

UPDATE April 2026

We ask readers to contact government health and development representatives and make sure that they are aware of the following concerns

- 1: Defining an emergency is a highly sensitive political action.
- 2: Unlike [WHO](#), [Codex](#) has a dual mandate to protect health and to facilitate fair trade. Codex texts are often compromised by commercial concerns and are used as a benchmarks in trade disputes. Although voluntary they can have far-reaching influence on national laws and policies.
- 3: Flexible labelling opens the door to double standards and exploitation of the most vulnerable populations.
- 4: Few national governments have adequate emergency preparedness safeguards to stop exploitive labelling.
- 5: The uncontrolled dissemination of badly labelled products is a health and safety risk, especially for infants and young children. (see examples above and left)
- 6: For agencies and NGOs working in emergency relief, flexible labelling can complicate the traceability and recall procedures of contaminated or unsafe food. [Formulas, possibly contaminated with cereulide, were sent from Switzerland to Ukraine, the Gaza Strip and West Bank.](#)
- 7: The [proposal summary](#) indicates the guidelines are not necessary: *"In general, most competent authorities regarded that they have the authority, either explicitly stated or implied/embedded within existing interpretations of authorizing legislation, to implement flexibilities to food labelling as necessary in times of emergency"*