Canadian Produce Marketing Response to Consultation Questions under CL 2021/9/OCS-FL

Question 1
Does the scope of the GSLPF need clarifying as it applies to 'food for catering purposes' for the purpose of declaring foods and ingredients known to cause hypersensitivity (see Section 1.1 of Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response. If yes, then how should the scope of the GSLPF as it applies to 'food for catering purposes' be clarified for the purpose of declaring foods and ingredients known to cause hypersensitivity?

CPMA Response: The scope of the GSLPF, as it applies to this standard, applies to "prepackaged products for sale to consumers or for catering purposes" and therefore would only apply to prepackaged foods for catering purposes. This would include prepackaged food sold to caterers for further preparation before a final product is sold to consumers but *does not* apply to prepared foods sold by caterers, unless the caterer sells 'prepackaged foods' to consumers.

The GSLPF definition of *Foods for Catering Purposes* is well delineated as "those foods for use in restaurants, canteens, schools, hospitals and similar institutions where food is offered for immediate consumption". As noted in Sec 1.1 of appendix 1 of CL_202/9/OCS-FL, "some eWG members noted the scope issue relating to 'foods for catering purposes' was also relevant to other current CCFL work on the labelling of non-retail containers and internet sales/e-commerce and supported discussion and alignment across the differing work groups on the issue". **CPMA would agree that it seems prudent to ensure alignment between all labelling work.**

Question 2
Do you agree with including specific provisions for the presentation of declarations of foods and ingredients known to cause hypersensitivity in Section 8 (Presentation of mandatory information) in the GSLPF (see Sections 1.2 and 4 in Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response.

CPMA Response: Yes. CPMA also agrees that the presentation of declaration for sulphites should be at the threshold stated in Section 4.2.1.4 for sulphites at 10 mg/kg (10 ppm) or more.

Question 3
Do you agree with including definitions for 'hypersensitivity', 'allergen', 'food allergy' and 'food intolerance' in the GSLPF (see Section 2.2 of Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response. If yes, then please provide comments on these proposed definitions.

CPMA Response: Yes. For further clarity, CPMA would suggest that it may be clearer to define *food intolerance* as follows: "Adverse reactions to food components that occur through ~~nonimmunological~~ **non-immune response** mechanisms (i.e. involving the digestive system)". This terminology more closely aligns with that used in the definition suggested for *food allergy* at 2.2: "adverse **immune reactions** to certain food proteins, which may be immunoglobulin E (IgE) mediated, non-IgE mediated, or a combination of both".

Question 4
Do you agree with amending section 4.2.1.3 of the GSLPF so that the declaration of foods and ingredients in section 4.2.1.4 apply to all compound ingredients including those that constitute less than 5% of the food (see Section 3.1 of Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response.

CPMA Response: No comment as this is outside the scope of the fresh fruit and vegetable industry.

Question 5
Do you agree with specifying the use of common and well understood terms (words) for the source of the food and ingredient known to cause hypersensitivity as part of, or in conjunction with, the relevant ingredient name when declarations are made on prepackaged foods (see Section 3.2 of Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response.

CPMA Response: Yes. The inclusion of this information provides greater clarity for the purchaser (end user). EWG members considered at a minimum, the GSLPF should require allergen information to be clear and easy to understand in simple, plain language, preferably with reference to the common name or source of the allergen (e.g. milk).
The Co-Chairs are proposing to include provisions in the GSLPF for using common and well understood terms for the source of the food and ingredient known to cause hypersensitivity as part of, or in conjunction with, the relevant ingredient name (see new section 4.2.1.5 in Appendix II). This is consistent with the Canadian *Food and Drug Regulations* **B.01.010.1** (2).

Question 6
Do you agree that section 4.2.2 of the GSLPF requires no change in relation to allergen labelling (see Section 3.3 of Appendix I)?

CPMA Response: Yes, the definition of allergen is being included in this consultation and should help clarify when a label of the allergen would be required.
This is consistent with Canada's position on labelling of food derived from biotechnology. Under the *Food and Drugs Act*, labelling is mandatory if there is a health or safety issue with a food. For example, if the nutritional value or composition of the food has been changed, or **if there is an allergen present in the food, special labelling is required to alert consumers or susceptible groups in the population. Reference :** Labelling of Foods Derived from Biotechnology

Question 7
Do you agree with the proposal to amend to section 4.2.3.1 in relation to the ingredients listed in section 4.2.1.4 and class names (See Section 3.4 of Appendix I)? Please provide reasons for your response.

CPMA Response: CPMA agrees with eWG members who noted that if a class name in section 4.2.3 is more informative than the name mentioned in section 4.2.1.4 with regard to allergenicity, then the class name should be allowed for making a declaration.

Question 8
Do you agree with the proposal to amend section 4.2.4.2 to clarify the exemption applying to processing aids and the carry-over of food additives (see Section 3.5 of Appendix I)?

CPMA Response: CPMA agrees that only items included under Section 4.2.4.2 should be considered in the proposal.

Question 9
Do you agree with the proposal to remove the exemption from declaring foods and ingredients listed in section 4.2.1.4 as it currently applies to small units (see Section 3.6 of Appendix I)?

CPMA Response: No comment.

Question 10
Do you have any other comments about the proposed approach or proposed revisions in Appendix II?

CPMA Response: No comment.