

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 4.10

CX/CAC 23/46/12 Add. 1
October 2023
Original Language Only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Forty-sixth Session

COMMENTS ON DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS SUBMITTED
BY THE 47TH CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING¹

BACKGROUND

1. This document compiles the comments on the draft standards submitted at Step 5 of the Procedure. The comments are as shown in Appendices I, II and III.
2. OCS is an online tool that enables Codex Contact Points to submit comments on draft texts in a standardised way, thus providing more transparency and better management of comments on different Codex texts as requested through Circular Letters. Since its launching at CAC39 (2016), the OCS has been used for different Codex Committees.

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON APPENDICES I, II AND III

3. The comments received are presented in a table format, with two columns as follows:
 - **First column** – Presents the comments with the rationale.
 - **Second column** – Presents the provider of the comments (name of member or observer)

¹ This document compiles comments submitted through OCS, or via email by the time this document was issued, in reply to CL 2023/69/OCS-CAC, CL 2023/70/OCS-CAC and CL 2023/71/OCS-CAC

COMMENTS IN REPLY TO CL 2023/69/OCS-CAC - REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AT STEP 5 ON THE REVISION OF THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PRE-PACKAGED FOODS: PROVISIONS RELEVANT TO ALLERGEN LABELLING

Comments of Australia, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Guatemala, Kenya, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Association Of European Coeliac Societies Codex and Regulatory Affairs, ENCA, European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations, FIVS, Food Industry Asia, IDF/FIL, International Baby Food Action Network, International Special Dietary Food Industries, and World Public Health Nutrition Association.

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
Australia considers the proposed draft guidelines can be adopted at Step 5 noting the text, including text not in brackets, is open to be further developed through a CCFL electronic working group prior to CCFL48.	Australia
Cambodia supports for adoption at Step 5 of draft texts for the provisions relevant to allergen labeling of the general standard for labeling of Pre-packed Food.	Cambodia
Chile no tiene observaciones sobre el documento: "Anteproyecto de revisión de la norma general para el etiquetado de los alimentos preenvasados, pertinente para el etiquetado de alérgenos", por tanto, considera que está listo para avanzar a trámite 5.	Chile
Las disposiciones están listas para adopción. Teniendo en cuenta que, en el CCFL47, Colombia estuvo de acuerdo con que se avanzaran los trabajos de los GTE a trámite 5.	Colombia
Costa Rica supports its adoption at Step 5.	Costa Rica
Egypt appreciates the work done in the document & agrees that the guidelines are ready for adoption at Step 5 .	Egypt
<p>4.2.1.5 Guatemala no está de acuerdo con incluir el apartado 4.2.1.5 por los siguientes motivos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puede dar lugar a inconsistencias en los enfoques de etiquetado en el comercio global; • Las diferencias en las interpretaciones podrían causar confusión entre los consumidores; Incluir los alérgenos a nivel nacional en el texto del Codex no promueve la armonización a nivel internacional, contraviniendo uno de los principios del Codex de facilitar el comercio. <p>8.3.1 Los alimentos e ingredientes enumerados en las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5 se declararán de manera que contrasten claramente con el texto circundante [cuando sea posible], Guatemala, solicita que se elimine esta frase ("CUANDO SEA POSIBLE"), ya que debe quedar claro para el consumidor respecto a lo que está consumiendo.</p> <p>8.3.2 Guatemala apoya que se deje el 8.3.2 Cuando los ingredientes de las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5 se declaren en la lista de ingredientes, también podrán declararse en una declaración separada, que se colocará cerca y en el mismo campo visual que la lista de ingredientes.</p> <p>8.3.2.1 Guatemala de acuerdo con 8.3.2.1 La declaración comenzará con el término "Contiene" (o un término equivalente) y deberá declarar todos los alimentos e ingredientes declarados en la lista de ingredientes como aplicables de conformidad con la Sección 8.3.1].</p> <p>8.3.3 Guatemala hace la siguiente corrección en el texto en español. Cuando un alimento esté exento de la declaración de ser declarado una lista de ingredientes, se declararán los alimentos e ingredientes enumerados en las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5, como en una declaración realizada de conformidad con la Sección 8.3.2.1.</p>	Guatemala

<p>8.3.4 En el caso de los alimentos de un solo ingrediente, la Sección 8.3.3 no se aplicará cuando los alimentos e ingredientes enumerados en las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5 se declaren como parte de la denominación del alimento o junto con ella</p>	
<p>Kenya supports the adoption at step 5 (Appendix II) of the proposed draft revision to General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods: provisions relevant to allergen labelling by CAC46.</p>	<p>Kenya</p>
<p>New Zealand supports advancement of the revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods: provisions relevant to allergen labelling to Step 5.</p> <p>New Zealand considers significant agreement was reached on much of this text at CCFL47 and strongly supports ongoing work focussing on the text remaining in square brackets at 4.2.1.6, 4.2.1.7 8.3.2 and 8.3.2.1. We discourage any relitigating of text agreed at CCFL47 as much of the agreed text was the result of long and considered discussion and often a degree of compromise to reach agreement. We do note however, there was little time for discussion of section 8.3 at either the working group immediately prior to CCFL47 or at the meeting itself and would therefore be open to the EWG discussion the whole of section 8.3.</p>	<p>New Zealand</p>
<p>Paraguay esta de acuerdo en la adopción en trámite 5 del documento ANTEPROYECTO DE REVISIÓN DE LA NORMA GENERAL PARA EL ETIQUETADO DE LOS ALIMENTOS PREENVASADOS (CXS 1-1985) PERTINENTE PARA EL ETIQUETADO DE ALÉRGENOS.</p>	<p>Paraguay</p>
<p>Párrafo 4.2.1.4. Dice: pacana. Debería decir: pecana. Párrafo 4.2.1.4. Dice: sésamo. Debería decir: sésamo (ajonjolí) editorial. Comentario: Incorporar el término equivalente ajonjolí. Párrafo 4.2.1.5. Dice: soy. Debería decir: soya Párrafo 4.2.1.5 Dice: lupino" ('altramuz') . Debería decir: "lupino" ('altramuz', "tarwi") editorial. Comentario: Incorporar el término equivalente tarwi Párrafo 4.2.1.6 Dice: [A reserva de una evaluación con arreglo a los criterios establecidos , las autoridades nacionales podrán eximir de declarar los ingredientes derivados de los alimentos enumerados en la Sección 4.2.1.4 y, de ser pertinente, en la Sección 4.2.1.5.] Debería decir: A reserva de una evaluación con arreglo a los criterios establecidos, las autoridades nacionales podrán eximir de declarar los ingredientes derivados de los alimentos enumerados en la Sección 4.2.1.4 y, de ser pertinente, en la Sección 4.2.1.5. Párrafo 4.2.1.4 y 4.2.1.5 Dice: "(...) y sus productos. Debería decir: "(...) y productos derivados. Comentario: Se solicita que se precise la diferencia entre estos términos. Párrafo 4.2.1.7 Dice: "(...) en un alimento [listos para comer] [o productos reconstituidos según las instrucciones del fabricante]. Debería decir: en un alimento listos para comer o productos reconstituidos según las instrucciones del fabricante. Párrafo 4.2.1.7 Dice: "sulfito". Debería decir: "sulfito" o "sulfitos". editorial / técnico Los métodos de ensayo expresan los resultados de estos compuestos como "sulfitos" Párrafo 8.3.1 Dice: contrasten claramente con el texto circundante [cuando sea posible], por ejemplo, mediante . Debería decir: contrasten claramente con el texto circundante cuando sea posible, por ejemplo, mediante. Párrafo 8.3.2 Dice: Cuando los ingredientes de las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5 se declaren en la lista de ingredientes, también podrán declararse en una declaración separada, que se colocará cerca y en el mismo campo visual que la lista de ingredientes. Debería decir: Ter. Los alimentos e ingredientes enumerados en las secciones 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 y, cuando fuera pertinente, la 4.2.1.5 se declararán de manera que contrasten claramente con el texto circundante (por ejemplo, mediante el uso del tipo de letra, el estilo o el color) y/o declararse en una declaración</p>	<p>Peru</p>

<p>separada que comience con el término “contiene” (o un término equivalente) directamente debajo de la lista de ingredientes.]. Comentario: La comisión considera que el mejor texto para la sección 8.3.2 es el Ter.</p> <p>Párrafo 8.3.2.1 Dice: [La declaración comenzará con el término “Contiene” (o un término equivalente) y deberá declarar todos los alimentos e ingredientes declarados en la lista de ingredientes como aplicables de conformidad con la Sección 8.3.1]. Debería decir: La declaración comenzará con el término “Contiene” (o un término equivalente) y deberá declarar todos los alimentos e ingredientes declarados en la lista de ingredientes como aplicables de conformidad con la Sección 8.3.1.</p>	
<p>The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports the adoption of the provisions relevant to allergen labelling at step 5.</p>	<p>Saudi Arabia</p>
<p>Sierra Leone agrees with the revision and confirms that the provisions relevant to allergen labeling are ready for adoption</p>	<p>Sierra Leone</p>
<p>South Africa supports the adoption of the proposed draft revision to the general standard for the labelling of pre-packaged foods- provisions relevant to allergen labelling at step 5.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the considerable progress had been made at CCFL 47 and the committee had reached majority consensus that the text was ready to advance in the Step procedure. We are also of the opinion that the advancement of the document in the step procedure will allow further consideration of the outstanding texts in the draft document.</p> <p>Additional comment:</p> <p>SA supports the following proposed statement in Section 8.3.2: Foods and ingredients in sections 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.7 and where applicable 4.2.1.5 shall be declared in the list of ingredients or in a separate statement which shall be [placed directly under] the list of ingredients or in both. The most appropriate manner to declare these foods and ingredients shall be decided by national competent authorities.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be declared either in the ingredient list or in a separate statement directly under the ingredient statement or in both. • The allergen information should be provided in the easiest way for consumers to access the information. • It is easiest for consumers to identify allergens when the allergens are stated separately to the ingredient list. • The “appropriate manner to declare these foods and ingredients” gives national authorities the option of how to declare these foods i.e through the use of the word “contains and/or the use of font style, type or colour etc. 	<p>South Africa</p>
<p>At CCFL47 it was agreed that further consideration would be given to a separate section for oats in work going forward, given that its reason for inclusion on the list is due to risk management rather than risk assessment considerations. Therefore provision 4.2.1.5 should be in square brackets.</p>	<p>United Kingdom</p>
<p>The United States supports interim adoption of the revisions to the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (GSLPF) at Step 5. While significant progress has been made by the committee and advancement to Step 5 recognizes that progress, the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL) must still find agreement on several aspects of allergen labelling, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how to manage oats which are not a gluten containing grain and when free from cross contact from gluten containing grains are a good source of whole grains for those with celiac disease. The committee needs to consider if specific labelling is needed and if so, how those foods should be labelled so as to best help consumers with celiac disease or if oats can be effectively managed via the Precautionary Allergen Labelling (PAL) framework CCFL is developing to deal with cross contact from allergenic foods. 	<p>United States of America</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how best to provide suitable flexibility for declaration of allergens as part of ingredient declaration while also providing flexibility when names used in ingredient declarations are not sufficient or in conflict with the basic nature of the ingredient. 	
<p>AOECS would like the Codex Committee on Food Labelling to consider that there are certain food ingredients or substances that should be exempt from allergen labelling which has not been taken into consideration in CXS 1-1985.</p> <p>In the EU, UK and further European countries there are certain food ingredients or substances that are exempt from allergen labelling as per Annex II of EU Regulation 1169/2011, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Wheat based glucose syrups including dextrose b. Wheat based maltodextrins c. Glucose syrups based on barley d. Cereals used for making alcoholic distillates including ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin <p>The reason for this exemption was based on the opinion of EFSA, that these ingredients or substances do not cause an adverse reaction in susceptible individuals.</p> <p>4.2.1.4 The footnote 2 need revision to state that it complies with CSX 118-1979 as explained before.</p> <p>SPECIFIED NAME</p> <p>In CXS 118-1979, para 2.1.1. "Gluten free foods", chapter b) defines: "consisting of one or more ingredients from wheat (i.e. all Triticum species, such as durum wheat, spelt, and khorasan wheat, which is also marketed under different trademarks such as KAMUT), rye, barley, oats or their crossbred varieties, which have been specially processed to remove gluten, and the gluten level does not exceed 20 mg/kg in total, based on the food as sold or distributed to the consumer".</p> <p>Therefore, we cannot agree to the "specified name" of 'wheat', 'rye' and 'barley' because it will create a lot of confusion in gluten intolerant consumers when gluten-free ingredients e.g. gluten-free wheat starch are requested to be labelled as 'wheat'.</p> <p>AOECS supports the comments that were made by other delegates that 'gluten' should be included under the specified name column for cereals containing gluten and its use should be mandatory, e.g. 'wheat/gluten' etc. People with coeliac disease are affected by exposure to gluten which is the protein found in cereals containing gluten, therefore it would be appropriate to alert coeliac consumers to the fact that gluten is present in these foods.</p> <p>Therefore, we think it is too early to adopt these texts at Step 5 and AOECS requests a revision.</p> <p>2. Definition of Terms "Coeliac disease"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of CD does not reflect recent research: CD is not only an intestinal disease, it is a multifactorial systemic autoimmune disease. • According to Codex procedures, Codex standards should not have different texts of the same subject, the description of gluten proteins should comply with CSX 118-1979. <p>Therefore, the text should read: "Coeliac disease" means a chronic multifactorial systemic autoimmune disease in genetically predisposed individuals induced by exposure to dietary gluten</p>	<p>Association Of European Coeliac Societies Codex and Regulatory Affairs</p>

<p>proteins that come wheat (i.e. all Triticum species, such as durum wheat, spelt, and khorasan wheat, which is also marketed under different trademarks such as KAMUT), rye, barley or their crossbred varieties.</p>	
<p>ENCA agrees that the Proposed Draft Revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CXS belling 1-1985): Provisions Relevant to Allergen Labelling is ready for adoption at Step 5</p>	<p>ENCA</p>
<p>EFA strongly encourages Codex to consider adapting the proposed provisions in line with the comments below, before proceeding to adoption:</p> <p>4.2 List of ingredients 4.2.1.3 While EFA acknowledges that the rule of 5% is not directly connected to allergen labelling, we see a conflict with regards to potential "new allergens" (see Codex Watchlist), that might not always be identified and therefore not reported appropriately, if the 5% rule remains as it is.</p> <p>4.2.1.4 EFA reminds that gluten-containing cereals are relevant to two different allergic diseases: coeliac disease as well as IgE-mediated food allergies. Both consumer groups need specific information, which should be included in the labelling. This means, that both the specific gluten containing cereal as well as the presence of gluten must be labelled. Therefore, EFA suggests to add 'gluten' as 'specified name' below 'wheat', 'rye' and 'barley'. As an example, when a product of a triticum species is used as ingredient, such as speltflour, the ingredient list should read: "... speltflour (wheat/gluten) ..."</p> <p>8.3 Declaration of certain foods and ingredients 8.3.1 EFA suggests to remove "whenever possible" from this paragraph, as any flexibility of this type in the ingredient list can be confusing from the perspective of consumers with food allergy.</p> <p>8.3.2 EFA agrees with the updated provision that separate statements shall be placed directly under the list of ingredients, yet reminds that this should apply to all types of allergen information, including PAL and other aspects e.g. 4.2.2 related to this safety assessment.</p>	<p>European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations</p>
<p>FIVS welcomes the opportunity to comment on the work conducted by Codex on the revision of the GSLPF.</p> <p>By way of background, FIVS is a global trade federation for the alcohol beverage industry since 1951. We are committed to providing a venue and developing tools to encourage social, environmental, and economic sustainability among our members and the wider sector, in keeping with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Our membership includes producers, importers, exporters, and trade associations (currently accounting for 75% of the wine traded globally). We also welcome and collaborate effectively with affiliates from allied industries.</p> <p>FIVS supports the adoption of the provisions relevant to allergen labelling, provided that article 4.2.4.2 is clarified as suggested:</p> <p>Article 4.2.4.2 should explicitly cross reference article 4.2.1.6 in order to clarify the existence of national exemptions granted under the above-mentioned article that would apply to carry-over additives and processing aids.</p>	<p>FIVS</p>
<p>FIA supports the adoption of the proposed draft revision.</p>	<p>Food Industry Asia</p>
<p>The International Dairy Federation (IDF) does not support moving these provisions to step 5 because of some concerns in relation to a secondary allergen list in 4.2.1.5. If this secondary allergen list in section 4.2.1.5 is to be retained in the standard, it needs to be made clear that it is not an exhaustive list. Additionally, before countries can require the declaration of allergens in</p>	<p>IDF/FIL</p>

<p>section 4.2.1.5, a robust risk assessment should be required for the specific population based on the same principles as used by the FAO/WHO expert group.</p>	
<p>IBFAN Comment PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE GENERAL STANDARD FOR THE LABELLING OF PRE-PACKAGED FOODS (CXS 1-1985): PROVISIONS RELEVANT TO ALLERGEN LABELLING (FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5)</p> <p>IBFAN agrees that the Proposed Draft Revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CXS belling 1-1985): Provisions Relevant to Allergen Labelling is ready for adoption at Step 5.</p>	<p>International Baby Food Action Network</p>
<p>ISDI welcomes the revision of the General Standard on Labelling of Pre-packaged Food (GSLPF) that integrates revised provisions on Allergen labelling and addresses the precautionary allergen labelling at step 5. ISDI thanks Australia, Chair, and United Kingdom and the United States of America, co-chairs, to lead this work.</p> <p>ISDI welcomes the progress made so far and support continuation of the work that should allow to overcome outstanding concerns especially around section 4.2.1.5.</p>	<p>International Special Dietary Food Industries</p>
<p>WPHNA agrees that the Proposed Draft Revision of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CXS belling 1-1985): Provisions Relevant to Allergen Labelling is ready for adoption at Step 5.</p>	<p>World Public Health Nutrition Association</p>

COMMENTS IN REPLY TO CL 2023/70/OCS-CAC - REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AT STEP 5 ON THE GUIDELINES ON THE PROVISION OF FOOD INFORMATION FOR PRE-PACKAGED FOODS TO BE OFFERED VIA E-COMMERCE

Comments of Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Kenya, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, USA, ENCA, European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations, FIVS, Food Industry Asia, IDF/FIL, International Baby Food Action Network, and International Special Dietary Food Industries.

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
Australia considers the proposed draft guidelines can be adopted at Step 5 noting the text, including text not in brackets, is open to be further developed through a CCFL electronic working group prior to CCFL48.	Australia
Brazil supports adoption of the proposed Draft Guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods to be offered via e-commerce at Step 5.	Brazil
<p>Chile esta de acuerdo con la adopción al tramite 5. Chile en futuros debates planteara las siguientes mejoras al documento.</p> <p>Chile examinó el documento y tiene las siguientes observaciones en relación al texto:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Por "duración mínima" se entiende el período (por ejemplo, en horas, días, meses, etc.) entre el punto de entrega y la fecha de consumo preferente o de caducidad, según corresponda.] - [Se recomienda indicar la [duración mínima]/[fecha de caducidad/fecha de consumo preferente/fecha de consumo preferente/fecha de caducidad] de los alimentos preenvasados.] - [5.3 Una autoridad competente podrá exigir que la exención de etiquetado de las unidades pequeñas descrita en la Sección 6 de la NGEAP (CXS 1-1985) se aplique en un contexto de comercio electrónico dentro de sus fronteras nacionales.] <p>Chile mantiene su postura, la cual, considera necesario eliminar tanto el período mínimo de durabilidad como el de exención de unidades pequeñas. Principalmente, ya que es muy difícil gestionar la durabilidad mínima con demasiados operadores de alimentos involucrados en la transacción de comercio electrónico, especialmente puede no ser aplicable a alimentos perecederos con vida útil corta y causar desperdicio de alimentos. Por otra parte, creemos que no se requiere la exención de unidades pequeñas, ya que no debe haber limitación de espacio para mostrar toda la información de los alimentos en los dispositivos electrónicos en circunstancias de comercio electrónico.</p> <p>Conceptualmente estamos de acuerdo en que la autoridad competente exija la información adicional que determine necesarias, sin embargo, el 5.3 parece ser una redundancia con el punto 5.1, ya que este último, contiene una referencia a la información alimentaria requerida por la legislación nacional, por lo que 5.3 es una duplicación. Por lo tanto, creemos que no es necesaria la adición de la sección 5.3 como está redactado.</p> <p>No obstante, lo anterior, Chile propone el siguiente texto en reemplazo de la sección 5.3:</p> <p>“[Una autoridad competente podrá exigir que, en la página electrónica de información sobre el producto, se indique que el producto debe llegar antes de la fecha de expiración, dentro de sus fronteras nacionales. Esta fecha será determinada por el productor.]”</p>	Chile

Las directrices están listas para adopción. Teniendo en cuenta que, en el CCFL47, Colombia estuvo de acuerdo con que se avanzaran los trabajos de los GTE a trámite 5	Colombia
Costa Rica supports its adoption at Step 5.	Costa Rica
Egypt appreciates the work done in the document & agrees that the guidelines are ready for adoption at Step 5.	Egypt
Kenya Supports the adoption of the Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Provision of Food Information for Prepackaged Foods to be Offered via E-Commerce by CAC46 at Step 5/8.	Kenya
<p>New Zealand supports advancement of the proposed draft guidelines on the provision of food information for prepackaged foods sold via e-commerce to Step 5.</p> <p>New Zealand considers significant agreement was reached on most of this text at CCFL47 and strongly supports the instructions of CCFL47 (report para101) that ongoing work by the EWG take into account the discussions at CCFL47 and focuses on the text remaining in square brackets namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of minimum durability • Reference to an indication of minimum durability in 5.1 • Text at 5.3 referencing requirements for foods in small packages • The newly proposed principle at 5.4 <p>In line with these clear instruction from CCFL47 we discourage any relitigating of text agreed at CCFL47 as much of the agreed text was the result of long and considered discussion and often a degree of compromise to reach agreement. We also encourage the EWG to take into account the significant progress made by the informal working group held in the margins of CCFL47 on the text remaining in square brackets.</p>	New Zealand
Paraguay esta de acuerdo en la adopción en el trámite 5 del documento ANTEPROYECTO DE DIRECTRICES SOBRE EL SUMINISTRO DE INFORMACIÓN ALIMENTARIA PARA ALIMENTOS PREENVASADOS OFRECIDOS A TRAVÉS DEL COMERCIO ELECTRÓNICO.	Paraguay
<p>Sección 1.1. Dice: La finalidad de estas Directrices es garantizar que los consumidores que compran alimentos preenvasados a través del comercio electrónico tengan la información necesaria para tomar decisiones informadas similar a la que encontrarían en la etiqueta física del alimento. [También tiene como objetivo proporcionar disposiciones adicionales que deben utilizarse específicamente cuando los alimentos se ofrecen a la venta a través del comercio electrónico, como se describe en la Sección 5, para abordar las complejidades específicas de las páginas electrónicas de información del producto.] . Debería decir: 1.1 La finalidad de estas Directrices es garantizar que los consumidores que compran alimentos preenvasados a través del comercio electrónico tengan la información necesaria para tomar decisiones informadas similar a la que encontrarían en la etiqueta física del alimento. También tiene como objetivo proporcionar disposiciones adicionales que deben utilizarse específicamente cuando los alimentos se ofrecen a la venta a través del comercio electrónico, como se describe en la Sección 5, para abordar las complejidades específicas de las páginas electrónicas de información del producto. Comentario: La comisión considera pertinente la inclusión del párrafo sobre disposiciones adicionales referentes al comercio electrónico.</p> <p>Sección 3. Dice: ["Duración mínima": Período (por ejemplo, en horas, días, meses, etc.) entre el punto de entrega y la fecha de consumo preferente o de caducidad, según corresponda.] Comentario: La comisión considera que</p>	Peru

<p>este término debería de tener un mayor debate en la siguiente reunión del CCFL para su inclusión en el anteproyecto.</p> <p>Sección 5.1. Dice: Sección 4 y Sección 5 de la NGEAP (CXS 1-1985) excepto la información requerida por lo estipulado en las secciones 4.6 y 4.7.1; [Se recomienda indicar la [duración mínima]/[fecha de caducidad/fecha de consumo preferente/fecha de consumo preferente/fecha de caducidad] de los alimentos preenvasados.]. Comentario: La comisión considera que este término “duración mínima” debería de tener un mayor debate en la siguiente reunión del CCFL para su inclusión en el anteproyecto</p> <p>Sección 5.3. Dice: [Una autoridad competente podrá exigir que la exención de etiquetado de las unidades pequeñas descrita en la Sección 6 de la NGEAP (CXS 1-1985) se aplique en un contexto de comercio electrónico dentro de sus fronteras nacionales.] [Se anima a los operadores de empresas de alimentos a facilitar información adicional que, de otro modo, estaría exenta en el caso de los envases pequeños.] Debería decir: Una autoridad competente podrá exigir que la exención de etiquetado de las unidades pequeñas descrita en la Sección 6 de la NGEAP (CXS 1-1985) se aplique en un contexto de comercio electrónico dentro de sus fronteras nacionales.] Se anima a los operadores de empresas de alimentos a facilitar información adicional que, de otro modo, estaría exenta en el caso de los envases pequeños. Comentario: La comisión considera pertinente la inclusión del subcapítulo 5.3</p> <p>Sección 5.4 Dice: [La información sobre los alimentos preenvasados ofrecidos para la venta en el comercio electrónico se proporcionará sin ningún costo para el consumidor.] Debería decir: La información sobre los alimentos preenvasados ofrecidos para la venta en el comercio electrónico se proporcionará sin ningún costo para el consumidor. Comentario: La comisión considera pertinente la inclusión del subcapítulo 5.4</p>	
<p>The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports the adoption of the guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods offered via e-commerce at step 5.</p>	<p>Saudi Arabia</p>
<p>Sierra Leone thinks the guide line is ready for adoption.</p>	<p>Sierra Leone</p>
<p>South Africa Position:</p> <p>South Africa supports the adoption of the proposed draft guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods offered via E-commerce at Step 5, with the provisor that the term “minimum durability” is removed.</p> <p>Rationale: South Africa is of the opinion that the term “minimum durability” should be removed in line with the amendment made to the GSLPF (CXS 1-1985) at the CAC 41 session and currently this term it is not defined anywhere in the Codex texts.</p> <p>Additional Comment: South Africa wishes to highlight that the definition of “minimum durability” is in reference to section 5.1 of the proposed draft guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods offered via E-commerce.</p> <p>We are also of the suggestion that e-commerce needs to be mindful of the date marking criteria as prescribed in the GSLPF (CXS 1-1985).</p> <p>Clarity is also sought on how to provide surety to the consumer that the products which have been purchased via e-commerce are still within the date marking requirements in the GSLPF.</p>	<p>South Africa</p>

<p>The United States acknowledges the progress made and supports interim adoption at Step 5.</p> <p>The United States remains concerned that the definition agreed to by the committee was based on a non-negotiated definition adopted by the World Trade Organization (WTO) working group for the purposes for the WTO work. The definition was not established with intention of being used for trade matters. Adoption of basically the same definition with minor amendments by Codex gives the definition trade status. The United States continues to have the view that a simpler and more concise definition would better serve Codex.</p> <p>The United States recalls that the 47th Session of the Codex Committee on CCFL47 was particularly divided with respect to two aspects of the guideline. The first was providing consumers with some indication of minimum durability date prior to reaching the best use by date. The United States continues to have the position that this should be optional due to the complexities of supply chains and already existing protections for consumers. The second is regarding if the small package exemption provided in the GSLPF should continue to apply in e-commerce where there is no space limitation on product information e-pages. The United States continues to have the position that the exemption should be maintained for e-commerce as it adds complexity to businesses who sell via e-commerce, especially small business owners who have limited resources. Not retaining the exemption creates a situation where consumers get different information when shopping in retail stores to that provided via e-commerce. The United States is of the view that the available information be harmonized.</p> <p>If the committee continues to feel strongly that the exemption not be continued in e-commerce the United States can support that view, however the CCFL should then amend the General Standard provision containing the small package exemption to require the information be provided via alternative means which could be technology.</p>	<p>United States of America</p>
<p>ENCA recommends the addition of the following safeguards before adoption at Step 5. The food information pre-packaged foods offered via e-commerce for foods for infants and young children must be in conformity with the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent WHA resolutions The standard should make Reference to the Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid Transactions (CXC 20-1979) in order to safeguard the marketing of foods for infants and young children. Labelling relating to foods for infants and young children should not lead consumers to commercial websites and other commercial and promotional information. No user data should be collected or tracked through electronic means.</p>	<p>ENCA</p>
<p>Should change to 'Proposed draft guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods offered via e-commerce'</p> <p>EFA strongly encourages Codex to consider adapting the proposed draft guidelines in line with the comments below, before proceeding to adoption:</p> <p>2. Scope EFA emphasises the importance that these guidelines also include provisions about procedural aspects e.g. who bears the cost of shipping back of food products for which the provided information was inaccurate or non-exhaustive.</p> <p>3. Definitions EFA invites Codex to reinstate the e-commerce definition adapted from WTO, with the addition of the "production" aspect. This is also to cover the e-commerce of non-pre-packaged products such as pizza, kebab, etc.</p> <p>5. Food information principles</p>	<p>European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations</p>

<p>EFA reiterates the need to set a requirement that e-page information include 'last review date', so that food retailers are obliged to state the last time they updated food information, including on potential allergens. This is key, given that recipe changes are common in some prepacked food products.</p> <p>5.1 Consumers with food allergy need to be aware of allergens both as ingredients (already covered by the GSLPF as mandatory information) and in case of unintended allergen presence such as Precautionary Allergen Labelling (PAL), which is under voluntary information (art.36 EU REG 1169/2011). In fact, EFA strongly calls for PAL statements to become mandatory, including compulsory education for Food Business Operators and other involved actors.</p> <p>5.3 EFA insists that the labelling exemption for small units should not apply to online commerce, given that electronic means (e.g. platforms, webpages etc) do not have the space limitations that physical packaging has. So it is important to remove this exemption, as applicable in an e-commerce context, in order to ensure that crucial information, such as the presence of allergens, is duly made available before the food purchase.</p> <p>7.2 EFA encourages to adopt a wording that offers more clarity on this provision: 'Information should be in a language or languages easily understood by consumers in the country in which the food is marketed and to which it may be delivered.'</p> <p>This is directly in line the EU law, which in many aspects represents a best practice in terms of food information to consumers.</p>	
<p>FIVS welcomes the opportunity to comment on the work conducted by Codex on the Guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods offered via e-commerce.</p> <p>By way of background, FIVS is a global trade federation for the alcohol beverage industry since 1951. We are committed to providing a venue and developing tools to encourage social, environmental, and economic sustainability among our members and the wider sector, in keeping with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Our membership includes producers, importers, exporters, and trade associations (currently accounting for 75% of the wine traded globally). We also welcome and collaborate effectively with affiliates from allied industries.</p> <p>FIVS supports the adoption of the guidelines.</p>	FIVS
<p>FIA supports the adoption of the proposed draft guidelines.</p>	Food Industry Asia
<p>IDF can support these Guidelines moving to Step 5 noting there is still text in square brackets for further discussion.</p>	IDF/FIL
<p>IBFAN Comment</p> <p>PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON THE PROVISION OF FOOD INFORMATION FOR PRE-PACKAGED FOODS OFFERED VIA E-COMMERCE (FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5)</p> <p>IBFAN recommends the addition of the following safeguards before adoption at Step 5.</p> <p>The food information pre-packaged foods offered via e-commerce for foods for infants and young children must be in conformity with the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent WHA resolutions,</p>	International Baby Food Action Network

<p>The standard should make Reference to the Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid, Transactions (CXC 20-1979) in order to safeguard the marketing of foods for infants and young children,</p> <p>Labelling relating to foods for infants and young children should not lead consumers to commercial websites and other commercial and promotional information,</p> <p>No user data should be collected or tracked through electronic means.</p>	
<p>ISDI welcomes the progress made on the revision of the Guidelines on the provision of food information for pre-packaged foods to be offered via e-commerce and supports the adoption at step 5 and continuation of the work. ISDI notes its concerns around the concept of minimum durability which still needs further discussion.</p> <p>ISDI thanks the United Kingdom, Chair, and Chile, Japan, India and China, co-chairs, for leading this work.</p>	<p>International Special Dietary Food Industries</p>

COMMENTS IN REPLY TO CL 2023/71/OCS-CAC - REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AT STEP 5 ON THE GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE FOOD INFORMATION

Comments of Australia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, El Salvador, Kenya, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, USA, ENCA, European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations, FIVS, Food Industry Asia, IDF/FIL, International Baby Food Action Network, International Special Dietary Food Industries and World Public Health Nutrition Association.

COMMENT	MEMBER / OBSERVER
Australia considers the proposed draft guidelines can be adopted at Step 5 noting the text, including text not in brackets, is open to be further developed through a CCFL electronic working group prior to CCFL48.	Australia
Brazil supports adoption of the proposed Draft Guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information at Step 5.	Brazil
<p>Chile apoya la adopción al tramite 5 Chile considerar para futuros debates los siguientes comentarios. Comentarios: Chile examinó el documento y tiene las siguientes observaciones en relación a los siguientes principios: 7.3[La información alimentaria descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología se presentará en un solo lugar, separadamente de otra información comercial destinada a fines de venta o comercialización]. Chile sugiere aclarar la intención del principio 7.3 para asegurar un entendimiento común. No queda del todo claro cómo esta información se presentará en una plataforma electrónica, que tan separadamente (¿Otro link?), con qué fin se realiza esta distinción, a que se refiere con información comercial destinada a fines de venta o comercialización? Desde nuestra perspectiva, la información comercial NO debe restringirse y/o separarse de otra información alimentaria en el paquete cuando se proporciona a través de la tecnología, ya que es un derecho instaurado en la Ley de Protección al Consumidor Chilena (Ley 19.496, Art N°3, letra b) información veraz y oportuna sobre los bienes y servicios, su precio, condiciones de contratación y otras características relevantes de los mismos, siendo esta información útil para el consumidor a fin de tomar una decisión informada en la compra. Por otra parte, las tecnologías disponibles actualmente pueden tener diferentes interfaces, la separación/restricción de información comercial requerirá modificaciones de tecnologías (Herramientas, aplicaciones, sitios, entre otros).</p> <p>7.5 Cuando la información alimentaria obligatoria se facilite utilizando tecnología, la referencia en la etiqueta o en el etiquetado debe vincularse directamente a esta información y la información alimentaria debe estar disponible durante toda la vida útil del alimento [como mínimo y no inferior a la fecha de consumo preferente o de caducidad]. [El enlace no incluirá publicidad relativa al alimento]. Chile considera que el texto en corchetes puede ser incluido como aclaración, pero no es necesario hacerlo, dado que el requisito es evidente por sí mismo (RSA).</p> <p>7.6 La información sobre los alimentos descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología debe ser fácilmente accesible para consumidores [y cumplir con las políticas de protección de datos de las organizaciones matrices] sin tener que proporcionar o divulgar información que se utilice para identificar a una persona.</p>	Chile

Chile considera pertinente agregar la información entre corchetes []. La posible necesidad de revelar información de identificación personal era lo que habían expresado anteriormente como preocupación otras delegaciones y observadores. Por lo tanto, sugerimos agregar, además, la palabra "ninguna" información que se utilice para identificar a una persona a este principio, como se indicó anteriormente en el CCFL47.

7.7 Cuando la etiqueta o el etiquetado de un alimento preenvasado haga referencia a información alimentaria a la que se puede acceder mediante tecnología, se deberá mostrar suficiente información en la plataforma tecnológica para permitir a los consumidores determinar que la información alimentaria pertenece a ese alimento preenvasado.

Chile considera que el texto propuesto es razonable. El consumidor debe ser capaz de identificar en la plataforma tecnológica el alimento preenvasado al que pertenece la información alimentaria. Sin embargo, consideramos que se podría a la vez, proporcionar un ejemplo o ejemplos de lo que podría considerarse información suficiente para mayor claridad.

7.8 Si la finalidad de la referencia en la etiqueta o en el etiquetado del alimento preenvasado no se explica por sí misma para los consumidores, debe ir acompañada de una explicación de cómo utilizarla o del tipo de información alimentaria que se encontrará cuando se utilice (por ejemplo, "escaneen aquí para obtener más información sobre los ingredientes").

Chile apoya la sección 7.8 ya que permite a los consumidores comprender cómo obtener información sobre alimentos, lo cual, es esencial para tomar decisiones saludables, seguras, sostenibles y económicas en relación con la alimentación. Ayuda a los consumidores a ser más conscientes y responsables en sus elecciones alimentarias, lo que tiene un impacto positivo en su salud y en el mundo que les rodea.

7.9 Las referencias y cualquier declaración explicativa, que figure en la etiqueta o en el etiquetado, que enlace con la información alimentaria a la que obtenga acceso por medio de la tecnología deben ajustarse a las secciones 8.1.2 y 8.1.3 de la Norma general para el etiquetado de los alimentos preenvasados (CXS 1-1985).

Chile apoya la sección 7.9, las declaraciones deben ser claras, destacadas y deberán indicarse con caracteres claros, bien visibles, indelebles y fáciles de leer por el consumidor en circunstancias normales de compra y uso, según las directrices del Codex sobre etiquetado de alimentos.

7.10 La información alimentaria descrita o presentada que utilizará tecnología será clara, destacada y fácilmente legible para el consumidor en entornos y condiciones normales de uso de la plataforma tecnológica.

Principio 7.10 y Principio 7.9, punto 8.1.2 indicaron la misma información. Por lo tanto, Chile Sugiere eliminar el Principio 7.10 para evitar la duplicación, porque el concepto propuesto ya se transmite en el punto anterior.

7.11 El idioma o idiomas de la información alimentaria descrita o presentada mediante tecnología deberán ser adecuados para el consumidor del país en el que se comercialice el alimento.]

Chile apoya la sección 7.11, toda vez que en nuestro país la Ley de Protección al Consumidor¹ (LPC) (Art N°32), menciona que la información básica comercial de los servicios y los productos de fabricación nacional y de procedencia extranjera, así como su identificación, instructivos de uso y garantías, y la difusión que de ellos se haga, deberá efectuarse en idioma castellano, en término comprensibles.

Las directrices están listas para adopción. Teniendo en cuenta que, en el CCFL47, Colombia estuvo de acuerdo con que se avanzaran los trabajos de los GTE a trámite 5	Colombia
Costa Rica supports its adoption at Step 5.	Costa Rica
Egypt appreciates the work done in the document & agrees that the Guidelines are ready for adoption at Step 5.	Egypt
El Salvador considera que el anteproyecto está listo para avanzar al trámite 5	El Salvador
Kenya has no reservations about the adoption of this standard at step 5, as Kenya actively participated in its development	Kenya
New Zealand supports advancement of the proposed draft guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information in food labelling to Step 5. New Zealand considers significant agreement was reached on much of this text at CCFL47 and strongly supports ongoing work focussing on the text remaining in square brackets namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new principle at 7.3 • The two sets of square brackets at 7.5 • The text added to 7.6 • All text at 7.7 – 7.11 New Zealand is happy to be co-chairing the EWG to progress this work.	New Zealand
Paraguay esta de acuerdo en adoptar en el trámite 5 el documento PROYECTO DE DIRECTRICES PROPUESTAS SOBRE EL USO DE LA TECNOLOGÍA PARA PROPORCIONAR INFORMACIÓN ALIMENTARIA.	Paraguay
<p>Párrafo 4: Dice: "Información alimentaria" es la información que es objeto de un texto del Codex sobre un alimento preenvasado. Debería decir: "Información alimentaria": Información sobre un alimento preenvasado que es objeto de un texto del Codex (Comentario: Si bien el concepto es equivalente, la comisión considera que la definición de "información alimentaria" debería ser igual, tanto en la carta circular 70 como en la carta circular 71)</p> <p>Párrafo 7.3. Dice: La información alimentaria descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología se presentará en un solo lugar, separadamente de otra información comercial destinada a fines de venta o comercialización. Debería decir: La información alimentaria descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología se presentará en un solo lugar, separadamente de otra información comercial destinada a fines de venta o comercialización.(Comentario: La comisión considera pertinente la inclusión del subcapítulo 7.3)</p> <p>Párrafo 7.5. Dice: Cuando la información alimentaria obligatoria se facilite utilizando tecnología, la referencia en la etiqueta o en el etiquetado debe vincularse directa Vida de almacén mente a esta información y la información alimentaria debe estar disponible la duración de la vida de almacén del alimento [como mínimo y no inferior a la fecha de consumo preferente o de caducidad]. [El enlace no incluirá publicidad relativa al alimento].Debería decir: Cuando la información alimentaria obligatoria se facilite utilizando tecnología, la referencia en la etiqueta o en el etiquetado debe vincularse directamente a esta información y la información alimentaria debe estar disponible durante la duración de la vida de almacén del alimento como mínimo y no inferior a la fecha de consumo preferente o de caducidad.(Comentario; La comisión considera que el enlace si debe proporcionar información sobre los claims de declaraciones nutricionales y saludables, además de información publicitaria del producto. Se incluye, además, un cambio editorial.</p> <p>Párrafo 7.6. Dice: "La información sobre los alimentos descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología debe ser fácilmente accesible para consumidores [y cumplir con las políticas de protección de datos de las organizaciones matrices] sin tener que proporcionar o divulgar información que se utilice para identificar a una persona". Debería decir: La información sobre los alimentos descrita o presentada utilizando tecnología debe ser fácilmente accesible para</p>	Peru

<p>consumidores y cumplir con las políticas de protección de datos de las organizaciones matrices, de acuerdo con la regulación de protección de datos de cada país. sin tener que proporcionar o divulgar información que se utilice para identificar a una persona. (Comentario: La comisión considera incluir: "de acuerdo con la regulación de protección de datos de cada país").</p> <p>Párrafo 7.7 al 7.11: Comentario: La comisión considera pertinente la inclusión de los subcapítulos 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.10 y 7.11.</p>	
<p>The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports the adoption of the guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information in food labelling at step 5.</p>	Saudi Arabia
<p>Sierra Leone supports the guide lines and think it is ready for adoption.</p>	Sierra Leone
<p>South Africa Position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Africa supports the adoption of the proposed draft guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information at step 5. <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are of the opinion that considerable progress had been made at the CCFL 47 and the committee agreed with most proposals, editorial changes and the decisions taken. We are also of the opinion that the advancement of the text in the step procedure will allow further consideration of the outstanding texts in the draft document and that the EWG will serve to confirm any outstanding issues. 	South Africa
<p>The United Kingdom thanks Canada for the opportunity to provide comment on the Circular Letter. As previously stated in our response to the Use of Technology draft paper, the parallels between this paper and the E-Commerce paper are greatly valued.</p> <p>The United Kingdom considers the proposed guidelines ready for adoption at Step 5, provided that consensus is reached with other Codex members/organisations. We thank you for the opportunity to offer comment on these guidelines and look forward to working with you on other Codex texts in the near future.</p>	United Kingdom
<p>Tanzania proposed the following for clarity of the proposed draft standard:</p> <p>7.3 To delete the words (in one place) in the square bracket</p> <p>7.5 To delete the first square bracket</p> <p>7.6 To retain the information in the square bracket</p> <p>Tanzania accepted to be adopted by CAC 46 after inclusion of proposed changes</p>	United Republic of Tanzania
<p>The United States supports interim adoption of the proposed Guidelines on the Use of Technology to Provide Food Information at Step 5.</p> <p>The United States notes there remains significant work to harmonize the divergent views of the committee. Particularly if and when technology might replace mandatory labelling elements. Recalling the U.S views on e-commerce and the small package exemption, technology could be used to provide consumers in the retail setting information that would not fit on packages.</p> <p>CCFL will need to consider if technology used for labelling will be restricted to non-mandatory elements which may impact the scope and nature of the guidelines.</p>	United States of America
<p>The Guidelines are not ready for adoption and must include the additional text.</p> <p>Para 1. The Purpose is to provide scientific, factual information to consumers.</p> <p>Para 5.2 Nutrition and health claims must not be permitted for foods for infants and young children. Health warnings about inappropriate and needless use, and safe preparation of the product must be communicated in any information using technology.</p> <p>7.10 Food information described or presented using technology shall be</p> <p>INSERT: truthful, clear</p> <p>Add the following New paras:</p>	ENCA

<p>7.12 The food information accessible via technology for foods for infants and young children must be in conformity with the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.13 Reference must be made to the Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid Transactions (CXC 20-1979) in order to safeguard the marketing of foods for infants and young children and ensure that all labelling conforms to the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent relevant WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.14 Electronic labelling relating to foods for infants and young children should not lead consumers to commercial websites and other commercial and promotional information.</p> <p>7.15 No user data should be collected or tracked through electronic means</p>	
<p>EFA strongly encourages Codex to consider adapting the proposed draft guidelines in line with the comments below, before proceeding to adoption:</p> <p>5. CONSIDERATIONS FOR DECIDING IF MANDATORY FOOD LABELLING INFORMATION COULD INSTEAD BE PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS USING TECHNOLOGY:</p> <p>EFA insists that any use of technology should be complementary to the physical (on-pack) labelling. As proposed now, the section title can be dangerously misleading. We suggest moving back to the previous title (Step 3): 'Principles for the use of technology in food labelling'.</p> <p>5.2. EFA suggests to move this provision at 5.1, setting the scene for section 5 already from the beginning, but also to go back to the more detailed definition of 'food information concerning health and safety' contained in the previous draft (Step 3), which specified that these refers to 'e.g. ingredients, allergens, expiration dates'.</p> <p>6. USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE CONSUMERS ACCESS TO MANDATORY FOOD INFORMATION THAT IS NOT ACCESSIBLE ON THE LABEL:</p> <p>EFA insists that, with regards to information concerning health and safety, such exemptions must not lead to the provision of information exclusively by digital means. Further clarification is still needed in this provision.</p>	<p>European Federation of Allergy and Airways Diseases Patients' Associations</p>
<p>FIVS welcomes the opportunity to comment on the work conducted by Codex on the Guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information. By way of background, FIVS is a global trade federation for the alcohol beverage industry since 1951. We are committed to providing a venue and developing tools to encourage social, environmental, and economic sustainability among our members and the wider sector, in keeping with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Our membership includes producers, importers, exporters, and trade associations (currently accounting for 75% of the wine traded globally). We also welcome and collaborate effectively with affiliates from allied industries. FIVS supports the adoption of the guidelines.</p>	<p>FIVS</p>
<p>FIA supports the adoption of the proposed draft guidelines.</p>	<p>Food Industry Asia</p>
<p>IDF questions the appropriateness of adopting the draft standard at Step 5 given that as per para 135(ii) of the CCFL47 report, "the whole document remains open" including text not in square brackets. We appreciate progress that has been in the draft standard in several areas of importance to the global dairy sector but stand ready to support additional effort to improve the standard, including in areas that are not captured in brackets.</p>	<p>IDF/FIL</p>
<p>IBFAN Comment: PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE FOOD INFORMATION IN FOOD LABELLING (FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5</p>	<p>International Baby Food Action Network</p>

<p>1. PURPOSE Provide guidance on the use of technology to provide scientific, factual information to consumers[1] about pre-packaged foods1.</p> <p>2. SCOPE These guidelines apply to food information that is accessed by consumers using technology via a reference on a pre-packaged food's label1 or labelling1.</p> <p>3. USE These guidelines should be read in conjunction with Codex texts related to labelling of pre-packaged foods, including but not limited to General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CXS 1-1985).</p> <p>4. DEFINITIONS For the purpose of these guidelines: "Food information" means the information that is the subject of a Codex text about a pre-packaged food. "Technology" refers to any electronic or digital means, including but not limited to websites, online platforms and mobile applications.</p> <p>5. CONSIDERATIONS FOR DECIDING IF MANDATORY FOOD LABELLING INFORMATION COULD INSTEAD BE PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS USING TECHNOLOGY IBFAN's position is that all mandatory food information must be present on both the label of the product and if technology is used to provide information about the product, this must include all mandatory information.</p> <p>5.1 The food information should be readily accessible to consumers during normal and customary circumstances of purchase and use, which means: (a) there should be sufficient technological infrastructure to support providing food information using that technology within the geographic area or country where the food is sold, such as in regards to prevalence and reliability of service, (b) the general population, or a sub-set of the population for whom the food information is intended, should have widespread and adequate access to the technology in that geographic area or country, and have adopted its use, and (c) it is reasonable for the consumer to use the technology to access the food information during the normal and customary circumstances of purchase and use and that there is evidence of similar consumer understanding of the technology.</p> <p>5.2 Name of the food and food information concerning health and safety should not be provided exclusively using technology. Nutrition and health claims must not be permitted for foods for infants and young children. Health warnings about inappropriate and needless use, and safe preparation of the product must be communicated in any information using technology.</p> <p>5.3 Food information that relates to an individual physical product (e.g. lot code, date marking) should not be provided only using technology if doing so would compromise the ability to relate the information to that individual product.</p> <p>6. USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE CONSUMERS ACCESS TO MANDATORY FOOD INFORMATION THAT IS NOT ACCESSIBLE ON THE LABEL</p> <p>6.1 In cases where food labelling information is not accessible to consumers, due to conditions of sale or to exemptions from having to be provided on the label or labelling, consideration should be given to the use of technology to provide consumers with access to that information.</p> <p>7. PRINCIPLES THAT ARE APPLICABLE WHEN FOOD INFORMATION IS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS USING TECHNOLOGY Food information that is accessed by consumers using technology via a reference on the pre-packaged food's label or labelling should be based on the following principles, whether the food information is required on a mandatory basis or provided voluntarily:</p> <p>7.1 The general principles in Section 3 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CXS 1-1985) are applicable to food information that is described or presented using technology.</p>	
---	--

<p>7.2 Food information described or presented using technology shall not conflict with information provided on the label or labelling of the pre-packaged food, including when shown in different languages.</p> <p>[7.3 Food information described or presented using technology shall be presented in one place, separately from other commercial information intended for sale or marketing purposes.]</p> <p>7.4 Where food information is provided using technology, the food information shall be shown in accordance with applicable Codex texts.</p> <p>7.5 Where mandatory food information is provided using technology, the reference on the label or labelling should link directly to this information and the food information should be available for the duration of the food's shelflife [at least and not less than best before date or expiry date]. [The link shall not include advertising[2]pertaining to the food.]</p> <p>7.6 Food information described or presented using technology should be readily accessible to consumers [and comply with the data protection policies of parent organizations] without having to provide or disclose information that is used to identify an individual.</p> <p>7.7 [When the label or labelling of a pre-packaged food references food information to be accessed using technology,sufficient information shall be displayed on the technology platform to enable consumers to ascertain that the food information pertains to that pre-packaged food.</p> <p>7.8 If the purpose of the reference on the label or labelling of the pre-packaged food is not self-explanatory to consumers, it should be accompanied by an explanation of how to use it or the type of food information that will be found when used (e.g. "scan here for more information on ingredients").</p> <p>7.9 The reference and any explanatory statement shown on the label or labelling that links to food information to be accessed using technology should adhere to sections 8.1.2 and 8.1.3 of the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods 9 (CXS 1-1985).</p> <p>7.10 Food information described or presented using technology shall be truthful, clear, prominent and readily legible to the consumer under normal settings and conditions of use of the technological platform.</p> <p>7.11 The language or languages of food information described or presented using technology shall be suitable to the consumer in the country in which the food is marketed.]</p> <p>7.12 The food information accessible via technology for foods for infants and young children must be in conformity with the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.13 Reference must be made to the Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid Transactions (CXC 20-1979) in order to safeguard the marketing of foods for infants and young children and ensure that all labelling conforms to the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent relevant WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.14 Electronic labelling relating to foods for infants and young children should not lead consumers to commercial websites and other commercial and promotional information.</p> <p>7.15 No user data should be collected or tracked through electronic means. [1]</p>	
<p>ISDI welcomes the progress made on the revision of the Guidelines on the use of technology to provide food information and can support the Guidelines moving to Step 5 on the condition that, as per para 135(ii) of the CCFL47 report, "the whole document remains open" even for text not in square brackets.</p> <p>While we agree that special focus should be on the text in square brackets, the discussion at CCFL47 were not conclusive on some of the text that is not in square brackets and so moving the Guidelines to Step 5 should not preclude further discussion on those. For example, ISDI considers that the text in</p>	<p>International Special Dietary Food Industries</p>

<p>section 7.4 that was newly introduced during CCFL47 is confusing and should be further discussed, although that section is not in square brackets.</p>	
<p>WPHNA is of the opinion that the Standard is not ready for adoption at Step 5 without some wording changes and additional provisions. WPHNA's recommended text is provided for the relevant items.</p> <p>1. PURPOSE Provide guidance on the use of technology to provide scientific, factual information to consumers[1] about pre-packaged foods1.</p> <p>5.2 Name of the food and food information concerning health and safety should not be provided exclusively using technology. Nutrition and health claims must not be permitted for foods for infants and young children. Health warnings about inappropriate and needless use, and safe preparation of the product must be communicated in any information using technology.</p> <p>7.10 Food information described or presented using technology shall be truthful, clear, prominent and readily legible to the consumer under normal settings and conditions of use of the technological platform.</p> <p>7.11 The language or languages of food information described or presented using technology shall be suitable to the consumer in the country in which the food is marketed.]</p> <p>7.12 The food information accessible via technology for foods for infants and young children must be in conformity with the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.13 Reference must be made to the Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid Transactions (CXC 20-1979) in order to safeguard the marketing of foods for infants and young children and ensure that all labelling conforms to the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes and subsequent relevant WHA resolutions</p> <p>7.14 Electronic labelling relating to foods for infants and young children should not lead consumers to commercial websites and other commercial and promotional information.</p> <p>7.15 No user data should be collected or tracked through electronic means.</p>	<p>World Public Health Nutrition Association</p>