



**PLENARY MEETING OF THE ADVISORY GROUP ON THE FOOD CHAIN AND ANIMAL AND  
PLANT HEALTH**

12 DECEMBER 2014

**Summary Record**

**1. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The Chair opened the meeting on behalf of COM and welcomed participants. He presented the agenda which was then adopted.

**2. FOOD INTEGRITY PROJECT**

COM stressed the importance of food research going on through framework programmes for nearly 25 years with increasing number of food related projects financed.

COM briefly presented the activity "Fork to Farm": Food (including sea-food), health and wellbeing under 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme's theme Food, agriculture and fisheries and biotechnologies and its theme 'Assuring quality and authenticity in the food chain'. The expected impact of this theme is *inter alia* to offer authentic, high-quality food from sustainable production to consumers, to strengthen the competitiveness of European food producers, to determine the authenticity of foods, to reduce trading blocks and prevent fraud, to allow consumers to make informed choices and restore consumer confidence.

COM further presented the status of a large-scale collaborative project under this theme "FOODINTEGRITY – Ensuring integrity in the European Food Chain" running for 5 years starting in 2014 with 38 partners including public bodies, universities, research organisations, SMEs and enterprises. The project aims at providing Europe with a state of art and integrated capability for detecting fraud and assuring the integrity of the food chain, providing a sustainable body of expertise to inform on food fraud/authenticity issues and priorities, to bridge previous research activities. The project will consolidate expertise through its network including FoodIntegrity Advisory Board, existing expert networks, EC Food Fraud network and FoodIntegrity stakeholders.

COM highlighted that the project will provide evidence by means of setting up a database web-tool including an inventory of existing analytical tools and an inventory of reference datasets useful for development of standards for reporting as well as guidelines for sharing analytical data.

COM emphasised that the project will consolidate existing information and harmonise current methods as well as develop new field devices, and provide training. The kick off meeting of the project was organised in February 2014 linked to a public workshop on food authenticity.

COM informed participants on the next steps regarding the competitive calls under the FoodIntegrity Project scheduled for 2015 as well as on an a FOODINTEGRITY session during the EU Science Global Challenges conference in the European Parliament on 4 March 2015. Updated information on the project can be found on the website <https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/foodintegrity/index.cfm>.



2 FoodIntegrity  
Project .pdf

### Comments and questions raised

Chair pointed out that under FoodIntegrity Advisory board there is no mentioning of EFSA. It will be checked.

EUROGROUP for Animals asked whether animal wellbeing is mentioned in the project as well as novel food and animal cloning.

COM explained that for the moment there is only a working package on sea food but explained that via the competitive calls there is an opportunity to include other food commodities. Regarding cloning and novel food there is no specific research activity in the FoodIntegrity project.

UECBV expressed wish from industry to act in relevant networks and asked for more details on the conference in March 2015.

COM confirmed that during the EU Science Global Challenges conference in the European Parliament the FoodIntegrity Project will have a dedicated session. More information on a full programme will be certainly available soon. <http://www.globalsciencecollaboration.org/home>.

ESA asked whether the observation on intellectual property rights is included in the project activities.

COM agreed that it is a very important issue which will be a part of the project, also as regards data protection.

AIPCE asked on links between the FoodIntegrity project and project on fish labelling.

COM explained that as the project has not produced any reports yet not many details are known but there is a specific working package on sea food and within it all existing projects will be checked and taken into account to avoid duplication.

### **3. PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE BEST PRACTICE DOCUMENT ON COEXISTENCE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED SOYBEAN CROPS WITH CONVENTIONAL AND ORGANIC FARMING**

COM/JRC presented briefly the coexistence concepts in which the different agricultural systems coexist side by side in a sustainable manner and the coexistence measures that include segregation measures designed to minimize the probability of admixture of genetically modified (GM) in non-GM crops complemented by administrative and liability rules that are set out to resolve values losses as consequences of admixture.

COM/JRC explained that EU coexistence strategies are developed at national level following general guidelines from the European Commission which develops technical advice through European Coexistence Bureau (ECoB).

COM/JRC further presented the scope of the work of the technical working group of soybean that examined the state-of-art knowledge from scientific literature, research projects and reports, as well as empirical evidences for the impact of GM soybean cultivation on non-GM soybeans crop production, honey production and reviewed the methods for quantification of GM soybean presence in other crops and honey. The technical working group prepared a report (Best Practice Document), which was presented to the stakeholders. The main parts of the report are the following: soybean biology, soybean cultivation in the EU, existing segregation systems in soybean production, review of the available information on adventitious GM presence in soybean crop production, occurrence of soybean material in honey, detection of GM events in soybean crops and honey, best practice for coexistence in soybean crop production and economic analyses of proposed best practices.

The Best Practice Document on Coexistence of GM soybean crops with conventional and organic farming will be circulated to stakeholders after the meeting for their comments to be sent by end of January 2015.



3 BPD\_Soy.pdf

### Comments and questions raised

SLOW FOOD asked what would be the cost of safety distance measures implementation.

COM/JRC pointed out that due to lack of the data representative for EU conditions it is impossible to make precise cost analysis of the proposed coexistence segregation measures and that the responsibility for their implementation is of Member States. Because of that there could be differences in the adoption approaches. JRC also replied that the very well documented case of Canada – included in the report could serve as a proxy for economic costs of soybean coexistence.

ESA asked whether the utilization of different categories of seeds, e.g. basic seeds is included in a study.

COM/JRC replied that coexistence practices for seed production are not the subject of the ECoB work and that in the proposed set of coexistence measures in BPD the use of non-GM certified seeds complying with EU legislation of purity is recommended.

## **4. PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT “FRAMEWORK FOR THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE CULTIVATION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS”**

COM/JRC shortly introduced the mission and scope of the European GMO Socio-Economic Bureau (ESEB) and explained the structure, procedures and a timeline for the ESEB Framework document.

COM/JRC presented the main sections of the document that is a general methodological framework to investigate the socio-economic impacts of GM crop cultivation. COM/JRC explained that it sets indicators for socio-economic impacts at country/EU level and defines methods for data collection and for economic analysis.

COM/JRC detailed the procedure/timeline for drafting the ESEB Framework Document. The same procedure will apply for further documents prepared for the specific crops.

COM/JRC presented the scope of the document as well as criteria used for inclusion of different topics in the document together with more specific measurable indicators.

COM/JRC further pointed out at the approach in methodology and gave an example of methods used, such as farm surveys, field trials, etc.

COM/JRC then presented the topics under various effects on different economic sectors (on crop farming, outside crop farming, on livestock producers) in case of adoption or non-adoption of GM cultivation.

COM/JRC highlighted that first ESEB document provides framework applicable to any GM crops that might be grown in EU Member States, identifies 27 topics and almost 100 indicators along with methodological recommendations. COM/JRC stressed that some evidence of impacts already exists, but very limited for most topics as the main constraint is the lack of data.



1st ESEB Reference  
Document.pdf

#### Comments and questions raised:

EUROGROUP for Animals asked what is meant by welfare economy and whether there are any examples or figures available.

COM/JRC clarified that economic concept of welfare is welfare of industry as well as consumers. It explained that adoption of GM crops will lead to higher supply which can have an impact on prices. With decreasing the price the welfare of consumers would increase.

UECBV commented that there are studies existing on economic welfare and asked whether the environmental benefits will be accounted for and assessed as well.

COM/JRC confirmed that the working group discussed the correlation of economic and environmental issues. ESEB will consider crops that have previously been evaluated by EFSA concerning environmental risk. COM/JRC affirmed the possibility of considering indirect environmental benefits in ESEB.

IFOAM EU-GROUP stressed the importance of environmental impact, given that the discussion with MS reached the compromise so they can cultivate GM or remain GM free. It asked for more time to comment the document than one month given.

COM extended the deadline for comments by 15 February.

## 5. INTRODUCTION TO THE REFIT PROGRAMME

COM shortly introduced the Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) as a process of putting Smart Regulation into practice. Smart Regulation was introduced in 2010 as a reply to criticism of EU legislation as being too complex, burdensome, costly and unclear, as well as difficult to implement, ignoring the views of affected parties, violating the subsidiarity principle. COM underlined that the Smart Regulation is to ensure the high quality legislation; it covers the whole cycle – from the design of a piece of legislation, to implementation, enforcement, evaluation and revision. It is about actively engaging those affected by interventions. Smart Regulation is a shared responsibility of the European Institutions and of Member States. In the context of the REFIT, the Commission proceeds to a mapping exercise to identify burdens, inconsistencies, gaps and ineffective measures across the Union *acquis*, takes action (e.g. by withdrawing, repelling, simplifying and improving Union legislation), makes assessments (evaluations and Fitness Checks), consults stakeholders and keep track of the progress made.

### ON THE SPECIFIC FITNESS CHECK ON GENERAL FOOD LAW

In the context of the REFIT programme, the Commission has initiated a Fitness Check on Regulation 178/2002 on General Food Law (GFL). COM explained that the overall purpose of the Fitness Check on Regulation 178/2002 is a comprehensive policy evaluation assessing whether the regulatory framework introduced by Regulation 178/2002 for the entire food sector is "fit for purpose". Regulation 178/2002 was selected as it is the foundation of the EU food and feed policy and sets out the basic objectives of food law, definitions, general principles and requirements, procedures for the management of emergencies and crisis and it establishes EFSA.

The criteria to be covered are the following: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value.

COM detailed the data sources of Fitness Check, namely, 2 external studies with inclusion of stakeholder consultations as well as SME survey. Both studies are to be completed by end of May 2015. Apart from these studies, further data sources include joint evaluation with the Member States, EFSA reports, complaints/infringements, previous evaluations/impact assessments, and implementation.

COM presented the timeline of the Fitness Check on General Food Law. It was launched in April 2014, external studies to be carried out from September 2014 till June 2015. Commission Staff Working Document presenting the outcome of the Fitness Check on GFL should be available by December 2015.

Finally, COM informed the participants about the dedicated Advisory Group working group on the specific external study on the general part of GFL, which was to take place on 19 December 2014 to discuss 2 specific case studies, i.e. traceability and distribution of responsibilities of feed/food business operators. The supporting documents will be sent shortly after the plenary meeting.



### Comments and questions raised

COPA-COGECA asked whether more case studies are envisaged and whether the outcome of the study on food fraud will be included in the Fitness Check exercise.

COM ensured participants that more case studies will be carried out on 4-5 themes but internal discussion is still ongoing. COM confirmed that the outcome of the study on food fraud will feed in to the Fitness Check.

BEUC asked whether further working group meetings will be organised with other topics.

COM replied that additional workshops might be organised if contractor collects more information. COM stressed the importance of the Advisory Group as a forum for discussion with stakeholders along this exercise.

EUROCOOP wanted to know more about the efficiency criterion and what weight is put to the different criteria.

COM presented the general criteria of Fitness Check to be used. If needed these could be discussed during the dedicated working group meeting.

EUROGROUP for ANIMALS expressed their worries about art 16 of the Regulation referring to labelling of meat if animals have not been stunned before killing and whether it will be changed so it is not deceptive and contradictory to reality.

COM replied that it is too early to take a position at this stage.

### **ON RAPID ALERT SYSTEM FOR FOOD AND FEED**

COM explained that evaluation of RASFF is a part of the same Fitness Check framework. COM shortly informed participants on the timeline. Contractor is finalising a questionnaire to be sent to MS contact point authorities as well as stakeholders via the Advisory Group. The finalised questionnaire should be launched with deadline of most probably mid February 2015.

COM informed participants that 3 case studies are being developed by contractor: on Melamine, e-coli, and glass fragments in instant coffee.

### Comments and questions raised

EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS asked a specific question on how consumers are warned considering minced beef meat as the results of tests come only after sale and possible consumption of meat. Will there be anything to improve the microbiological tests or change the reference.

COM replied that this is a normal practice, and the importance is not only to withdraw and recall the product from the market as soon as possible, but also to investigate the origin of the product and the reason of the problem in the food, processing, storage, bad conditions of transport, and even more, keeping track of the recurrent problems coming from the same operator or place of origin, in order to avoid further alerts.

Chair stressed that the role of REFIT exercise is to check whether the legislation is fit for purpose and responds to the needs.

On FEFAC's question whether a case study on melamine will cover only food or also feed part COM confirmed that it will cover both to get bigger overview.

FESASS asked on more information on case studies to be carried out by national authorities.

COM replied that so far no Member State committed to carry out a case study in the future.

## **6. UPDATE ON SOPs FOR RAPID ALERT SYSTEM FOR FOOD AND FEED**

COM shortly summarised the work done on SOPs so far and gave an update on the state of play.

COM pointed out that SOPs were discussed in the RASFF Seminar in Athens, in September 2012, mainly the confidentiality of RASFF notifications, criteria for notification, and best practices for competent authorities.

COM stressed that SOPs were discussed in the Standing Committee for Plants, Animal Feed and Food at the end of 2014 and endorsed.

COM presented the main structure of SOPs, and gave brief preview of each of its 10 chapters/standards as follows:

- Best practices for National Contact Points (NCP) – to ensure simple structure involving all food and feed control authorities ensuring effective communication between the contact points and the authorities competent for control,

- Scope of RASFF - criteria to determine whether notification to the RASFF is optional or mandatory,

- Preparation of an original notification – steps how to collect information, use of notification templates, language used, handling of documents, role of the NCP,

- Preparation of a follow-up notification, when any additional information relating to an original notification is available,

- Submission of a notification to the European Commission Contact Point (ECCP) on steps to be taken from when a RASFF notification is prepared to when the notification is submitted to the ECCP including time-limits,

- ECCP verification of the RASFF notification on how to verify scope, legal basis, legibility and completeness, risk evaluation, or other issues of compliance with the SOPs,

- Distribution of RASFF Notifications received from the ECCP on how to assess, filter and distribute the notifications received from the ECCP,

- Assessing a notification received from the ECCP with elements on hazards and risk, product characteristics, and measures taken,

- Archiving and consulting RASFF notifications and related information,

- Publication of RASFF information with keeping the balance between transparency of RASFF information and confidentiality of RASFF information.



## 7. FOOD FRAUD: ONGOING INITIATIVES

COM pointed out that fraud in the agri-food chain is not a new phenomenon. Significant cases already occurred in the past, e.g. colorants in chilli products in 2003, mineral oil into sunflower oil from Ukraine in 2008, melamine in infant milk in China in 2008 and fatty acids intended for technical purposes used in animal feeding in 2010. In 2013 the horse meat incident drew once again attention of media and politicians to the issue of food fraud and led to an increased focus on it.

COM explained that there is currently no EU legal definition for food fraud. However a working definition has been agreed on, focusing on two points: the intentional violation of the rules and the motivation by the prospect of economic or financial gain. In practice food fraud covers many different situations, e.g. substitution of species or ingredients, undeclared addition or deletion or treatment, tampering, counterfeiting, misrepresentation, sophistication to strengthen the product characteristics, etc.

COM underlined that following the horse meat scandal it announced and carried out a 5-point action plan covering the following areas: DNA testing programme for horsemeat in beef products, more secure horse passports, horizontal actions to strengthen the fight against food fraud at EU and MS level, legislative framework for official controls and origin labelling.

Further to this first action plan several further initiatives have been launched and are still ongoing: establishment of a network of national contact points for food fraud that meets regularly, development of a computerised tool for the exchange of information, awareness programme, research (FoodIntegrity Project) etc.

COM insisted on the importance of an effective cooperation between MS through the exchange of information for cases with cross border dimension, and also on the need to promote multidisciplinary approaches between food, police, customs and judicial authorities.

As far as legislation is concerned COM stressed that, beyond the existing provisions included in the General Food Law (Regulation 178/2002) and in the legislation on official controls (Regulation 882/2004), several new provisions targeted on food fraud have been included in the legislative proposal adopted in May 2013 intended to revise Regulation 882/2004 (financial penalties, unannounced inspections, coordinated control plans).

COM also informed participants that a study has been launched to review the type of sanctions applicable to food fraud in the different MS, to identify possible gaps in the existing legislation and to assess the need for an EU harmonised definition for food fraud.

Finally COM underlined the importance of training through the Better Training for Safer Food (BTFS) programme where in 2014-2015 a module on investigation techniques to detect food fraud as well as module on sales of food over the internet are foreseen.





7 Food fraud .pdf

### Comments and questions raised

EUROGROUP for ANIMALS expressed its concern about horsemeat and the high possibility that the fraud or unintentional addition of horse meat into other meat products continues. It also questioned the system of own-checks by food business operators and certification.

While acknowledging on the need to remain vigilant COM pointed out at two positive elements concerning the meat sector, firstly the strengthening of the horse passports rules and secondly the awareness and alertness of meat industry following the horse meat scandal. Food business operators should be inclined to carry out own-checks to guarantee the identity of meat they are using, which becomes easier while DNA testing technology is developing and is getting less expensive. COM also reminded that the outcome of the second testing round, carried out in April-June 2013, was encouraging with 0,61% of samples testing positive versus 4,6% for the first round.

CEFIC asked on cooperation with the industry. COM explained that MS bear the responsibility to carry out official controls for the proper enforcement of EU rules while EC is responsible for ensuring that Member States and the third countries exporting to the EU meet with their legal obligations. When necessary COM provides coordinated assistance and follow up. COM also mentioned ongoing work of the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) from the private sector to develop tools to mitigate the risk of food fraud.

BEUC asked whether coordinated testing programmes are envisaged in the future and which category of products would be tested as a priority.

COM replied that discussion with MS is ongoing to consider which products might be subjected to such coordinated controls in the future.

COPA-COGECA wanted to know more details on the study related to the legislative framework and the penalties applicable in the ME.

COM reminded the 3 main objectives of the study and indicated that it should be available in spring 2015.

### **8. UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT ON FOOD WASTE**

COM gave a brief feedback from the dedicated working group meeting with stakeholders and underlined the good progress made. The working group has looked at all possible measures (namely on labelling, hygiene, food donation, taxation, etc.) taking into account the subsidiarity principle<sup>1</sup>. There is unanimous agreement among all stakeholders that:

- prevention of food waste cannot jeopardise food safety,

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect an expert group with Member States has been established to coordinate the general policy issues related to food waste and to facilitate sharing of learning and best practice. [http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food\\_waste/eu\\_actions/member\\_states/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/food_waste/eu_actions/member_states/index_en.htm)

- all actors from food chain are involved,
- EU action complements/adds value to Member States initiatives,
- best practice should be shared effectively.

COM highlighted in particular the issue of date marking as consumers often confuse the meaning of "best before" and "use by" indicated on food labels. There was a suggestion presented in the Council to look at the feasibility of extending the list of foodstuffs which are today exempt from "best before" labelling (cf Annex X of Regulation N° 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers). This proposal will be assessed carefully taking into account feedback received from MS experts and stakeholders. COM informed participants about BEUC's letter which expresses their negative opinion on the possible removal of "best before" labelling from foods which today carry such labelling. A study might be launched to help to evaluate the options.

COM explained that guidelines to facilitate food donation will be developed at EU level so as to help Member States establish their own guidelines adapted to the national administrative and other structures.

COM stressed the importance of awareness raising, information and communications at all levels and of pursuing the dialogue with all stakeholders and Member States at the various levels (local, national, EU).

COM also referred to the Commission's food waste website, which is regularly updated, including with good practices from public authorities, NGOs and industry and with the minutes of all meetings.

Finally COM referred to the food pyramid, underlining that food produced for human consumption should by order of priority be consumed by humans and then in order of priority to animals, recovered for energy, etc. COM also explained that the FUSIONS project was on the definition of food waste and methodology to facilitate measurement and monitoring of food waste.



8 foodwaste.pdf

### Comments and questions raised

Further to SLOW FOOD's question on why agricultural losses are not included in the proposed food waste target, COM confirmed that losses at the agricultural level are not covered by the target as limited information is available. However, the proposal provides for some monitoring at agricultural level.

BEUC explained that studies show that in many countries fresh products (vegetables, bakery products) with no date are mostly wasted by consumers. COM replied that there are many different studies carried out on this issue with different outcomes regarding the mostly wasted food.

EUROCOMMERCE supported BEUC and expressed concerns whether the Communication on the Circular Economy Package will be maintained and that it is important that the work to tackle the food waste continues. COM indicated that the Circular economy package will be looked at – outcome not known yet. Concerning the

Communication on Food Sustainability it is under the responsibility of DG ENV and it is impossible to say at this stage whether it will be adopted in 2015.

UECBV commented that it is a part of project to reduce fresh meat waste by developing the sensor indicating its freshness and by that increasing its shelf life.

CLITRAVI made a point that some losses might be prevented by storage of perishable food in a fridge under correct temperature, and that the fridges should be equipped by thermometer.

COM agreed that all small innovations can play an important role as well as awareness raising at the local level.

COM confirmed that date marking is under the responsibility of food business operators. There could be an opportunity to improve date marking without jeopardizing food safety.

COPA-COGECA asked whether a study on the issue would be carried out and whether stakeholders will be consulted. COM confirmed that stakeholders will be consulted on all relevant issues including on a study if it is carried out.

#### **9. STATE OF PLAY BY THE COMMISSION ON THE REPORTS ON MANDATORY ORIGIN LABELLING REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 26(5) OF REGULATION (EU) No1169/2011**

COM presented an update on the reports on mandatory origin labelling foreseen in the recent Regulation (EU) no1169/2011 on food information to consumers.

COM pointed out that presently the origin labelling is mandatory for certain products, such as honey, fruit, vegetables, imported poultry and beef but there are some new provisions introduced by the Regulation. The first one concerning fresh meat from swine, goat, sheep, and poultry has been decided already and introduces a mandatory origin labelling applicable in April 2015.

COM underlined that the Regulation has requested a report on the possibility to extend the mandatory origin labelling regime to other food categories, namely to meat as an ingredient. This first report has already been adopted. Soon to be adopted are reports dealing with other meats not yet covered previously (rabbit, horse, game), the origin of milk and milk in dairy products. These reports are under responsibility of DG AGRI.

DG SANCO in collaboration with DG AGRI deals with the report on possible mandatory labelling of unprocessed food, single ingredient product and ingredients that present more than 50% of food.

COM stressed that the Regulation requests the following aspects to be dealt with in the reports: the need for consumers to be informed, feasibility to provide the mandatory indication of the country of origin in the labelling, analysis of costs-benefits of introduction of such measures, impact on the internal market and international trade.

COM concluded that the studies have been finalised by external contractors, the reports have been drafted, and the adoption will take place in the beginning of 2015.

## Comments and questions raised

EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS asked on next steps after publication of the reports and on a time frame. It asked also on specific origin labelling when meat is from animals not stunned and whether it is going to be implemented.

COM noted the specific question; it will be answered in writing by the relevant colleagues. Regarding the reports COM confirmed that they will be the basis for discussion with the Member States and the European Parliament to find out the best way forward.

BEUC questioned the role of focus group to discuss the findings in the reports. BEUC wanted to clarify and have it clearly noted that it took part in the focus group but did not validate the report's findings.

COM explained that the idea of the group organised by a contractor was to invite stakeholders to give critical views, to have their say on data.

BEUC countered that during the meeting of the focus group the data were not available yet.

COM concluded that as regards the coming reports the findings and data of the study were presented.

PFM asked whether the studies will be published together with the report.

COM confirmed that concerning the studies connected to mandatory origin labelling they will be published together with the report.

## **10. DRAFT GUIDANCE DOCUMENT ON THE CARRY OVER PRINCIPLE, LAID DOWN IN ARTICLE 18 OF REGULATION (EC) NO 1333/2008 ON FOOD ADDITIVES**

COM gave a short summary on Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 on food additives that provides for the definitions, conditions of use, union list of authorised food additives and labelling requirements. COM stressed that only food additives included in the Union list, in its annex II, may be used in foods. There is also Annex III listing food additives authorised in additives, enzymes, flavouring and nutrients.

COM explained that there might be additives present in the food that are not listed in Union list which is due to carry over principle. This carry over principle is explained in Regulation in article 18 on which the Guidance was required.

COM further detailed relevant paragraphs of this article of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 stating when the presence of a food additive shall be permitted as well as pointing at exceptions concerning infant formulae, baby foods and dietary foods for special medical purposes.

COM explained that the Guidance document should help the Member States control authorities and food industry to assure correct implementation of the food additives legislation. It does not represent the official position of the Commission and does not intend to produce legally binding effects.

COM next presented the structure of the Draft Guidance document as well as informed participants on next steps. Stakeholders are requested to provide feedback, comments, and suggestions by 28 February 2015. Commission will further consult with Member States experts and finalise during first half of 2015.



10 carry over.pdf

### Comments and questions raised

CEFIC expressed their appreciation of the draft document.

BEUC asked whether also additives that are allergens and are carried over without being labelled are covered in the document.

COM stressed that for additives that are allergens the specific rules have to apply.

### **11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

COM informed participants on the meetings of Commissioner for Health and Food Safety with stakeholders in the area of food chain envisaged to be held in January/February 2015.

COM thanked all the participants for their constructive contributions, invited them to send possible suggestions for the topics to be discussed in the next plenary meetings that are scheduled for 30 April and 27 November 2015 and closed the meeting.