

09/10/2018

**Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification
Systems (24th Session)**

Brisbane, Australia, 22-26 October 2018

European Union comments on

Agenda Item 7:

Discussion paper on food integrity and food authenticity

(CX/FICS 18/24/7)

*Mixed Competence
European Union Vote*

The European Union and its Member States (EUMS) would like to thank Iran, Canada and the eWG participants for excellent cooperation and constructive contributions in preparing the discussion paper on food integrity and authenticity.

Food fraud, while not a new phenomenon, has come under the spotlight in recent years. Food chains are vulnerable to fraud at national and international level. Initiatives are under way by many governments and within the industry to combat food fraud.

It is therefore very timely to consider how Codex could contribute to tackle fraudulent practices in food trade. The discussion paper provides a basis for these considerations, starting with the necessary definitions.

The EUMS agree to develop definitions for food integrity, food authenticity and food fraud. The proposed definitions can be supported subject to some minor adjustments. The proposed definition for “economically motivated adulteration” (EMA), is a specific definition which is already covered by the general definition for food fraud and would therefore deserve additional consideration.

As the definitions are of importance for the work of several Codex committees it would be appropriate to adopt them as formal Codex definitions by including them in the Procedural Manual in the section “Definitions for the purposes of the Codex Alimentarius”. CCFICS should ask CCGP to further consider this matter.

The EUMS agree with the conclusion of the discussion paper that prevention and control of food fraud is generally covered by most CCFICS texts as their scope extends to the dual mandate of Codex, i.e. protecting the health of consumers and ensuring fair practices in food trade. The EUMS also agree with the conclusion that there may be a need for further specific guidance addressing issues surrounding food fraud.

Apart from the definitions which are the first priority, CCFICS could elaborate guidance on what type of risks competent authorities should consider when designing control programmes targeting specifically food fraud. Another priority area meriting CCFICS guidance would be the exchange of information and cooperation between different authorities at national and international levels as well as communication with stakeholders and general public on incidents of food fraud. Further guidance could also be developed on administrative measures specifically targeting food fraud. Such guidance could be a standalone text but would also nicely fit as an annex to the *Principles and Guidelines for National Food Control Systems* (CAC/GL 82-2013).

After commencing this work, CCFICS could repeat its call to other Codex committees to consider whether there is any need for fraud related work in their respective areas of competence. This would apply in particular to CCGP, CCFL and CCMAS.