however, that the revision of the General Standard would take time. The Committee considered, therefore, that in the meantime the problem highlighted by the Norwegian delegation should be brought specifically to the attention of the Commission at its next session. It was agreed that the Commission should be asked for its views on how best the problem could be tackled. The Norwegian paper on this subject is attached as Appendix X to this report. (Secretariat Note: Appendix X will be issued separately from this Report).

REVISION OF THE RECOMMENDED INTERNATIONAL GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PREPACKAGED FOODS (CAC/RS 1-1969)

120. The Committee had before it a background paper outlining matters pertinent to a revision of the above standard (CX/FL 79/7). The Committee had also before it information papers on the subject prepared by the delegation of Australia and the observer of the EEC which had been presented as conference documents.

121. The Committee was informed of the proposal made by the Chairman of the Codex Alimentarius Commission at its 12th session that the Committee on Labelling might wish to consider a revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods in the light of developments with regard to food labelling during the last ten years.

122. The background document contained some indications of labelling matters which could be considered for inclusion in a revised standard such as date marking, bulk containers, lot identification, etc. Furthermore, it was suggested that some provision at present contained in the standard could be up-dated to reflect the current thinking of member governments.
123. Several delegations pointed out that the General Labelling Standard for Prepackaged Foods had greatly influenced the development of labelling regulations in a large number of countries and had been used extensively in drawing up national regulations for food labelling.
124. The observer of the EEC stated that the EEC Directive on Labelling which had been finalized in December 1978 had widely used the expertise provided by the Codex standard although other labelling concepts had also been incorporated into the EEC Directive.
125. Taking into account the importance of the standard, the Committee thought that it was timely to revise the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.
126. In view of the complexity of the matter, it was considered appropriate that a consultant should be engaged to prepare a working paper for the next full session of the Committee. The Secretariat was requested to investigate whether it would be possible to make provisions for the recruitment of a consultant. The paper should be based on the background and information papers prepared for this session of the Committee, on notifications of acceptances received from member countries and on a survey of national labelling regulations.
127. It was further agreed that the paper prepared by the consultant should be sent to governments for comments prior to the next full session of the Committee.

OTHER BUSINESS

PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS ON THE MARKETING AND ADVERTISING OF INFANT FOODS

128. Further to the inquiry of the delegation of Norway concerning progress in the development of the above code of ethics, the Secretariat informed the Committee that this topic had been considered by the Executive Committee at its recent 25th session (see also paragraph 12). The Committee took note of action underway on this subject from the extract given below from the report of the Executive Committee.

"Proposed Code of Ethics on the Marketing and Advertising of Infant Foods

The representative of North America informed the Executive Committee that he had been requested by the government of Canada to seek a clarification of the work proposed to be undertaken by the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, the World Food Council, the AGC Sub-Committee on Nutrition and a Joint WHO/UNICEF Meeting, on the development of a Code of Ethics for the Marketing and Advertising of Infant Foods. The Executive Committee noted that the World Food Council attached particular importance to such a Code being developed within the Codex framework in order to provide governments with a Code or Guideline which they could consider for enforcement by regulatory authorities rather than voluntary compliance by industry. At the request of the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, the AGC Sub-Committee on Nutrition, whose membership comprised all the agencies of the UN System concerned with nutrition, had endorsed the view that these practices should be considered in the widest possible context by the Joint WHO/UNICEF Meeting on Infant and Young Child Feeding scheduled to be held at WHO Headquarters 9-12 October, 1979. Following this meeting, arrangements would be made to provide the Codex Secretariat with a draft Code for further elaboration by the Codex Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses at its next session in 1980 and a finalized proposed Code would be put before the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at its 14th Session. The Executive Committee considered that in view of the importance attached to this matter by the World Food Council and to urgent needs expressed by delegations from developing countries for the early elaboration of a Codex Code of Practice, that progress in this matter should be reported to the Commission at its next session and an opportunity afforded to the members of the Commission to discuss these matters. It was agreed to provide for this under item 8 of the Provisional Agenda of the Commission's 13th Session."

DATE MARKING

129. The delegation of Australia introduced, as a Conference Room Document, a paper which it had prepared on this topic entitled "Discussion Paper on the Standardising of Wording for Date Marking Requirements in Codex Standards" (CX/FL 79/9). The delegation of Australia indicated that the main idea behind the paper was to illustrate the need to harmonize date marking requirements in Codex Standards. The delegation of Australia was requested to prepare, for the forthcoming November 1979 session of the Committee, a progress report on action taken to-date in the various Codex Commodity Committees on the subject of date marking, based on its discussion paper mentioned above. The delegation of Australia undertook to prepare such a report, for which the Committee expressed gratitude.

CLASS TITLES FOR FOOD ADDITIVES

130. The delegation of Sweden, referring to existing class names listed in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, indicated to the Committee that there was great interest in the Swedish food industry in the possibility of using one class name — "consistency regulators" — as an alternative class title in place of the following: anti-caking agents, emulsifiers, stabilizers, thickening agents, and vegetable gums, all of which appeared as class titles in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. In the absence of any significant degree of support in the Committee for taking any action on this matter, the Committee proceeded no further with it.

131. The delegation of Australia drew attention to the discussion paper which it had proposed on the Recommended General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, and which it had submitted to the Committee as a Conference Room Document (CX/FL 79/7, Add. 1). Attention was drawn to Appendix I of the paper concerning class names applied to food additives. The paper drew attention to certain discrepancies between the list of class names for food additives appearing in the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods and class names recommended by the Codex Committee on Food Additives. There was some discussion of this topic, following which the Committee agreed that the matter of the discrepancies between the two lists could be brought to the notice of the Codex Committee on Food Additives at its next session, with a view to seeing what could be done to bring the two lists into harmony and make amendments as relevant. The delegation of the Netherlands indicated that it was not convinced of the need for bringing the matter to the attention of the Codex Committee on Food Additives at this time. The two lists are attached to this Report in Appendix IX. (Secretariat Note: Appendix IX will be issued separately from this Report).

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FATS AND OILS

132. The Committee was informed by the Secretariat that the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils had requested advice as to how the recommendation of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Dietary Fats in Human Nutrition concerning the labelling of fats and oils could be applied in practice. The Committee agreed that the attention of the Codex Committee on Fats and Oils should be drawn to the fact that the Codex Committee on Food Labelling had commenced work on Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. However, as the guidelines were in the early stages of development no precise guidance could be given at this point in time.

FUTURE WORK AND DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

133. The delegation of Canada stressed the need for the Committee to devote its efforts principally to subject matters of high priority. The delegation expressed the opinion that because these priority matters were of a rather complex nature, there might be merit in elongating the period between sessions of the Committee to afford governments more time to study these issues. The Committee noted that its next session, which would be devoted to endorsement of labelling provisions in draft standards would be held in Rome 28 to 30 November 1979, immediately prior to the 13th session of the Commission.

134. Several delegations drew attention to the heavy workload on priority items before the Committee, and stressed the need for a full session of the Committee at a suitable time between the 13th and 14th session of the Commission. It was noted that the date of that session would be arranged between the Canadian authorities and the Codex Secretariat, taking into account the scheduling of other Codex sessions.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE

Mr. L.J. Erwin
Principal Executive Officer
Department of Primary Industry
Canberra, A.C.T.

Dr. C. Hudson
Council of Australian Food
Technology Associations
c/o Davis Gelatine (Australia) Pty Ltd.
28 Spring Street
Botany N.S.W. 2019

Mrs. W. Williams
Australian Federation of
Consumer Organizations
38 Taurus Street
North Balwyn 3104
Victoria

BRAZIL
BRESIL
BRASIL

Dr. Werner Max Rudolfo Thiele
Secretary of Animal Product Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture
Brasilia DF

CANADA

Mr. C. Sheppard
(Head of Canadian Delegation)
Chief, Food Division
Consumer Fraud Protection Branch
Consumer Standards Directorate
Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada
Place du Portage, Phase 1
Hull, P.Q. K1A 0C9.

Mr. K.H. Dean
Chief, Processed Fruit and Vegetable
Section
Fruit and Vegetable Division,
Production and Marketing Branch
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa K1A 0C5.

Canada (cont.)

Dr. M.C. Cheney
Chief, Nutritional Quality
Foods Division
Bureau of Nutritional Sciences
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0L2.

Mr. B. Lingeman
Chief, Quality Control Division
Inspection and Technology Branch
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0E6

Mr. A. Hemming
Chief, Special Projects
Industry Trade and Commerce
Ottawa

Dr. Joyce Beare-Rogers
A/Director
Bureau of Nutritional Sciences
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0L2.

Mr. R. Cosmatos
National Coördinator
Standards and Labels
Meat Inspection Division
Health of Animals Branch
Agriculture Canada
580 Booth Street
Ottawa

Dr. François Jargaille,
Chief, Standards and Labels
Meat Hygiene Directorate
Agriculture Canada
Logan Building
580 Booth Street
Ottawa, K1A 0Y9

Dr. A. Anzengruber,
Director, Enforcement Audit
Meat Hygiene Directorate
Agriculture Canada
2525 Traverse Drive
Ottawa, K1V 8B1.

CANADA (cont)

Dr. Frédérique Moulin
Hygiène -es viandes
Agriculture Canada
580 rue Booth
Ottawa, K1A 0Y9.

Mr. J.H.G. Roy,
National Coordinator
Standards and Labels
Agriculture Canada
580 Booth Street,
Ottawa, K1A 0Y9

Mr. Des Doran
International Liaison Services
Intergovernmental and
International Services Branch
Sir John Carling Building
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0C5.

Dr. Dawn Palin
Applied Nutrition Consultant
Health Promotion Directorate
Health and Welfare Canada
365 Laurier Avenue W.,
Ottawa,

Mr. Emile Ducharme
Directeur
Service de Normalisation et
Répression des fraudes
Ministère de l'Agriculture
200 A Chemin Ste. Foy, ch. 110-
Québec, Que.

Mr. John Jackson
National Dairy Council
365 Laurier Avenue W.
Ottawa, K1P 5K2.

Mr. Kempton L. Matte
National Dairy Council
365 Laurier Avenue W.
Ottawa, K1P 5K2

Mr. Philip Moyes
Executive Vice President
Grocery Products Manufacturers
of Canada
1185 Eglinton Avenue E.
Don Mills, Ontario, M3C 3C6

Mr. C.J. Ross
Research Manager
Canadian Cannery Limited
(Canadian Food Processors Association)
1101 Walkers Line,
Burlington, Ontario, L7N 2G4

Mr. W.E. Gunn
H.J. Heinz Co. of Canada Limited
(Canadian Food Processors Association)
250 Bloor Street E.
Toronto, Ontario

Geneviève S. Morgan
Canadian Food Processors Association
130 Albert Street, Suite 1409
Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5G4

Mr. James Drum
Canadian Soft Drink Association and
Flavour Manufacturers Association
of Canada
42 Overlea Blvd.
Toronto, Ontario, M4H 1B8

Mrs. Maryon Brechin
Consumers' Association of Canada
27 Elmcrest Road,
Etobicoke, Ontario, M9C 3R7.

Dr. Gordon W. Fuller
G.W. Fuller Association Limited
4207 Old Orchard
Montreal, Que. H4A 3B3.

Mr. W. Johnston
Retail Council of Canada
Suite #1, 64 35th Street,
Toronto, Ontario

Dr. Wally Pigden
Agricultural Institute of Canada
850 Norton Avenue
Ottawa, K2B 5P6.

CHILE

Mr. Hernan Sanchez
Minister Councillor
Embassy of Chile
Ottawa, K1P 5A9

CHILE (cont.)

Mr. Luis Lillo
First Secretary
Embassy of Chile
Ottawa, K1P 5A9

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Dr. L. Kroutil
16067 Praha 6
P.O.B. 776/Koospol
Tchecoslovaquie

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINA'ARCA

Mr. Henning Feilberg
Senior Principal
Ministry of Agriculture
Havnegade 31
DK-1058
Copenhagen. K

Mrs. Anne Brincker
Food Technologist
Danish Meat Products Laboratory
13 Howitzvej
DK-2000 Copenhagen -F

Mrs. Anne Busk-Jensen
Food Technologist
Federation of Danish Industries
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 18
DK-200, Copenhagen N

Mrs. Aase Koushede
Assistant Principal
National Food Institute
Morkhoj Bygade 19
DK-2860 Soborg

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

Dr. K. Salminen
National Board of Trade
and Consumer Interests
Food Office
Haapaniemenkatu 4B
00530 Helsinki 53 Finland

FRANCE

Mme. Roseline Taillé
Inspecteur de la Répression des
Fraudes et du Contrôle de la
Qualité
44 boulevard de Grenelle
Paris 75015

GERMANY, Fed. Rep.
ALLEMAGNE Rép. féd.
ALEMANIA, Rep. fed.

Prof. Dr. D. Eckert
Ministerialdirigent
Federal Ministry of Youth, Family
Affairs and Health
D53 Bonn Bad-Godesberg

Dr. H.B. Tolkmitt,
Schwanenwik 33
D 2000 Hamburg 36

Dr. W. Schultheiss
Geschäftsführer
Kelkheimer Strasse 10
D-6380 Bad Homburg

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

Mr. John T. Dully
Assistant Principal
Commerce Division
Dept. of Industry Commerce and
Energy
Frederick Building
South Frederick Street
Dublin 2

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

Dr. Riccardo Monacelli
Istituto Superiore d'Sanitia
Viale R. Elena 299
00161 Roma

Mirelia Cipolleta
Ministero Sanita
Pizza Marconi- Dir-Gen
Igiene Alimento e nutrizione
Roma

JAPAN

Dr. Takao Maki
Deputy Director
Food Sanitation Division
Ministry of Health and Welfare
100 Kasumigasaki
Tokyo

Mr. Yasuhisa Sagawa
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda - Ku,
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries
Tokyo

Mr. Kazuhiro Kondo
Embassy of Japan
255 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, K1N 9E6.

MEXICO
MEXIQUE

Lic. Guillermo Tietzsch Cabrera
Secretaria de Comercio
Direccion general de Normas comerciales
Av. Cuauhtemoc # 80
Mexico 7, D.F.

Lic. Maria Antonieta Garcia Lascuzain
Secretaria de Comercio
Direccion general de normas comerciales
Departamento de Publicidad comercial
Cuauhtemoc 80 1^{er} Piso
Mexico 7, DF

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

Dr. R.F. van der Heide
Ministry of Public Health and
Environmental Hygiene
P.O. Box 439
2260 AK Leidschendam

Mr. A. Feberwee
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK THE HAGUE

Mr. O.C. Knottnerus
General Commodity Board for Arable
Products
P.O. Box 29739
2502 LS THE HAGUE

Mr. A.M. Ruoff
Commission for the Dutch Food and
Agricultural Industry Calvé de Betu
P.O. Box 2
2600 MB DELFT

Mr. E. Veen
Commission for the Dutch Food and
Agricultural Industry
Koninklijke Verkade Fabrieken N.V.
P.O. Box 5
1500 EA ZAANDAM

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

Miss Marion Thomas
Food Technologist
Department of Health
P.O. Box 5013
Wellington

NIGERIA

Mr. George O. Baptist
Assistant Director
Food and Drugs Administration
and Laboratory Services
Federal Ministry of Health and
Social Welfare
Lagos

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

Mr. O.R. Braekkan
Government Vitamin Institute
P.O. Box 187
5001 Bergen

Mr. J.A. Race, Chief of Section
Norwegian Codex Alimentarius
Committee
P.O. Box 8139 Dep.
Oslo 1

Ms. A. Fulke, Consultant
Committee on Informative Labelling
Munkedamsveien 536B
Oslo 2

NORWAY (cont.)

Mr. P. Haram,
Head of Section
Ministry of Fisheries
P.O. Box 8118 Dep,
Oslo 1

Mr. S. Skilbrei,
Director,
Directorate of Fisheries
P.O. Box 185,
5001 Bergen

Mr. H. Pedersen,
Managing Director,
The Norwegian Canners' Association
P.O. Box 327,
4001 Stavanger

Mr. P.A. Rosness
Dep. Director,
Government Quality Control
Processed Fruits and Vegetables
Gladengveien 3 B,
Oslo 6

PHILIPPINES
FILIPINAS

Mr. J. Adriano
Vice-President
San Miguel Corporation
Ayala Avenue
Makati, Metro Manila

Mrs. Zenaida Veloso
Senior Quality Engineer
Quality Assurance
San Miguel Corporation
Ayala Avenue,
Makati

Mrs. Catalina C. Sanchez
Deputy Administrator
Food and Drug Administration
Ministry of Health
San Lazard CPD, Metro Manila

Mrs. Pilar Regala
Senior Researcher
Food and Drug Administration
Ministry of Health
San Lazard Corporation
Manila

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

Mr. F. Miranda de Larra
Ministerio de Agriculture
Poseo Infanta Isabel, 1
Madrid

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

Mr. Bengt Augustinsson
Head of Food Law Division
National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala

Mrs. Laila Freivalds
A/Head of Division
National Board of Consumer Policies
Fack
S-162
10 Vallingby

Dr. Carl E. Danielson
Head of Laboratory
UF Food Laboratory
Finnbodabagen 13
S-131 31 NACKA

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

Mr. Pierre Rossier
Head of Codex Section,
Federal Office of Public Health
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3008
Berne

Dr. B. Schmidli
Hoffmann-La Roche
Brenzacherstr 124
4000 Basel

Dr. G.F. Schubiger
Case Postal 88
1814 La Tour de Peilz

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDA

Mr. P. Maydom
Senior Executive Officer
Food Standards Division
Branch A
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Great Westminister House
Horse Ferry Road,
London, SW1

Mr. J. Elliott
Batchelors Foods Limited
Wadsley Bridge
Sheffield 6

UNITED STATES
ETATS UNIS
ESTADOS

Dr. Robert W. Weik
Assistant to the Director
Bureau of Foods (HFF-4)
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Mr. L.M. Beacham
Advisor to the President
National Food Processors Association
1133 20th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mrs. Gloria E.S. Cox
Chief Executive Officer
Cox & Cox Investments
12006 Auth Lane
Silver Springs, M.D. 20902

Mr. Albert H. Nagel
Coordinator Food Standards
250 N. Street
White Plains, NY 10625

Mr. Ralph W. Miller
Vice President Regulatory
Research, Planning and Council
Jewel Food Stores
1955 North Avenue
Melrose Park, IL 60160

UNITED STATES (cont.)

Mr. Irwin Fried
Director, Meat and Poultry
Standards and Labelling Division
Compliance Program
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Mr. John W. Farquahar
Vice President
Education and Technology
Food Marketing Institute
1750 K Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Charles Feldberg
Director, Health and Safety
CPC International Inc.
International Plaza
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07682

Mr. Hugh W. Symons
Director, Research and Technical
Services
American Frozen Foods Institute
1700 Meadows Road, Suite 100
Mc Lean, VA 22102

Mr. Taylor M. Quinn
Associate Director for Compliance
Bureau of Foods (HFF-300)
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204

ZAIRE, Rep. of
ZAIRE, Rép. du
ZAIRE, Rep. de

M. Kanda-Lonsa Kapela
Bureau des Relations Internationales
Agricoles
Departement de l'Agriculture
B.P. 15605
Kinshasa 1

Dr. Mbokanga Kabote
Centre National de Planification
de Nutrition Humaine /Santé publique
B.P. 12.684
Kinshasa

OBSERVER COUNTRY

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Abraham André Brink
S.A. Embassy
15 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, K1M 1M8

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

CPC International Inc.

Mr. Charles Feldberg
CPC International Inc.
International Plaza
Englewood Cliffs, U.S.A.
NJ 07632

European Economic Community
Conseil des Communautés Européennes

Mr. Luigi Cisnetti
Administrateur au Secrétariat
Général du Conseil des
Communautés Européennes
C.E.E. Council
170 rue de la Loi
Bruxelles

M. Egon Gaerner
Administrateur principal
Commission des Communautés
rue de la Loi 200 Européennes
B-1049
Bruxelles

M. Jean Louis Collin
Administrateur principal
Commission des Communautés E.
200, rue de la Loi, 1049
Bruxelles

International Organization of
Consumers Union

Mrs. Maryon Brechin
27 Elmcrest Road,
Etobicoke, M9C 3R7

International Dairy Federation

Mr. H.W. Kay
International Dairy Federation
Square Vergote 41
Brussels Belgium

Mr. Kenneth G. Savage
President of I.D.F.
International Dairy Federation
6661 Tamany Drive
Victoria B.C.

Mr. Art Goll,
Dairy Division
Agriculture Canada
Sir John Carling Building
Ottawa, K1A 0C5.

International Secretariat for the
Industries of Dietetic Food Products

Dr. W. Schultheiss
Geschäftsführer
Bundesverband der diätetischen
Lebensmittelindustrie e.v.
Kelkheimerstrasse 10
638 Bad Homburg v.d. H.l
Germany

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Mr. H.J. McNally
Senior Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy

Mrs. Barbara Dix
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100, Rome, Italy

CANADIAN SECRETARIAT

Mr. Robert McGee, (Chairman)
Director, Consumer Fraud Protection Br
Consumer Standards Directorate
Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada
Place du Portage,
Hull, P.Q. K1A 0C9.

CANADIAN SECRETARIAT (cont.)

Mr. B.L. Smith,
Head, Office of International
Food Standards
Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0L2.

Mr. I.B. Campbell,
Food Composition Division
Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch,
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, K1A 0L2.

ALINORM 79/22
APPENDIX II

GENERAL GUIDELINES ON CLAIMS

Section 1 Purpose

1.1 These guidelines are intended to provide examples of claims to which the following principle applies:

No food shall be described or presented in a manner that is false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its character in any respect.

As far as prepackaged foods are concerned, these guidelines are an amplification of Section 2.1 (General Principles) of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.

1.2 General Definition

For the purpose of these guidelines, a claim is any representation which states, suggests or implies that a food has particular qualities relating to its origin, nutritional properties, nature, processing, composition or any other quality.

2. Claims which should be prohibited

2.1 Claims stating that any given food will provide an adequate source of all essential nutrients are prohibited except in the case of well defined products for which a Codex Standard regulates the admissible claims or where appropriate authorities have accepted the product to be an adequate source of all essential nutrients.

Further, claims implying that a balanced diet of ordinary foods cannot supply adequate amounts of all nutrients are prohibited.

2.2 Claims which cannot be substantiated.

2.3 Claims as to the suitability of a food for use in the prevention, alleviation, treatment or cure of a disease, disorder, or particular physiological condition are prohibited unless they are:

(a) in accordance with the provisions of Codex standards or guidelines for foods under jurisdiction of the Committee on Foods for Special Dietary Uses, and following the principles set forth in these guidelines

(b) or, in the absence of an applicable Codex standard or guideline, permitted under the laws of the country in which the food is distributed.

2.4 Claims which could give rise to doubt about the safety of similar food or which could arouse or exploit fear in the consumer.

3. Claims which may be misleading

3.1 Meaningless claims including comparatives and superlatives.

3.2 Claims as to good hygienic practice, such as wholesome, healthful, sound.

3.3 Claims that the nature or origin of a food is "organic" or "biological".

4. Claims whose use should be controlled

4.1 An indication that a food has obtained an increased or special nutritive value by means of the addition of nutrients, such as vitamins, minerals and amino acids may be given only if such an addition has been made on the basis of nutritional considerations. This kind of indication is subject to legislation of the appropriate authorities.

4.2 The terms "natural", "pure", "fresh" and "home made", when they are used, have to be in accordance with the national practices in the country where the food is sold. The use of these terms should be consistent with the prohibitions set out in Section 2.

4.3 Religious or Ritual Preparation of a Food - may be claimed provided that the food conforms to the requirements of the appropriate religious or ritual authorities.