codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 57971 Telex: 625852-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6) 57973152-5782610

ALINORM 91/22

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Nineteenth Session
Rome, 1-10 July 1991

REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING
Ottawa, Canada, 11-15 March 1991

Note: This report incorporates Codex Circular Letter CL 1991/11-FL.

W/Z7285

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 57971 Telex: 625852-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6) 57973152-5782610

CX 4/15.2

CL 1991/11-FL
April 1991

TO: - Codex Contact Points
- Interested International Organizations

FROM: Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy

SUBJECT: Distribution of the Report of the Twenty-first Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (ALINORM 91/22)

The report of the Twenty-first Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL) is attached. It will be considered by the Nineteenth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to be held in Rome from 1-10 July 1991.

A. MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMISSION ARISING FROM THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

The following matters will be brought to the attention of the Nineteenth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission:

1. Revised Draft Section 5.2.1 (Irradiated Foods) of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods at Step 8; paras. 18-30 and Appendix III, ALINORM 91/22.

2. Revised Draft Codex General Guidelines on Claims at Step 8; paras. 31-43 and Appendix II, ALINORM 91/22.

3. Revised Draft Section 4.2.2.3 (Class Titles) of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods at Steps 5 and 8; paras. 44-49 and Appendix IV, ALINORM 91/22.

Governments wishing to propose amendments or to comment on the above revisions to the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods or to the Codex General Guidelines on Claims should do so in writing in conformity with the Guide to Consideration of Standards at Step 8 (see Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, Seventh Edition) to the Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, not later than 31 May 1991.

4. Revised Proposed Draft Section 3.3.4 (Nutrient Reference Values) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling at Step 5; paras. 50-58 and Appendix V, ALINORM 91/22.

Governments wishing to submit comments regarding the implications which the proposed draft revision of Section 3.3.4 or any provisions thereof may have for their economic interests should do so in writing in conformity with the Procedure for the Elaboration of Worldwide Codex Standards (at Step 5) (see Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, Seventh Edition) to the Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, not later than 31 May 1991.

5. Proposals concerning the endorsement of labelling provisions in Codex Standards; paras. 59-86, ALINORM 91/2.

6. Proposals concerning the elaboration of Guidelines for the Labelling of Potential Allergens in Foods at Steps 1 and 2; paras. 146-147, ALINORM 91/22.

7. Advice concerning the continuation of activities to establish analytical methodology for use in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling, paras. 138-142, ALINORM 91/22.

8. Proposed standardization of date marking systems; paras. 6 and 143-145, ALINORM 91/22.

9. Recommendations concerning the establishment of labelling guidelines addressing regional needs; paras. 10-12, ALINORM 91/22.

B. DOCUMENTS OF INTEREST TO BE ELABORATED FOR DISTRIBUTION AND/OR GOVERNMENT COMMENT PRIOR TO THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING

1. Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of the Term Natural in Food Product Labelling (Canada); see paras. 87-106, ALINORM 91/22.

2. Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling (Canada); see paras. 107-137, ALINORM 91/22.

3. Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for the Labelling of Potential Allergens in Foods (Norway); see paras. 146-147, ALINORM 91/22.

C. REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND INFORMATION

1. National Strategies regarding the application of Section 3.2.1.4 (Listing of Nutrients) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (para. 148, ALINORM 91/22)

Section 3.2.1.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling states that "where nutrient declaration is applied, the declaration of the following should be mandatory: ... the amount of any other nutrient considered to be relevant for maintaining a good nutritional status, as required by national legislation".

Governments are requested to inform the Secretariat of any nutrients they consider to be relevant for maintaining a good nutritional status and therefore, are required to be included in the nutrient declaration as outlined above. Information should be sent to the Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, not later than 1 October 1992.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Twenty-first Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling reached the following conclusions during its deliberations:

- Agreed to indicate to the Commission that if the Coordinating Committee for Asia wished to elaborate labelling guidelines addressing regional needs, the CCFL should be entrusted to examine any proposals for review and endorsement (paras. 10-12);

- Agreed that the Secretariat would keep the Committee informed as to deliberations concerning the establishment of Guidelines for Organically Produced Foods (paras. 13-15);

- Agreed to forward the draft amendment of Section 5.2.1 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (Irradiated Foods) to the Commission for adoption at Step 8, with a recommendation to retain the current wording of Section 4.2.1.3 (paras. 18-30);

- Agreed to forward the Revised Draft Codex General Guidelines on Claims to the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (paras. 31-43);

- Agreed to forward the Draft List of Class Titles for Food Additives to the Commission with a recommendation for adoption at Step 8 under the accelerated elaboration procedures (paras. 44-49);

- Agreed to recommend the adoption of the proposed draft amendment to Section 3.3.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (Presentation of Nutrient Content) at Step 5 to include proposed draft Nutrient Reference Values as elaborated by the Helsinki Consultation (paras. 50-58);

- Agreed to recommend to the Commission the adoption of proposals concerning the endorsement of labelling provisions in Codex Standards (paras. 59-86);

- Agreed that Canada would prepare updated Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of the Term Natural in Food Product Labelling based on written comments and the discussion at the meeting, for early circulation and additional government comment at Step 3 (paras. 87-106);

- Agreed that Canada would prepare updated Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling based on written comments, discussions at the meeting and input from the CCNFSDU for early circulation and additional government comment at Step 3, with the understanding that the issue of advertising would be limited to discussions only (paras. 9, 16-17, 107-137);

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (Cont'd)

- Agreed that comments and advice would be solicited from the CCNFSDU, CCMAS and CCEXEC concerning the Committee's elaboration of Analytical Methodology for use in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (paras. 138-142);

- Agreed that the matter of standardized Date Marking Systems would be handled between the Canadian and Codex Secretariats as an initial first step, with the understanding that the advice of the CCEXEC and the Commission might also be required (paras. 6, 143-145);

- Agreed that a paper concerning the Labelling of Potential Allergens in Foods would be prepared for discussion at the next CCFL Session under the direction of Norway, with the understanding that the CCEXEC would be informed of this undertaking (paras. 146-147); and

- Agreed to solicit comments and information on the types of nutrients that governments required to be listed as outlined in Section 3.2.1.4 (Listing of Nutrients) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (para. 148).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Food Labelling held its 21st Session in Ottawa, Canada, from 11 to 15 March 1991 by courtesy of the Government of Canada. The Session was chaired by Mr. Ralph McKay, Special Advisor, Consumer Products Branch, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada. The Session was attended by delegates from the following 23 countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Observers were present from the following international organizations: Confederation of the Food and Drink Industries of the EEC (CIAA), European Economic Community (EEC), International Dairy Federation (IDF), International Organization of Consumer Unions (IOCU) and International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI). A List of Participants, including the Secretariat, is contained in Appendix I to this report.

OPENING OF THE SESSION (Agenda Item 1)

2. The session was opened by Mr. David Watters, Assistant Deputy Minister, Consumer Bureau, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada, who welcomed the delegates and observers on behalf of the Government of Canada. Mr. Watters emphasized Canada's role in the development of policies related to consumer protection and to the assurance of fair and equitable trade practices on both national and international scales. In view of ever increasing globalization and interdependence, he stressed the need for all governments to participate in the development of internationally acceptable food and labelling standards for the benefit of consumers as well as to aid in the reduction of non-tariff barriers to trade.

3. Referring to the forthcoming Conference on Food Standards, Chemicals in Food, and Food Trade, (Rome, 18-27 March 1991), Mr. Watters noted the importance of the role of "horizontal" committees, such as the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, in the international movement away from commodity-oriented standards to providing the consumer with general standards for innovative new products through the use of clear, accurate, and internationally accepted labelling. He also congratulated the Committee for taking on the challenge of defining acceptable health and nutrition claims for food labelling and praised the Committee's work in dealing with the term "natural" with a view towards international harmonization.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 2)

4. At the suggestion of the Secretariat, the Committee agreed to discuss Agenda Item 8 (Endorsement of Labelling Provisions in Codex Standards) immediately following Agenda Item 3 (Matters of Interest), in order to ensure the full review of the labelling provisions presented for endorsement.

5. In addition, the Committee noted that the Working Group on Analytical Methodology would meet during the Session and prepare a Conference Room Document on this subject for consideration at Plenary (Agenda Item 11).

6. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Canadian Secretariat had received a request that consideration be given to the standardization of date marking systems used in the General Standard for Labelling and that adopted by the International Standards Organization (ISO) under Recommendation No. 8601. The Chairman noted that currently, the Codex labelling standard required that dates be declared by day, month and year in uncoded numerical sequence, while ISO recommended date declaration by year, month and day. It was noted that misinterpretation of coded dates could have serious consequences to the public. In addition, the greater use of electronic data interchange (EDI) in world food trading systems would seem to favour universal date marking declarations. The Chairman proposed that this matter be discussed under Agenda Item 12 (Other Business). The Committee agreed with this proposal (see paras. 143-145 below).

7. As a result of these discussions, the Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda (CX/FL 91/1), as amended above.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM THE REPORT OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 3)

8. The Committee had before it document CX/FL 91/2 containing matters of interest arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex sessions. The Committee agreed that most of the matters included in the paper would be discussed in detail under other relevant agenda items and therefore, focused their discussions on the following issues.

Proposed Draft Standard for Labelling of and Claims for Low-Energy and Reduced-Energy Foods

9. The Committee noted that the 17th Session of the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) had agreed to withdraw the above proposed draft standard in order to avoid duplication of work with the CCFL when elaborating the Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling, which was felt to be far more comprehensive (paras. 85-90, ALINORM 91/26). The CCNFSDU looked forward to collaborating with the CCFL to provide the appropriate nutrition-related advice on the Guidelines, as decided at the 36th Session of the Executive Committee (paras. 37-38, ALINORM 89/4). The Committee agreed with this procedure (also see paras. 125 and 137).

Consideration of the Implementation of Food Labelling in Asian Countries

10. The Committee noted a proposal forwarded by the 7th Session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia concerning the implementation of labelling guidelines specific to the Asian region, taking into account the Codex General Standard and other Codex labelling requirements.

11. The Secretariat noted that the elaboration of labelling guidelines specific to the Asian region could create a variety of problems, especially in relation to the creation of trade barriers. However, if the object of the CCASIA was to create guidelines for their regional use in addition to Codex Standards, this could be acceptable to the CCFL and Commission.

12. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the United States and Australia, stated that if the Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia wished to create additional guidelines addressing their regional needs, the CCFL should be entrusted to examine any proposals for review and endorsement. The Committee agreed to refer its position on this matter to the Commission, with a view towards providing advice to the CCASIA.

Consideration of Labelling and Other Issues in Relation to Organically Produced Foods

13. The Committee was informed of deliberations concerning this subject at various Codex Committees (i.e., CCNASWP, CCEURO, CCFL) and of the agreement of the 37th Executive Committee (paras. 92-94, ALINORM 91/3) for the creation of a Joint FAO/WHO consultation to examine the production, labelling, certification and control of organic or biologically produced foods. The Committee was also informed of an FAO Consultation on Biological Farming in Europe, held from 18-31 May 1990 in Bern, Switzerland.

14. The Delegation of Australia pointed out the urgent need to consider the labelling of these products. It was noted that Australia as well as Canada were developing regulations for organic and bio-dynamic produce, which were developed along the lines of a document prepared by Australia at the CCNASWP Session (CX/NASWP 90/10). The Delegation of Australia stressed the need for guidelines

that took consumer needs into account with a view towards facilitating international trade and providing label certification. Although organically produced foods presently represented only 1-2% of national production in several countries, it was foreseen that a rapid increase would occur in the next decade in the marketing of these products in international trade. It was also noted that several countries and economic groups, such as the EEC, were elaborating regulations in this area.

15. The Committee was informed that a working paper was being drafted by Canada for discussion at the forthcoming session of the Commission. It was agreed that the Secretariat would keep the Committee informed of future developments in this area.

Proposed Draft Guidelines for Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling

16. The Committee was reminded that the Executive Committee had agreed with the proposal of the Codex Coordinating Committee for North America and South West Pacific to elaborate Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling through the Codex Committee on Food Labelling, with the understanding that issues concerning advertising would be limited to discussions only, (paras. 72-73, ALINORM 91/3).

17. The Committee recognized that it was not outside the scope of the CCFL to undertake discussions concerning advertising, although the Commission did not consider it necessary to develop guidelines concerning this matter, (see para. 108).

CONSIDERATION OF REVISED DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR IRRADIATED FOODS AND FOR IRRADIATED FOOD ADDITIVES (Agenda Item 4)

18. The Committee had before it documents CX/FL 91/3 and CX/FL 91/3-Add. 1 which summarized comments submitted concerning this issue in response to CL 1989/43 -FL.

19. The Committee noted its discussions at its previous Session, whereby it was decided to endorse an amendment to Section 5.2.1 of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods to provide for the use of a clear text to indicate that a food had been irradiated, and the optional use of a logo, if desired. In taking this decision, the CCFL had noted that Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Standard would be applicable to composite food ingredients which contained irradiated components (paras. 15-24 and Appendix III, ALINORM 89/22). The CCFL had also decided to retain Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 of the General Labelling Standard and Section 7.2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives when sold as such without change.

20. The 18th Session of the Commission had adopted the proposed amendment of Section 5.2.1 at Step 5 only, in order to stimulate further government comment and discussion, especially in light of Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Standard, which allowed that ingredients (i.e., including irradiated ingredients) of a composite component in a food need not be specifically listed where the composite component itself was an ingredient in the final food at a level of less than 25 per cent (paras. 259-262, ALINORM 89/40).

21. The Chairman indicated that as Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 of the General Standard and Section 7.2 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Food Additives remained unchanged, no action was required of the CCFL regarding these provisions. Therefore, the Committee focused its discussions on Sections 5.2.1 and 4.2.1.3 of the General Labelling Standard.

22. The Observer of the EEC opened the discussions by summarizing Community efforts in this area as included in document CX/FL 91/3, and indicated that the Community could accept the revised sections in principle, as proposed. The Delegation of Spain agreed with the comments of the EEC observer. The Delegations of Argentina and Spain noted that they could also accept the proposed amendment to Section 5.2.1.

23. With respect to the current text of Section 5.2.1, the Delegation of Sweden, supported by Australia and the United States, recommended the deletion of the term "energy" in the second line, leaving the statement of the treatment simply as "ionizing radiation". This change was suggested as it was felt that the term "energy" could be misunderstood by consumers. The Committee accepted this amendment.

24. The Committee had mixed views on the usefulness of an optional accompanying logo in addition to the statement that the food had been treated with ionizing radiation. The Delegations of Canada and the United States pointed out that the use of a logo was mandatory in these countries.

25. The Delegation of Canada suggested that the international food irradiation symbol known as "Radura", originally developed in the Netherlands, should be used. The Delegations of Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States supported the use of the internationally accepted logo. The Delegation of Sweden noted that the radura symbol was not recognized by Swedish consumers, but that they would not object to its use.

26. At the suggestion of the Delegation of Canada, the Committee agreed to eliminate the requirement to qualify the logo with an explanatory statement as it seemed to be overly restrictive and onerous to require such a statement in two label locations (e.g., next to the product name and the logo). As a result of these discussions, the Committee agreed to allow for the optional use of the radura symbol, but when it was used, it would be in close proximity to the name of the food and the required language. The Committee noted that this would negate the need for a separate statement to identify the logo.

27. As a second issue, the Committee focused its discussions on Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Standard, which as written, excluded the necessity to declare components of composite ingredients if the composite ingredient was present in the food at less than 25%.

28. The Observer from the International Organization of Consumers Unions (IOCU) recommended labelling of irradiated ingredients present in any amounts in foods, including those that were included in composite ingredients. The Delegations of Sweden and Australia supported the IOCU position.

29. The Delegation of Switzerland noted the analytical difficulties associated with the labelling of irradiated ingredients which were a part of composite ingredients present at very low levels as a total percentage of the final product. The Delegations of the United States and Canada supported this position, and suggested that Section 4.2.1.3 remained unchanged.

30. As a result of these discussions, the Committee agreed to retain the current wording of Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Standard. As discussed above, the Committee also agreed to forward the draft amendment to Section 5.2.1 of the General Standard to the Commission for adoption at Step 8. The proposed amendment to Section 5.2.1 is attached to this report as Appendix III.

REVISED DRAFT CODEX GENERAL GUIDELINES ON CLAIMS (Agenda Item 5)

31. The Committee had before it working paper CX/FL 91/4 when discussing this agenda item, which summarized government comments submitted in response to CL

1989/43-FL concerning the draft Guidelines circulated at its last session (Appendix V, ALINORM 89/22).

32. The Committee was reminded that the Commission had adopted the draft revised guidelines as elaborated by the CCFL at Step 5, with the understanding that although the CCFL could discuss problems related to advertising, there was no need to initiate a Code of Practice on Advertising (paras. 256-258, ALINORM 89/40). The 37th Session of the Executive Committee agreed with and strongly supported the conclusions of the Commission (paras. 72-73, ALINORM 91/3). The Delegation of Sweden, however, noted that the Committee's terms of reference allowed for the study of problems associated with the advertisement of food. To facilitate its discussions, the Committee decided to discuss the guidelines on a point-by-point basis, as contained in Appendix V of ALINORM 89/22. The Committee's conclusions are highlighted below, as follows:

Section 1 - Scope and General Principles

33. No changes were made.

Section 2 - Definition

34. At the suggestion of the Delegation of Canada, the Committee agreed that the word "qualities" should be changed to "characteristics", as the latter term was more applicable to a description of food. In addition, the Committee agreed that "production" should be included in the list of food characteristics as being within the scope of the Guidelines.

Section 3 - Prohibited Claims

35. The Committee had considerable discussions as to the merits of Section 3.3 concerning "claims which could not be substantiated", as it was felt by some delegations that not all claims which could not be substantiated should be prohibited. For this reason, it was also noted that this section could be more logically included in Section 4 (Misleading Claims). The Committee also noted that the terms " should" and "shall" may need to be standardized within the text, as they had different meanings. The Observer of the IOCU, as supported by the Delegation of Australia, suggested the deletion of Section 3.4 (b).

36. The Committee decided to leave this section unchanged. However, it also suggested that the Commission may wish to examine the implications of the terms "should" and "shall" as part of its scheduled discussions concerning the legal ramifications of guidelines, standards and codes of practice.

Section 4 - Misleading Claims

37. In view of the fact that if such claims were misleading under all conditions they would be prohibited, the Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of Canada to include "Potentially" as part of the section title. The Committee also agreed to refer to the list of claims in Section 4 as examples of potentially misleading claims as opposed to an all inclusive list. The Delegation of Spain noted that all misleading claims should be included in Section 3.

38. The Committee also agreed that Section 4.3 concerning claims that foods had special characteristics when all such foods had such characteristics should be moved to Section 5, as this type of claim could be conditional depending on the circumstances. The statement was also modified to allow for its use if the fact that all such foods had such characteristics was apparent in the claim. The Delegation of France suggested that term "hygienic" be defined in Section 4.2, and that the terms "healthful" and "wholesome" be removed.

Section 5 - Conditional Claims

39. The Committee agreed to reference the Codex General Principles for the Addition of Essential Nutrients to Foods in Section 5.1(i) in order to clarify procedures to be followed when taking nutritional considerations into account. In addition, the Committee agreed to insert examples of religious or ritual preparations of a food (i.e., Halal, Kosher) in Section 5.1 (iii) for the sake of clarity.

40. The Committee also agreed to add a section referencing claims concerning the reduction or omission of nutrients to compensate for the permitted use of claims for the addition of nutrients in Section 5.1(i).

41. As a final issue, the Committee decided to delete the square brackets from Section 5.1 (iv)(d) and elected to include the second option in Section (d) as the better alternative. The Delegation of Argentina supported the first option.

42. As a result of these discussions, Section 5 was rearranged and renumbered.

Status of the Guidelines

43. The Committee agreed to forward the Revised Draft Codex General Guidelines on Claims to the Commission for adoption at Step 8. The subject Guidelines are included in this report as Appendix II.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REVISED DRAFT LIST OF CLASS TITLES FOR FOOD ADDITIVES (Agenda Item 6)

44. The Committee had before it documents CX/FL 91/5 and CX/FL 91/5-Add.1, which summarized comments submitted concerning this issue in response to CL 1989/43-FL.

45. The Committee recalled that it had proposed (Appendix II ALINORM 89/22), that the List of Class Titles for Food Additives as prepared by the 21st Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (paras. 82-84 and Annex II, Appendix VI, ALINORM 89/12A) should be used to replace Section 4.2.2.3 of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods. The Commission approved the initiation of the amendment procedure (paras. 263-264, ALINORM 89/40), with the understanding that comments would be solicited from governments at Step 3.

46. Subsequent to the approval of the Commission, the 22nd CCFAC Session made slight amendments to the list of class titles for forwarding and endorsement by the CCFL (para. 88, ALINORM 91/12). Namely, the CCFAC added a class title for firming agents and agreed on the title of acids for this category of compounds. The CCFL was also reminded that the CCFAC was forwarding the proposed list of class titles to the Commission as part of the International Numbering System for adoption at Step 8.

47. The Delegation of Sweden, supported by the Delegations of Israel and Norway, stated that the list of class titles for food additives should be as short as possible. The Delegations of Norway and Sweden suggested the deletion of a number of class titles, but noted particular concerns regarding "modified starch(es)" which were considered to fall within other class titles.

48. The Delegation of Argentina recommended the adoption of the list as proposed and amended by the 22nd CCFAC. The Delegation of Switzerland, supported by the Delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, emphasized that the list of class titles had been developed over many years in conjunction with the CCFAC and, therefore, should remain unchanged once finalized because of its impact on national legislation and food labelling. The Delegations of Australia and the

United States noted their concern that the class title "sweetener" does not distinguish between "artificial" and "nutritive" sweeteners. The Delegation of the United States further noted that the term "nature identical" in reference to flavours was meaningless. The Observer of the EEC confirmed their support for the proposed list and agreed with the Delegations of the Netherlands and Switzerland that no changes should be made. The Delegation of Spain also noted that consideration should be taken as to the accurate translation of these terms into English.

49. The Committee agreed to refer the Draft List of Class Titles for Food Additives to the Commission with a recommendation for adoption at Step 8 under the accelerated elaboration procedures. The subject class titles are included in this report as Appendix IV.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT NUTRIENT REFERENCE VALUES FOR FOOD LABELLING PURPOSES (Agenda Item 7)

50. The Committee had before it documents CX/FL 91/6 and CX/FL 91/6-Add.1, which summarized government comments in response to CL 1989/19-FL and CL 1989/43-FL, as well as a Conference Room Document (unnumbered) which included discussions held at the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) concerning this subject (paras. 99-101, ALINORM 91/26).

51. The Committee was reminded that the 18th Session of the Commission (paras. 271-273, ALINORM 89/40) had agreed to the amendment of Section 3.3.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling by incorporating the recommended Nutrient Reference Values (NRVs) as proposed by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Recommended Allowances of Nutrients for Food Labelling Purposes (12-16 September 1988) held in Helsinki, Finland. The Committee also noted that the 17th Session of the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses had recommended that the CCFL should replace the current reference recommended daily allowances in the Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling with the Nutrient Reference Values (NRVs) as proposed by the Helsinki Consultation. The CCNFSDU recommended the inclusion of a footnote to the proposed draft amendment stating that the list of nutrients and the nutrient reference values should be kept under review. The EEC observer at the CCNFSDU Session also welcomed the NRVs as proposed, while noting that the newly adopted Community Directive on Nutrition Labelling for Foodstuffs (90/496/EEC) contained identical values. The Delegation of Spain supported the comments of the EEC Observer as presented at the CCNFSDU Session.

52. The Delegation of France, supported by the Delegations of Australia, Switzerland and the United States, proposed a change of the title from NRV to "Recommended Daily Intake Values for Use in Nutrition Labelling". The Delegation of the United Kingdom noted that the sources from which the figures in the list had been drawn were already in process of change and therefore, to incorporate these figures now could involve serious inconvenience for industry and confusion for consumers. The Delegation was also concerned that there was no clear provision in the list for updating the values.

53. The Delegation of the Netherlands supported the list as recommended by the Helsinki Consultation, while stating that the Commission had agreed that the NRVs were only used as a standard for comparison of nutrient content of foods and did not relate to individual nutrient needs (para. 39, ALINORM 89/40). The Delegation emphasized that the NRV list could be adequately interpreted by consumers through the use of education programs, which was also a requirement of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (Section 4.3). Several countries, while indicating their strong support for the NRV's as proposed, also supported the CCNFSDU proposal to include the suggested footnote in the text which referred to the future possibility of amending the list of nutrients and values.

54. The Delegation of Malaysia, supported by the Delegations of Canada, Denmark and Switzerland, proposed to add to the table a footnote indicating the conversion factor used for the declaration of Vitamin A. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

55. The Delegation of Norway, supported by the Delegation of Sweden, recommended the inclusion of provisions for the declaration of Sodium and Potassium as indicated in the Helsinki report. These Delegations, as well as Malaysia, supported a reference value for Vitamin E. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegations of the United States, Netherlands and Spain, noted that reference values for sodium and potassium were not appropriate for nutrient information, as only absolute values were required for these two compounds. The Committee concluded not to include values for potassium and sodium at this time.

56. The Delegation of Argentina informed the Committee that they were not in a position to comment on the proposed amendment to the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling at the present Session, given that they still had doubts as to the NRVs.

57. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft amendment to Section 3.3.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling to Step 5 for endorsement by the Commission. It was agreed that the footnote as recommended by the CCNFSDU and the conversion factor for the calculation of Vitamin A would also be included.

58. The proposed amendment is included in this report as Appendix V.

ENDORSEMENT OF LABELLING PROVISIONS IN CODEX STANDARDS AND CODES OF PRACTICE (Agenda Item 8)

59. The Committee had for its consideration document CX/FL 91/7, containing labelling provisions submitted by various Codex committees for endorsement, as well as a conference room document (unnumbered) containing items for endorsement arising from the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses.

60. The Committee was reminded of the expedited labelling endorsement procedures adopted by the Commission to facilitate CCFL deliberations (see document CX/FL 91/2) and in this regard, noted that many of the standards were simply amended in accordance with the revised procedures.

Labelling Provisions Endorsed as Submitted

61. The Committee endorsed the labelling provisions of the following Codex standards and guidelines as submitted:

Codex Committee on Fish and Fishery Products, 19th Session, ALINORM 91/18

- Revised Proposed Draft General Standard for Quick Frozen Fish Fillets (Appendix II)
- Proposed Draft Standard for Dried Shark Fins (Appendix III)

Codex Committee on Processed Meat and Poultry Products, 15th Session, ALINORM 91/16

- Draft Guidelines for the Use of Non-Meat Protein Products in Processed Meat and Poultry Products (Appendix IV)
- Draft Standard for Corned Beef (Appendix V)
- Draft Standard for Luncheon Meat (Appendix VI)
- Draft Standard for Cooked Cured Ham (Appendix VII)

- Draft Standard for Cooked Cured Pork Shoulder (Appendix VIII)

- Draft Standard for Cooked Cured Chopped Meat (Appendix IX)

Codex Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes, 7th Session, ALINORM 91/29

- Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Rice (Appendix IV)

Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles Concerning Milk and Milk Products, CX 5/70 - 22nd Session

- Draft Group Standard for Cheeses in Brine (Appendix IX)

- Draft Group Standard for Uncured/Unripened Cheeses (Appendix X)

- Draft Standard A-14 for Edible Rennet Casein (Appendix XI)

- Draft Standard A-15 for Food Grade Sweet Whey and Acid Powders (Appendix XII)

Codex Coordinating Committee for Africa, 9th Session, ALINORM 91/28

- Draft African Regional Standard for Edible Cassava Flour (Appendix II)

- Proposed Draft African Regional Standard for Couscous (Appendix III)

Labelling Provisions Endorsed with Minor Amendments

62. In addition, the Committee considered the labelling provisions of the following standards and endorsed those provisions with minor amendments as indicated:

Codex Committee on Processed Meat and Poultry Products, 15th Session, ALINORM 91/6

- Draft Guide for the Microbiological Quality of Spices Used in Processed Meat and Poultry Products (Appendix III)

63. The Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of Australia that all references to "bulk" containers (Section 3.5) should be changed to read as "non-retail containers" in this and all other Codex standards.

64. The Committee agreed to endorse these labelling provisions, with the understanding that the suggested changes will be taken into account.

Codex Committee on Cereals, Pulses and Legumes, 7th Session, ALINORM 91/29

- Draft Standard for Durum Wheat Semolina and Durum Wheat Flour (Appendix III)

65. The Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of Australia that Section 7.1.2 (Name of the Food) should not include a requirement based on "national legislation" as this could have negative implications towards the successful establishment of internationally acceptable standards. As such the Committee recommended that this section should read as:

> "In addition thereto, there shall be added any qualifying term necessary to identify the product and to avoid misleading or confusing the consumer (e.g. enriched)."

66. The Committee agreed to endorse the labelling section of this standard as proposed, with the understanding that this change would be taken into account.

Joint FAO/WHO Committee of Government Experts on the Code of Principles Concerning Milk and Milk Products, CX 5/70 - 22nd Session

- Revised Draft Standard A-3 for Evaporated Milk, Evaporated Skimmed Milk, Evaporated Partly Skimmed Milk and Evaporated High-Fat Milk (Appendix IV)

- Revised Draft Standard A-4 for Sweetened Condensed Milk, Sweetened Condensed Skimmed Milk, Sweetened Condensed Partly Skimmed Milk and Sweetened Condensed High-Fat Milk (Appendix V)

67. The Delegation of the United Kingdom questioned the expression of fat as a percentage of weight of the product (Section 4.2) as this was different from Section 3.3.3 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling, which required declaration in grams per 100 grams. It was also noted that the label location of the declaration needed to be specified.

68. The Delegation of Canada deferred to the expertise of the Milk Committee concerning this issue, and also noted that fat declarations per serving and other declarations were allowed by the guidelines. The Committee also agreed that the fat declaration would also be required if full nutrition labelling was used and therefore, the declaration could exist in two different areas of the label, (i.e., nutrient declaration and percentage declaration).

69. The Committee concluded that percentage fat labelling was useful to consumers as an acceptable "quick reference" point, but agreed that the "Milk Committee" should require any such statement in close proximity to the name of the food.

70. The Delegation of the Netherlands also questioned the need for multiple names for each of these standards, as it was felt that it would be confusing for consumers when purchasing the same product under different names. The Secretariat noted, however, that the Milk Committee had based these product names on its expert evaluation of those designations used in international trade. The Committee agreed with this explanation.

71. The Committee noted that the above recommendation would apply to both standards A-3 and A-4, and endorsed these labelling provisions as proposed, with the understanding that the above amendments would be taken into consideration.

Joint ECE/Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Standardization of Fruit Juices, 19th Session, ALINORM 91/14

- Draft General Standard for Vegetable Juices (Appendix II)
- Draft Guidelines for Mixed Fruit Juices (Appendix III)
- Draft Guidelines for Mixed Fruit Nectars (Appendix IV)

72. The Committee agreed that the term "circulated" in Section 8.2.1 of the Guidelines for Mixed Fruit Juices should be corrected to read as "calculated".

73. In respect to claims concerning vitamin C (i.e., Section 7.3.3 of vegetable juices, Section 8.3.2 of mixed fruit juices and Section 8.3.3 of mixed fruit nectars) the Committee noted that as currently written, these provisions were restricted by national authorities in the country in which the product was sold. The Committee, while noting that provisions in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling (Section 3.2.5) address the declaration of vitamins and minerals which were present in significant amounts, recommended that the Fruit Juice Committee should re-examine this section based on the Guidelines. The Committee also agreed

to request the clarification of Section 8.3.7 (additional requirements) from the Fruit Juice Committee.

74. The Committee agreed to endorse the labelling provisions as proposed, with the understanding that the above discussion would be taken into consideration by the Fruit Juice Committee under procedures established for Committees which have adjourned *sine die*, if necessary.

Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods for Special Dietary Uses, 17th Session, ALINORM 91/26

- Draft Standard for Formula Foods for Use in Weight Control Diets (Appendix III)

75. The Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of the United Kingdom to delete Sections 9.2 (list of ingredients) and 9.4 (date marking) as these provisions are adequately covered by the General Labelling Standard. The Committee also agreed that the term "should" must read as "shall" in Section 9.6.2 (additional provisions).

76. The Committee agreed to endorse the labelling provisions as proposed, with the understanding that the above amendments would be taken into account by the CCNFSDU.

- Draft Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Foods for Special Medical Purposes (Appendix IV)

77. The Committee agreed with the recommendation of the Delegation of the United Kingdom to delete Section 4.3 (date marking) as this provision was adequately covered by the general labelling standard. In addition, the Committee also agreed with the Delegation of Australia in that the word "should" must read as "shall" in Sections 4.2.8 (nutrition labelling) and 4.5.4 (labelling information).

78. In regard to Sections 4.2.6 and 4.2.8 of the Standard, several Delegations questioned the need for these provisions, as it was felt that this information was not understood by consumers, and also is difficult to include on the label due to space limitations. However, several other Delegations felt that this information was important to include as this information could also be used by medical authorities as these products are used under medical supervision. The Committee concluded that Sections 4.2.6 and 4.2.8 should remain in the standard.

79. The Committee endorsed the labelling provisions as proposed.

Labelling Provisions Not Endorsed Due to Significant Amendments

80. And finally, the Committee considered the labelling provisions of the following standards and did not endorse those provisions for the reasons indicated below:

Codex Committee on Tropical Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, 2nd Session, ALINORM 91/35

- Proposed Draft General Format for Codex Standards for Tropical Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (Appendix II)

- Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Pineapple (Appendix III)

- Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Papaya (Appendix IV)

- Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Mango (Appendix V)

81. The Committee noted that these standards were all at Step 5 of the elaboration procedure. At the suggestion of the Delegation of the Netherlands, the Committee agreed that all of the standards should include an introductory statement as to the applicability of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods as required under the new elaboration procedures.

82. At the suggestion of the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Committee agreed that Sections 6.2 (Identification of Exporter and/or Packer) and 6.6 (Irradiation) of the standards should be removed, as these provisions were already covered by the general standard.

83. The Delegation of the Switzerland also noted that although a statement as to the country of origin was required by the general standard, the additional use of the term "Produce of ..." in Section 6.3 of these standards was overly restrictive, as the origin of the product could be expressed in other equally acceptable terms. Furthermore, the Delegation of Switzerland asked to harmonize the labelling requirements of Codex with those of the UN/ECE. The Committee agreed with this observation, and recommended the deletion of "Produce of .." in this section. The Committee also noted, however, that the remainder of this section would remain in the standard as proposed, as it allowed for the optional declaration of the region of production.

84. The Delegation of Australia, as supported by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, also noted that several aspects of the labelling provisions seemed to be applicable to non-retail containers, which was not normally within the scope of the general labelling standard (i.e., prepackaged foods). Among other provisions, this included Section 6.4 (Commercial Description) as to class, size, number of units, etc. and Section 6.1 (Nature of Produce) as to product in bulk. However, as the Committee noted that provisions related to the labelling of non-retail containers were permitted as part of the general standard, (Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual) it agreed that the labelling provisions should clearly be divided into sections addressing retail and non-retail labelling.

85. As a final matter, the Committee also agreed that the term "should" (e.g., in Section 6.1 and others) should read as "shall" to indicate mandatory requirements.

86. As a result of these discussions, the Committee decided to withhold endorsement of these labelling provisions pending action by the CCTFFV as outlined above. The Committee noted that this procedure would not necessarily delay the consideration of these standards for adoption by the 19th Session of the Commission at Step 5.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR USE OF THE TERM "NATURAL" IN FOOD PRODUCT LABELLING (Agenda Item 9)

87. The Committee had before it "Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Use of the Term Natural in Food Product Labelling" (CX/FL 91/8) as prepared by Canada as well as comments submitted concerning the proposal in documents CX/FL 91/8-Add.1 and Add.2.

88. The Committee noted that as a follow-up to discussions which took place at the First meeting of the Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific (paras. 74-76, ALINORM 91/32), the Executive Committee (ALINORM 91/3, para. 71) had decided that questions concerning the use of the term "natural" in food labelling should be examined by the CCFL. The Delegation of Canada agreed to undertake the task of developing draft guidelines, which were circulated for government comments at Step 3 (CX/FL 91/8).

89. In introducing its paper, Canada thanked the responding countries for the detailed information and comments received outlining their respective positions and

views on the issue, and for providing their pertinent national regulations, policies and guidelines. Canada stated that the proposed guidelines represented an attempt to reach a consensus position by outlining options based on the relatively divergent views of responding governments, ranging from disagreement on the need for the definition of terms such as "natural", to relatively strong support for clear and unambiguous guidelines to prevent misrepresentation and consumer confusion.

90. The draft guidelines also acknowledged the generally accepted international distinction in meaning between the claim "natural" as a term applicable to the post-harvest period as opposed to terms such as "organic" or "biologically grown", considered applicable to the pre-harvest period.

91. The Delegation of Denmark stated that it did not support the development of this guideline and recommended its withdrawal pending further comment by member countries. The Delegation of Finland also noted that it did not agree with the standardization of individual terms such as "natural". The Delegations of the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United States however, felt that it was important to ensure consistent, uniform use of this term. The Committee decided to proceed with a clause by clause review of the guidelines. Comments are recorded in the following paragraphs.

Section 1 - Scope

92. At the suggestion of the Delegation of Sweden, the reference in subsection 1.1 was edited to remove the term Draft, as well as the reference to Appendix IV, ALINORM 85/22A.

93. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegation of France, suggested that limiting the scope to claims was too narrow. It was felt that the guidelines should extend to labelling in general.

94. Several Delegations, including France, Australia, the United Kingdom and Malaysia, as well as the observer from the IOCU, did not agree that the guidelines should exclude subjective claims such as those relating to taste, appeal and appearance, as these might be misleading to the consumer. The Delegation of the United States asked why the guidelines did not extend to natural colours. The Delegation of Australia felt the guidelines should apply to natural flavours in addition to colours. The Delegation of Denmark, supported by the Delegation of France, did not agree that the guidelines should cover food additives. The Delegation of New Zealand suggested that the scope should be broad for now, with the opportunity to make exclusions later. The Delegation of Australia also suggested that the term "synonyms" should be replaced by "words of similar intent" (to natural). The Delegation of Spain noted that the present guidelines did not apply to the use of the word natural either in the preparation of canned fish or vegetables or to "natural flavours" as defined by the CCFAC.

Section 2 - Definition

95. The Delegation of the Netherlands questioned the appropriateness of the definition of minimal processing in this section, in that it seemed to imply that this was the key feature in determining whether a food could be considered natural. The Delegation of Spain proposed changing the title to "Procedures Producing a Minimum of Transformation". It was suggested that the list in the Annex would need study on a case-by-case basis as the processes could cause various various levels of transformation depending on the food.

96. The Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that the issue under consideration was not a matter of science, but a question of what the consumer would understand in association with the term "natural". It was further suggested that the accompanying list should not be exhaustive and should only contain

examples. The Delegations of Australia and Switzerland supported this view, and agreed with the comments of the Netherlands relating to the positioning of the definition of minimal processing in this section.

97. The Delegation of Sweden stated its position of not favouring the guidelines, but if these were necessary, their application should be very restrictive. The Delegation of Norway, supported by the Delegation of Finland, also was not in favour of guidelines for single words and felt a broad approach was required involving accompanying statements explaining the term. The Delegation of France felt that the proposed list of minimal processes was too extensive. The Delegation of Cuba felt the list should not be too restrictive as, for example, the original state of such products as sugar did not change with processing.

Section 3 - Criteria for Use of Natural

98. The Delegation of the Netherlands, supported by the Delegation of Norway, felt that the term "natural" in the case of single ingredient products should apply only to single ingredient products subjected to mechanical processing or refrigeration. The Delegation of the United Kingdom felt that the term "mechanical" should be replaced by "physical" which would include such processes as pasteurization.

99. With respect to subsection 3.1, several Delegations, including the Delegations of Norway, France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Denmark, supported option 1, as did Switzerland in principle. However, the Delegation of Switzerland noted that products such as breakfast cereals may be made from a number of different natural grains. The Delegation of New Zealand proposed amended wording involving the removal as well as the addition of substances. In this regard, the observer of the IDF noted that fat was commonly removed from fluid milk and therefore, skimmed milk products would be excluded if the proposal from New Zealand were adopted.

100. The Delegations of Canada, the United States, Spain, Cuba and the observers from the CIAA and the IDF supported option 2. The Delegation of Australia referred to the United Kingdom Guidelines contained in CX/FL 91/8 (p. 7) relating to processing acceptable for "single ingredient foods, such as cheese, yoghurt and butter" and suggested that this highlighted the need to clarify examples what was meant by single ingredient foods. The observer from the IDF expressed the view that consumers considered milk, butter, cheese and yoghurt to be natural foods. The Delegation of Canada recommended the removal of square brackets from food additives, vitamins, minerals, colours and flavours.

101. With reference to subsection 3.2, the Delegation of France suggested that this was an acceptable approach if Option 1 were adopted. The Delegation of Canada accepted Section 3.2 with removal of the square brackets. The Delegation of Switzerland, supported by the Delegations of Denmark and Norway, suggested the deletion of food additives from this section since the consumer usually perceives natural foods as products free from food additives. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegations of Malaysia, New Zealand and the United States, pointed out that there were natural source additives, vitamins and minerals. The Delegation of Spain, noting that it had previously supported option 2 of Section 3.1, suggested placing Section 3.2 entirely in square brackets.

102. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegations of France and Spain, recommended the removal of Section 3.3 as it would permit the term natural in association with a product containing up to 99% "non-natural" ingredients. The Delegation of New Zealand felt that Section 3.3 should only apply to major ingredients. The observer of the CIAA recommended retention of Section 3.3, because there already was a general prohibition against misleading claims under the Draft Codex General Guidelines on Claims.

103. Regarding subsection 3.5, the Delegation of the Netherlands suggested that terms such as "Mother Nature" were meaningless and should be prohibited. Furthermore, it recommended that the title be changed to "Other Equivalent Terms". The Delegations of the United Kingdom and Spain supported removing the examples in this section as the identification of like terms in different languages were difficult to identify. The Delegation of Malaysia suggested an additional Section 3.6 indicating that terms such as natural appearance, taste, appeal, etc., not be used unless the criteria of Subsection 3.1.1 were met. The Delegation of Canada suggested that this might not be necessary if the "subjective" references were removed from Section 1.2.

Section 4 - Additional Labelling Requirements

104. With respect to Subsection 4.2 relating to label statements explaining natural, the Delegation of Spain suggested deleting this section as it did not provide useful information to the consumer. This was supported by the Delegations of Cuba, France, Sweden, Switzerland and the observer from the CIAA. The Delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United States and the observer of the IOCU favoured its retention. The observer of the IDF, supported by the Delegations of the United States, recommended that information on why a product was natural could be given on any panel through reference by means of an asterisk or similar indications. The Delegation of the United Kingdom offered the alternative of supporting documentation being made available by the manufacturer rather than explanations being included as part of label information. The Delegation of Sweden noted that the draft General Guidelines already required manufacturers to be able to substantiate claims.

Annex to Appendix I - Proposed Minimal Processes

105. The Delegations of Norway and Sweden did not favour the elaboration of such a list. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegation of the Netherlands, suggested it should be a list of examples only. The Delegation of Switzerland asked that the entire list be placed in square brackets pending further study. The Delegation of Spain, supported by the Delegation of the United States, recommended that irradiation should be removed from the list of processes. The Delegation of Spain also suggested that reconstitution should be removed. The Delegation of Austria also suggested the removal of concentration, reconstitution, irradiation and sterilized.

Status of the Guidelines

106. The Committee agreed with a suggestion of the Delegaion of Canada to prepare updated guidelines based on written comments and the discussion at the meeting for early circulation to member countries and additional government comments at Step 3. The Committee also noted that at its next session it might be able to recommend the adoption of the document at Step 8 by the Commission through the accelerated elaboration procedure in view of the extensive discussions concerning this issue.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR USE OF HEALTH AND NUTRITION CLAIMS IN FOOD PRODUCT LABELLING (Agenda Item 10)

107. The Committee had before it proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for the Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Labelling (CX/FL 91/9) as prepared by Canada, as well as comments submitted concerning this proposal in document CX/FL 91/9-Add.1.

108. The Committee noted that the Codex Coordinating Committee for North America and the South West Pacific (CCNASWP), had supported the need to develop a uniform policy concerning the use of nutrition and health claims on labels, and recommended the elaboration of the subject Guidelines (paras. 77-79, ALINORM 91/32) by the

CCFL. The Executive Committee agreed that the CCFL should develop such guidelines (ALINORM 91/3, para. 72), with the understanding that the issue of advertising would be limited to discussions only (see paras. 16-17), and that EEC Directives in the areas of health and nutrition claims would also be taken into consideration. Currently, claims as to the suitability of a food for use in the prevention, alleviation, treatment or cure of a disease or a physiological condition, except under limited conditions, were prohibited under Section 3.4 of the Draft Revision of the Codex General Guidelines on Claims (see Appendix II), which had been submitted to the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (see paras. 31-43 above).

109. In its introduction of the Proposed Draft Guidelines, the Delegation of Canada stated that the proposed draft addresses three types of claims, namely, health claims, claims for the role of essential nutrients in human health and claims for nutrient content. The recommendation of the Committee on Food Standards of the International Union of Nutritional Sciences (IUNS), stating that health claims should be related to official dietary guidelines that described a pattern of eating designed to promote and maintain health, was used in elaborating the health claims section. With respect to claims for the role of essential nutrients in human health, it was considered that these should be limited to functions necessary to the maintenance of good health and normal growth and development. Claims for the nutrient content of foods were based on recommendations from the Helsinki Consultation and the IUNS Committee on Nutritional Aspects of Food Standards.

110. The Chairman and a number of Delegations expressed their thanks to Canada for the preparation of an informative and comprehensive document. The observer of the CIAA also noted their appreciation for the work of Codex and the Committee in developing guidance for providing valuable food labelling information to consumers.

111. The Delegation of Denmark stated its concerns for the use of labels to provide health advice to consumers, stating that this was normally the role and responsibility of national health authorities. The importance of ensuring that health and nutrition claims on labels were easily understood by consumers was also noted as an important aspect by the Delegation of the Netherlands. In this regard, it was felt that the permitted messages should be simple and balanced and that the number of descriptors be limited. The Delegation of Sweden also presented a summary of their national position concerning the use of health claims.

112. The Committee agreed to a clause-by-clause review of the draft guidelines as described in the following paragraphs:

Section 1 - Scope

113. The observer from the CIAA proposed that Subsection 1.1 be amended to read "The guidelines relate to the use of nutrition and health claims in food labelling". The Delegation of the United States supported this change.

114. It was suggested that a definition for health claims be included in the guidelines. However, it was noted that the definition used in Section 3 (c) of the Introduction to document CX/FL 91/9 was not appropriate for this purpose, as it was considered to define "drug" rather than "health" claims.

Section 2 - Nutrition Labelling

115. The Committee made no comments on this Section.

Section 3 - Health Claims

116. It was proposed by the Delegation of the United States and supported by the observer from the CIAA that "prohibited" be changed to "permitted" as the last word in this section. The Delegation of the United States further noted that

claims as to the suitability of a food as part of a dietary pattern in the reduction of disease risk or the delay of disease onset were precisely what the United States considered acceptable if based on sound science. The Delegation of Canada commented that it considered such claims related to disease prevention, etc. as unacceptable. In this regard, the Delegation of Canada also suggested that the title of this section be changed to "Disease Prevention Claims".

117. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that a total prohibition as specified in this Section was unnecessary as certain general claims should be allowed.

118. Two kinds of claims were suggested by the Delegation of France for the Committee's consideration: the first dealing with the prevention or curing of a disease, and the second concerning the general functioning of the body.

Section 4 - Claims Related to Dietary Guidelines and Healthy Diets

119. Several Delegations questioned the meaning of "official dietary guidelines". It was agreed that such guidelines could be those developed within a country, or by an international organization, but in any event should be those recognized by the appropriate national authority having jurisdiction.

120. The observer from the CIAA proposed the deletion of Subsection 4.5 as it was considered contradictory. The Delegations of Denmark, France, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as the observer from the IOCU, favoured retention of this clause. However, both the Delegations of Australia and the Netherlands noted that interpretation of the meaning of this subsection may be difficult and that re-wording should be considered.

Section 5 - Claims for the Role of Essential Nutrients in Human Health

121. The Delegation of the United Kingdom questioned the clarity of the term "generally recognized action or effect". Canada commented that this was intended to refer to actions or effects which were scientifically documented. The observer from the IOCU suggested "contained in dietary guidelines or recommendations" as alternative wording.

122. There was some discussion regarding claims for the specific nutrient needs of groups of individuals who might have special requirements (e.g. high carbohydrate beverages for athletes in endurance activities).

123. The Delegation of Denmark again noted that it was the responsibility of health authorities and not of the food industry to inform the consumer of the role of essential nutrients in human health.

Section 6 - Claims for Nutrient Content

124. The Observer from the CIAA suggested that the wording for claims in Subsection 6.2 be given as examples only.

125. It was noted by Canada that the Executive Committee had decided that the CCNFSDU retained responsibility for advising the CCFL on what levels of reduction or increase of a nutritional component should qualify for the use of an appropriate nutrient descriptor. It was further noted that the CCNFSDU had withdrawn the Codex Proposed Draft Standard for the Labelling of and Claims for Prepackaged "Low Energy" or "Reduced Energy" Foods in order not to duplicate the work of the CCFL (see para 9).

126. The Delegation of the United States noted that under recent legislation passed in the United States no claims other than those authorized by the U.S. Food

and Drug Administration would be permitted, and consequently this section should refer to "official recognition" of claims.

127. The Delegation of Norway, supported by the Delegation of Finland, suggested that reference should be made in the Table to this section and the use of the term "light", which was similar to the term "reduced". The Delegation of the United Kingdom commented that the term "light" could refer to various food characteristics in addition to nutrients, and if provisions for its use were made, the Committee would have to ensure that other legitimate uses of the term were not excluded.

128. With respect to the term "NRV", the Delegation of the United States stated that the term "RDI" should be used. The Delegation of New Zealand suggested that conditions for claims for polyunsaturated and monounsaturated fats should also be included in the Table.

129. The Delegation of the Netherlands, supported by the Delegations of the New Zealand, Sweden and the United Kingdom, suggested that there should be fewer descriptors for nutrients under Part B of the Table. The Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested a maximum of two descriptors, e.g. "source" and "high source". In addition, the Delegation of the Netherlands questioned the inclusion of cholesterol in the Table since its presence in foods might not be nutritionally relevant. The Delegation of Denmark noted that it used three descriptors in relation to fibres without problems.

130. The Delegation of Canada noted that a correction needed to be made to the "conditions" column of Part B of the Table to include the quantity basis for the claims.

131. The Delegation of Australia noted that the term "free" with reference to a substance could not be used in Australia if any amount of the substance was present. Australia permitted the claim "less than (specific amount)". Sweden agreed with Australia's interpretation of the term "free".

132. The Delegation of Switzerland suggested that conditions should be stated either per serving or per 100g since both formats were used. Switzerland also suggested that the term "serving" should be defined since this might vary significantly between countries.

Section 7 - Comparative Claims

133. With respect to subsection 7.1, the Delegations of the Netherlands, New Zealand and Australia agreed that comparative claims should be restricted to different versions of the same food. Subsection 7.2 would have to be consequently amended.

134. With respect to Subsection 7.2, the Delegation of the Netherlands suggested that the label should not be required to include the precise amount of the difference but that the descriptors "increased" or "reduced" could be used.

135. Regarding Subsection 7.3, the Delegations of Denmark, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and the United States noted that they preferred a 1/3 reduction as a condition for comparative claims for energy. The Delegations of Sweden and the United States agreed that other nutrients might have to have different criteria for comparative claims. The Observer of the IOCU stated that 25% was too small a difference for comparative claims and that it should be raised to at least 33% and preferably 50%.

136. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the Delegations of Canada and the CIAA, were in agreement with Subsection 7.3 as proposed. It was stated that there was benefit to the public in having available a large number of foods with a reasonably significant level of reduction such as 25%, rather than a

few foods with much higher reductions. The Delegation of the Netherlands suggested that 25% to 40% be placed in square brackets in this Subsection.

137. The Committee agreed with a suggestion of the Delegation of Canada to prepare updated guidelines by taking the above comments as well as written comments into consideration for early circulation and additional government comments at Step 3, with the understanding that the comments of the CCNFSDU would also be solicited. The Committee also noted that at its next session it might be able to recommend the adoption of the document by the Commission at Step 8 through the accelerated elaboration procedure in view of the extensive discussions concerning this issue.

PROGRESS REPORT ON ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY FOR USE IN THE CODEX GUIDELINES ON NUTRITION LABELLING (Agenda Item 11)

138. The Committee examined Conference Room Document 1, which summarized the conclusions of the ***Ad Hoc*** Working Group on Methodology for Use in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling.

139. Dr. N. Thompson (Canada) reported that the Working Group initiated a preliminary examination of a "Review on Precision Parameters of Methods of Analysis Required for Nutrition Labelling" undertaken by W. Horwitz *et al.*, and concluded that the working group should continue to examine Codex methods of analysis and sampling for nutrition labelling purposes for forwarding to the CCMAS for endorsement. The Report of the ***Ad Hoc*** Working Group is included as Appendix VI to this report.

140. The Delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that it was not clear as to the connection between the working group and the terms of reference of the CCFL, as the identification of Codex methods of analysis and sampling was not a task of this Committee but rather of the CCNFSDU and the CCMAS. The Delegation of Canada emphasized that the CCFL was in charge of identifying nutrients which were related to methods of analysis and sampling. The Delegation of Australia agreed that the Working Group could identify specific methods needed for nutrient labelling purposes for forwarding to the CCMAS for endorsement.

141. The Committee was informed that the methods of analysis identified for nutrients were required to be referred to the CCMAS for endorsement. However, the Committee also noted that specific methods of analysis for nutrients used for labelling purposes could be identified by the CCFL if not provided by the CCNFSDU when required.

142. The Committee agreed that before deciding on the reinstatement of the Working Group, comments would be requested concerning this issue from the CCMAS and CCNFSDU. More importantly, the Committee also agreed that the Executive Committee would be advised of this procedure with a view towards providing advice. The Secretariat would present a report of deliberations concerning this issue at the next CCFL Session.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 12)

Date Marking Systems

143. The Committee recalled its discussions under Agenda Item 2 concerning this issue (see para. 6 above) whereby the Chairman informed the Committee of a matter brought to the attention of the Canadian Secretariat concerning discrepancies between Codex and ISO date marking procedures.

144. The Delegations of Australia and the United Kingdom questioned the need for any action on this by the Committee, as the Codex Alimentarius had the sole responsibility for the elaboration of international food standards. Furthermore, the Delegation of Australia noted that the ISO standard had already been considered

by the CCFL when elaborating the General Labelling Standard and at that time, the ISO proposals were rejected on the basis that they had generally not been accepted by national governments for date identification. It was also noted that documentation concerning this issue was not available to the Committee for their consideration. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that date marking procedures as elaborated by Codex were also incorporated into EEC directives and national laws and therefore, any amendments introduced at this stage would cause confusion as well as other significant problems.

145. The Committee concluded that this matter should be handled between the Canadian and Codex Secretariats as an initial first step, with the understanding that the advice of the CCEXEC and Commission might also be required.

Labelling of Potential Allergens in Foods

146. At the suggestion of the Delegation of Norway, the Committee agreed to discuss a working paper at its next Session which would examine the labelling of potential allergens which were included as components of composite ingredients in foods and thus were not included in the ingredients list. The working paper would be prepared under the direction of Norway, with assistance provided by the governments of Finland, Iceland and Sweden.

147. The Committee noted that this issue would require the examination of Section 4.2.1.3 of the General Labelling Standard, which addressed the labelling of composite ingredients, especially as related to the "25% rule". The working paper would examine this issue in detail, and would include possible recommendations to the Committee for their consideration. It was also concluded that the CCEXEC would be informed of CCFL deliberations in this area.

Solicitation of Government Comments in Regard to Section 3.2.1.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling

148. The Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Delegation of the Netherlands to solicit information concerning the types of nutrients that governments required to be listed as outlined in Section 3.2.1.4 (Listing of Nutrients) in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling. The Committee noted that the questions prepared by the Delegation of the Netherlands would be included in the circular letter accompanying this report.

Future Work

149. The Committee noted that the following matters would be considered at the next Session:

- Endorsements of labelling provisions in Codex Standards;
- Consideration of Draft Nutrient Reference Values for Food Labelling Purposes (at Step 7);
- Consideration of Proposed Draft Guidelines for Use of the Term "Natural" in Food Product Labelling (at Step 4);
- Consideration of the Proposed Draft Guidelines for the Uses of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling (at Step 4);
- Consideration of labelling for allergenic ingredients in foods (at Steps 1, 2 and 3) and;
- Consideration of information submitted by governments regarding Section 3.2.1.4 (Listing of Nutrients) in the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 13)

150. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Government of Canada wished to continue to act as host government, with the next meeting tentatively scheduled for late April or early May 1993.

151. The Committee noted that the dates agreed upon between the Canadian and Codex Secretariats would be communicated in due course.

Annex 1

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING
Summary Status of Work

Standard/Guideline	Step	For Action by:	Document Reference
Section 5.2.1 (Irradiated Foods) of the General Labelling Standard	8	19th CAC	ALINORM 91/22, Appendix III
Revised Draft Codex General Guidelines on Claims	8	19th CAC	ALINORM 91/22, Appendix II
Section 4.2.2.3 (Class Titles) of the General Labelling Standard	5 & 8	19th CAC	ALINORM 91/22, Appendix IV
Section 3.3.4 (Nutrient Reference Values) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling	5	19th CAC	ALINORM 91/22, Appendix V
Endorsement of Labelling Provisions in Codex Standards	--	19th CAC 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 59-86
Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of the Term Natural in Food Product Labelling	3	Canada Governments 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 87-106
Proposed Draft Codex Guidelines for Use of Health and Nutrition Claims in Food Product Labelling	3	Canada Governments 18th CCNFSDU 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 107-137
National strategies regarding the application of Section 3.2.1.4 (Listing of Nutrients) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling	3	Governments 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, para. 148
Labelling of Potential Allergens in Foods	1, 2	Norway 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 146-147
Standardization of Date Marking Systems	--	Secretariat CCEXEC/CAC 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 6, 143-145
Methodology for the Analysis of Nutrients	--	CCEXEC/CAC CCMAS/CCNFSDU 23rd CCFL	ALINORM 91/22, paras. 138-142

ALINORM 91/22
APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman:
Président:
Presidente:

Mr. R.H. McKay
Senior Advisor on Food Standards
Bureau of Consumer Affairs
Consumer & Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase I
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9, Canada

ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE

Mr. Rodolfo I. Rodriguez
Minister-Counsellor
Economic and Commercial
Embassy of Argentina
151 Slater Street
Suite 400
Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5H3
Canada

Jorge Blanco
Counsellor
Embassy of Argentina
Royal Bank Centre
90 Sparks Street
Suite 620
Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5B4
Canada

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE

Mr. Laurie Erwin
Principal Executive Officer
Dept. of Primary Industries & Energy
Edmund Barton Building
Canberra, ACT 2601
Australia

Dr. G. Maynard
Director
Food Policy Section
Dept. of Community Services & Health
G.P.O. Box 9848
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE

Prof. Komm.Rat Walther Stuller
Vice-President
Codex Commission of Austria
Stubenbastei 10
1010 Vienna
Austria

CANADA

Mr. G.F. Reasbeck
Chief
Food Division
Consumer Products Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase I
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

Dr. M.C. Cheney
Chief
Nutrition Evaluation Division
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
Canada

Ms. Pat Steele
Food Division
Consumer Products Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase I
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

Ms. L. Crapigna
Food Division
Consumer Products Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9, Canada

Mrs. K. Gourlie
Director
Consumer Products Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

Mr. G. Roy
National Coordinator Labelling
Agriculture Canada
2255 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario K0A 1N0
Canada

Mrs. Marsha Sharp
Chief Executive Officer
Canadian Dietetic Association
480 University Avenue
Suite 601
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1V2
Canada

Mr. Henk Wrisma
Technical Adviser
Awatto International Foods
39 Westminster Avenue S.
Montreal West, Quebec H4X 1Y6
Canada

Dr. F.A. Homonnay
Senior Partner
Homonnay Associates
39 Westminster Avenue S.
Montreal West, Quebec H4X 1Y6
Canada

Dr. Andrew Kawczak
President
Chief Seattle Foundation
39 Westminster Avenue S.
Montreal West, Quebec H4X 1Y6
Canada

Dr. Roger Giroux
Technical Adviser
Chief Seattle Foundation
39 Westminster Avenue S.
Montreal West, Quebec H4X 1Y6
Canada

Dr. René Riel
Technical Adviser
Chief Seattle Foundation
60 Therien
Hull, Quebec, J8Y 1J1
Canada

Mr. Dale A. Tulloch
Vice-President
National Dairy Council of Canada
704-141 Laurier Avenue W.
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5J3
Canada

Mr. Robert de Valk
General Manager
Further Poultry Processors
Assoc. of Canada
2319-500 St. Laurent Blvd.
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 4K6
Canada

Mrs. Erina de Valk
Consultant
De Valk Consulting Inc.
2319-500 St. Laurent Blvd.
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 4K6, Canada

Mr. C.S. Sheppard
1750 Dorset Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada

Mr. G. Busque
Directeur de l'Inspection
des produits laitiers
Ministère de l'Agriculture,
des Pecheries et de
l'Alimentation du Québec
200 A Chemin Ste-Foy
Québec (Québec) G1R 4X6
Canada

Mr. Gil Barrows
External Affairs
Tower C, 3rd Floor
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C9
Canada

Mr. Gary Dinan
Exec. Vice-President
Mammoth International
Humanitarian Societies
2236 Girouard
Montreal, Quebec H4A 3C3
Canada

Dr. J.N. Thompson
Bureau of Nutritional Sciences
Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
Canada

Dr. R. Knight
Director, Regulatory Compliance
Kraft General Foods Canada
95 Moatfield Drive
Don Mills, Ontario M3B 3L1
Canada

Mr. Frank Massong
Agriculture Canada
930 Carling Ave.
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C5
Canada

Dr. M. Sahasrabudhe
Food Research Institute
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C5
Canada

Dr. N. Tape
Food Research Institute
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C5
Canada

Ms. Elizabeth Harper
Technical Advisor and
Director Government Relations
Flavour Manufacturers
Association of Canada
24 Blackdown Crescent
Etobicoke Ontario M9B 5X6
Canada

Ms. Marion Zarkadas
Food Officer
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase I
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

Mrs. Sue Lee-Spiegelberg
Food Program Officer
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase I
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHÈCOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Mr. P. Jancik
Deputy Trade Commissioner
Trade Commission of the
Czechoslovakian Republic
1280 St. Marc Street
Montreal, Quebec
Canada

Mr. Juraj Kosmel
Scientific Attaché
Embassy of the Czechoslovakian
Republic
50 Rideau Terrace
Ottawa, Ontario, K1M 2A1
Canada

CUBA

Ms. Doris Hernandez Torres
Ingeniero Especialisto en
Normalización
Ministerio Industria Pesquera
Calle 158/esq 5ta Ave.
Barlovento Stafe Playa
C. Habana, Cuba

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

Anne Endahl
Head of Delegation
Head of Section
National Food Agency of Denmark
Morkhoj Bygade 19
DK 2860 Copenhagen
Denmark

Mrs. Karen Jensen
Head of Division
Danish Veterinary Service
Ministry of Agriculture
Howitzvej 13
DK 2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark

Mrs. Anne Busk-Jensen
Deputy Director
Federation of Danish Industries
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 18
DK 1790 Copenhagen V
Denmark

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

Mrs. Auli Suojanen
Senior Food Officer
National Food Administration
P.O. Box 5
00531 Helsinki
Finland

FRANCE
FRANCIA

Madame R. Amiel
Chef de délégation
Ministère de l'Economie des
Finances et du Budget
Carré Diderot
3-5 boulevard Diderot
75012 Paris
France

Dr. Philippe Pittet
Directeur
Service Législation Alimentaire
Nestlé France
17-19 Quai du Président
Paul Doumer
92414 Courbevoie
France

Mlle Darchy
Ministère de l'Agriculture
et de la Forêt
35 rue Saint-Dominique
75007 Paris
France

Mr. Philippe Mouton
Directeur Affaires Européennes
Pernod Ricard
Rue de Trèves, 45
1040-Bruxelles
Belgium

Mme. Catherine Vigreux
Scientific and Regulatory Affairs
BSN
7 rue de Teheran
75008 Paris, France

ISRAEL

Mr. Reuven Knobil
Secretary
Israel Codex Committee
Ministry of Industry and Trade
P.O. Box 299
Jerusalem
Israel

JAPAN
JAPON

Kazutoshi Amano
Technical Adviser
Japan Health Food Association
3-6, Hirakawacho 1-Chome,
Chiyoda-Ku
102 Tokyo, Japan

Hiromutsu Imada
Director Office of Health Policy
on Newly Developed Foods
Environmental Health Bureau
M.H.W. Japan
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
100-45 Tokyo, Japan

Shozo Onishi
Food Standards Specialist
Consumers Economy Division
Food and Marketing Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture,
Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
100 Tokyo, Japan

Ikuo Tsukamoto
Food Sanitation Division
Environmental Health Bureau
Ministry of Health & Welfare
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
100-45 Tokyo, Japan

Toru Takahashi
First Secretary
Embassy of Japan
255 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K2A 0L6
Canada

Shuhei Yoshida
Technical Adviser
Japan Health Food Association
3-6, Hirakawacho 1-chome
Chiyoda-Ku
102 Tokyo, Japan

KOREA
CORÉE
COREA

Mr. Young-Dong Kim
Senior Research Officer
Korea Food Research Institute
148-1 Dangsu, Banwol, Hwaseong
Kyonggi-do, 445-820
Suwon
Republic of Korea

MALAYSIA
MALAISIE
MALASIA

Miss Fauziah Arshad
Food Technologist
Food Quality Control Unit
Ministry of Health Malaysia
4th Floor, Block E
Offices complex
Jalan Dungun, Damansara Height
50490 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia

MYANMAR

Mr. Hla Pe Than
First Secretary
Embassy of the Union of Myanmar
Suite 902
85 Range Road
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 8J6
Canada

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

Dr. R.F. van der Heide
Head of Delegation
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Deputy Director Nutrition
and Product Safety Affairs
P.O. Box 5406
2280 HK Rijswijk (ZH)
The Netherlands

A.F. Onneweer
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature Management and Fisheries
Nutrition and Quality Affairs
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
The Netherlands

Mrs. I.M.F. Rentenaar
Advisor
General Commodity Board
for Arable Products
P.O. Box 29739
2502 LS The Hague
The Netherlands

G.H. Schipper
Advisor
Commission of the Dutch
Food and Agricultural Industry
Unilever
P.O. Box 760
3000 DK Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E. Veen
Advisor
Commission for the Dutch
Food and Agricultural Industry
P.O. Box 93093
2509 AB The Hague
The Netherlands

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

Ms. Judy Barker
Senior Food Technologist
Food Quality and Hygiene Unit
Department of Health
P.O. Box 5013
Wellington
New Zealand

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

Ms. Ragnhild Kjelkevik
Norwegian Food Control Authority
P.O. Box 8187 Dep.
N-0034 Oslo 1
Norway

Ms. Carla A.M. Botten-Verboven
National Institute
for Consumer Research
P.O. Box 173
N-1324 Lysaker
Oslo, Norway

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

Fernando Lumbreras Azanza
Jefe de Delegación
Consejero Técnico
Ministerio Economía y Hacienda
Castellana 162
Madrid, Spain

D. José Luis Gomez Lopez
Funcionario del Ministerio
de Asuntos Exteriores
Consejero Tecnico
Secretaría de Estado (CEE)
C/Maria de Molina 39
28071 Madrid
Spain

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

Mrs. Eva Lonberg
Head of Delegation
National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Mrs. Birgitta Lund
Advisor
National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala
Sweden

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

Mr. P. Rossier
Head of Codex Section
Federal Office of Public
Health
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3000 Berne 14
Switzerland

Dr. M. Imfeld
Regulatory Affairs
Hoffman La Roche AG
CH-4002 Basel
Switzerland

Mr. U. Noehle
Nestec Limited
Avenue Nestlé 55
CH-1800 Vevey
Switzerland

TURKEY
TURQUIE
TURQUIA

Ahmet Olmez
Directeur de Section
du Contrôle Alimentaire
Direction générale
de Soins de Santé de Base
Ministère de la Santé
Saglik Bakanligi Sihhiye
Ankara
Turkey

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

Mr. C.A. Cockbill
Head of Consumer Protection Division
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries & Food
Ergon House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
England

Dr. D.H. Buss
Head of Nutrition Branch
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries & Food
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
England

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

Mr. L. Robert Lake
Director
Office of Compliance (HFF 300)
The Center for Food Safety and
Applied Nutrition
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204, U.S.A.

Mr. C. Ronald Brewington
Chief
Labelling Policy & Approval Branch
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Cotton Annex Building - Room 204
300 - 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20250
U.S.A.

Mr. Raymond W. Gill
Deputy Director
Office of Compliance
The Center for Food Safety and
Applied Nutrition
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204
U.S.A.

Dr. John E. Vanderveen
Director
Division of Nutrition (HFF 260)
Office of Nutrition and Food Science
The Center for Food Safety and
Applied Nutrition
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204
U.S.A.

Dr. Allen Matthys
Director
Regulatory Affairs
National Food Processors Association
1401 New York Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
U.S.A.

Ms. Gloria Brooks-Ray
Director
Regulatory Affairs and Nutritional
Sciences
CPC International Inc.
International Plaza
P.O. Box 8000
Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632
U.S.A.

Ms. Carol Fletcher
Staff Nutritionist
Grocery Manufacturers of America
1010 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20007
U.S.A.

Ms. Ellen Thomas
Manager
Regulatory Affairs
Kraft General Foods
801 Waukegan Road
Glenview, Ill 60025
U.S.A.

Ms. Margaret A. Wilson
Manager
Regulatory Affairs
McCormick & Co., Inc.
204 Wight Avenue
Hunt Valley, Md. 21031 U.S.A.

Mr. Bruce Silverglade
Legal Director
Center for Science in the
Public Interest
1875 Connecticut Avenue N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20009
U.S.A.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

Confederation of the Food and Drink Industries of the EEC
Conféderation des industries Agro-alimentaires de la CEE
(C.I.A.A.)

Dr. M. Horst
Observer
CIAA
74 rue de la Loi
1040 Brussels
Belgium

European Economic Community
(EEC)
Communauté économique européenne
Comunidad Economica Europea

Mr. L. Gonzalez-Vaque
Administrador Principal
CEE - Comision
200 rue de la Loi
1040 Brussels
Belgium

Mr. Bent Mejborn
Administrator
Council Secretariat of the
European Communities
170 rue de la Loi
B-1048 Bruxelles
Belgium

International Dairy Federation (IDF)
Fédération Internationale de Laiterie (FIL)

Mr. G. Busque
Directeur de l'Inspection des produits laitiers
Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pecheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec
200 A Chemin Ste-Foy
Québec (Québec) G1R 4X6
Canada

Mr. Philippe Pittet
Chairman of the IDF Labelling Group
Nestlé France
17-19 Quai du Président Paul Doumer
92411 Courbevoie
France

Mr. Dale A. Tulloch
Vice President
National Dairy Council of Canada
704 - 141 Laurier Ave. W.
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5J3
Canada

International Organization of Consumer Unions (IOCU)

Dr. Mike Rayner
Coronary Prevention Group
102 Gloucester Place
London W1H 3DA
England

International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI)

Mr. R.J. Ohlson
ILSI
1126-16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
U.S.A.

Joint FAO/WHO Secretariat

Mr. D. Byron
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
00100 Rome
Italy

Dr. E. Casadei
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
00100 Rome
Italy

Canadian Secretariat

Mr. R.B. Burke
Head, International and Interagency Liaison
Food Regulatory Affairs Division, Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch
Health & Welfare Canada
Room 200, HPB Bldg.
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
Canada

Mr. Ian B. Campbell
Head, Food Program Section
Consumer Products Branch
Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Place du Portage, Phase 1
50 Victoria Street
Hull, Quebec K1A 0C9
Canada

Ms. Christina Zehaluk
Scientific Evaluator
Health & Welfare Canada
Bureau of Nutritional Sciences
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
Canada

ALINORM 91/22
APPENDIX II

DRAFT REVISION OF THE CODEX GENERAL GUIDELINES ON CLAIMS
(at Step 8)

1. SCOPE AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1.1 These guidelines relate to claims made for a food irrespective of whether or not the food is covered by an individual Codex Standard.

1.2 The principle on which the guidelines are based is that no food should 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.

1.3 The person marketing the food should be able to justify the claims made.

2. DEFINITION

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

3. PROHIBITED CLAIMS

The following claims should be prohibited:

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

3.2 Claims implying that a balanced diet of ordinary foods cannot supply adequate amounts of all nutrients.

3.3 Claims which cannot be substantiated.

3.4 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 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 follow the principles set forth in these guidelines.

or,

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

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

4. POTENTIALLY MISLEADING CLAIMS

The following are examples of claims which may be misleading:

4.1 Meaningless claims including incomplete comparatives and superlatives.

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

5. CONDITIONAL CLAIMS

5.1 The following claims should be permitted subject to the particular condition attached to each:

(i) 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 according to the Codex General Principles for the Addition of Essential Nutrients to Foods. This kind of indication should be subject to legislation by the appropriate authorities.

(ii) An indication that the food has special nutritional qualities by the reduction or omission of a nutrient should be on the basis of nutritional considerations and subject to legislation by the appropriate authorities.

(iii) Terms such as "natural", "pure", "fresh", "home made", "organically grown" and "biologically grown" when they are used, should 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 3.

(iv) Religious or Ritual Preparation (e.g. Halal, Kosher) of a food may be claimed provided that the food conforms to the requirements of the appropriate religious or ritual authorities.

(v) Claims that a food has special characteristics when all such foods have the same characteristics, if this fact is apparent in the claim.

(vi) Claims which highlight the absence or non-addition of particular substances to food may be used provided that they are not misleading and provided that the substance:

(a) is not subject to specific requirements in any Codex Standard or Guideline;

(b) is one which consumers would normally expect to find in the food;

(c) has not been substituted by another giving the food equivalent characteristics unless the nature of the substitution is clearly stated with equal prominence; and

(d) is one whose presence or addition is permitted in the food.

(vii) Claims which highlight the absence or non-addition of one or more nutrients should be regarded as nutrition claims and therefore should invoke mandatory nutrient declaration in accordance with the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling.

IRRADIATED FOODS

(Proposed Amendment to Section 5.2.1 of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods, at Step 8)

5.2 Irradiated Foods

5.2.1. The label of a food which has been treated with ionizing radiation shall carry a written statement indicating that treatment in close proximity to the name of the food. The use of the international food irradiation symbol, as shown below, is optional, but when it is used, it shall be in close proximity to the name of the food.

ALINORM 91/22
APPENDIX IV

CLASS TITLES FOR FOOD ADDITIVES

(Proposed Draft Amendment to Section 4.2.2.3[1] of the General Standard for Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods, at Step 8)

CLASS TITLES

Acidity Regulator
Acids
Anticaking Agent
Antifoaming Agent
Antioxidant
Bulking Agent
Colour
Colour Retention Agent
Emulsifier
Emulsifying Salt
Firming Agent
Flour Treatment Agent
Flavour Enhancer
Foaming Agent
Gelling Agent
Glazing Agent
Humectant
Preservative
Propellant
Raising Agent
Stabilizer
Sweetener
Thickener

---

[1] The General Standard in Section 4.2.2.4 also states:

The following class titles may be used for food additives falling in the respective classes and appearing in lists of food additives permitted generally for use in foods:

Flavour(s) and Flavouring(s)
Modified Starch(es)

The expression "flavours" may be qualified by "natural", "nature identical", "artificial" or a combination of these words as appropriate.

ALINORM 91/22
APPENDIX V

PROPOSED DRAFT NUTRIENT REFERENCE VALUES FOR FOOD LABELLING PURPOSES[1]

(Proposal for amendment to Section 3.3.4 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling, at Step 5)

3.3.4 Numerical information on vitamins and minerals should be expressed in metric units and/or as a percentage of the Nutrient Reference Value per 100 g or per 100 ml or per package if the package contains only a single portion. In addition, this information may be given per serving as quantified on the label or per portion provided that the number of portions contained in the package is stated.

In addition, information on protein may also be expressed as percentages of the Nutrient Reference Value.

The following Nutrient Reference Values should be used for labelling purposes in the interests of international standardization and harmonization:

Protein	(g)	50
Vitamin A	(μg)	800[2] (retinol equivalents)
Vitamin D	(μg)	5[3]
Vitamin C	(mg)	60
Thiamine	(mg)	1.4
Riboflavin	(mg)	1.6
Niacin	(mg)	18[3]
Vitamin B_6	(mg)	2
Folic acid	(μg)	200
Vitamin B_{12}	(μg)	1
Calcium	(mg)	800
Magnesium	(mg)	300
Iron	(mg)	14
Zinc	(mg)	15
Iodine	(μg)	150[3]
Copper	Value to be established	
Selenium	Value to be established	

---

[1] In order to take into account future scientific developments, future FAO/WHO and other expert recommendations and other relevant information, the list of nutrients and the list nutrient reference values should be kept under review.

[2] Proposed addition to Section 3.2.7 (Calculation of Nutrients) of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling: "For the declaration of ß-carotene (provitamin A) the following conversion factor should be used: 1 μg retinol = 6 μg ß-carotene

[3] Nutrient Reference Values for Vitamin D, Niacin and Iodine may not be applicable for countries where national nutrition policies or local conditions provide sufficient allowance to ensure that individual requirements are satisfied. See also section 3.2.4.1 of the Codex Guidelines on Nutrition Labelling.

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON METHODOLOGY FOR USE IN THE CODEX GUIDELINES ON NUTRITION LABELLING

1. The meeting of the Working Group was attended by representatives of Canada, Denmark, Malaysia, the United States, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Dr. J.N. Thompson (Canada) acted as Chairman.

2. The Working Group met to review the precision of some of the recommended methods of analysis (ALINORM 87/22, Appendix III) and to discuss future activities.

3. The Group also undertook a preliminary examination of the review of "Precision Parameters of Methods of Analysis Required for Nutrition Labelling. Part I - Major Nutrients" by W. Horwitz *et al.*, published in the Journal of Official Association Analytical Chemists 73, 661-680, 1990 (see Conference Room Document 1 - Agenda Item 11). Reproducibility of the determination of protein nitrogen (Kjeldahl) was fully satisfactory. Although larger variations were observed in measurements of total fat, moisture, fibre and ash, the results appeared to be adequate for the calculation of energy and carbohydrate levels.

   Variations in the measurement of dietary fibre were high and it was suggested that the precision of label values should be limited accordingly. Few data were available for the assessment of methods for the direct determination of individual carbohydrates.

4. The Working Group took note of the warning in the review that analytical results will be inconsistent if laboratories neglect to undertake programs of quality assurance or fail to adhere closely to directions.

5. The Working Group believes that it should continue to encourage evaluation of methods. It also recommended improved support of collaborative tests. Preliminary reviews confirmed the need to accelerate the validation of methods that might be used to prevent or resolve disputes during the evaluation of nutritional labelling. Although accuracy is important in such methods, at least equal emphasis must be placed on reproducibility.

6. The Working Group proposed better communication with other Codex committees concerned with nutrients analysis. The Group will examine methods already collated for CODEX and will discuss its activities with representatives of CCMAS and the CCNFSDU.