Council of the European Union

Brussels, 12 January 2024
(OR. en)

16745/23
ADD 22

LIMITE

AGRI 822
AGRIORG 152
AGRILEG 349
FOOD 99
CODEC 2489
IA 365

Interinstitutional File: 2023/0105(COD)

NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
No. Cion doc.:	8624/23 + ADD 1- ADD 4
Subject:	Proposal for a DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Council Directives 2001/110/EC relating to honey, 2001/112/EC relating to fruit juices and certain similar products intended for human consumption, 2001/113/EC relating to fruit jams, jellies and marmalades and sweetened chestnut purée intended for human consumption, and 2001/114/EC relating to certain partly or wholly dehydrated preserved milk for human consumption - Comments from the Swedish delegation

Delegations will find attached the Swedish delegation's comments and replies in response to the request from the Presidency sent on 20 December 2023, and that can be found in document 16745/23.

ANNEX.

Breakfast directives - Questions for the SCA – Comments and replys from Sweden (16745/23)

What is the opinion of the Member States on the introduction of a traceability system that requires Member States to trace back the entire supply chain of a given honey to beekeepers or harvesting operators in the case of imported honey (AM 21, 59)?

In general, SE are in favour of a traceability system for imported honey to prevent fraud. It could provide control authorities with better tools to investigate fraudulent practices. However, this should be balanced with the administrative burden on businesses and the official controls that the proposal on traceability systems may entail. Far-reaching administrative requirements can affect operators in developing countries to a greater extent than those in developed countries, especially if they are small. The proposal is somewhat unclear and raises several supplementary questions such as the one pointed out by the Estonian delegation.

The proposal for the introduction of EURL (AM 61) is somewhat questionable regarding the purpose and need, it would be desirable for the justification to be clarified so that a final position can be taken. Many types of honey analysis today fall within the remit of the already existing EURL and it is unclear how the new EURL would relate to these. It is also important to look at the financial implications, as an EURL means that the NRL also needs to be set up in each Member State, which is costly. In addition, our view is that the introduction of EURL has its legal basis in the Control Regulation (EU Regulation 2017/625) and not in the Honey Directive.

What is the opinion of the Member States on the proposed change of the definition of honey, in particular to exclude ultrafiltration, artificial evaporation and vacuum evaporation as allowed techniques and to introduce a new type of honey, namely 'unheated honey' (AM 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 67)?

SE are in favour of excluding ultrafiltration, artificial evaporation and vacuum evaporation from the honey definition, as these processes impair the properties and quality of the honey.

As regards 'unheated honey' as a concept, we believe that the term 'honey' should be used. The product that does not comply with the lined criteria of AM29 is not 'Honey' and should consequently be called something else. Alternatively, as a compromise, we suggest that heated honey (above 40 degrees) be indicated as 'heated honey' rather than the other way around.

As regards AM 31 and pollen, we believe that the proposed minimum filter size of 100 my is too small and means that pollen will be filtered out. The limit should be 200 min in order not to affect the pollen content of the honey. Otherwise, we have no objection to the wording of AM31.

As far as AM67 and enzyme activity are concerned, we have no objection.

What is the opinion of the Member States on the proposal to introduce origin labelling for fruit in fruit juices (main AM 33)?

SE are of the opinion that origin labelling is a valuable consumer information that can help consumers make conscious choices, but we believe it should be on a voluntary basis in this case. We do not support current EP proposals for mandatory origin labelling of fruit in fruit juice. We fully agree with Finland's argument as to why the proposal cannot be supported.

What is the opinion of Member States on the proposal to restrict claims for reduced-sugar fruit juices and to prohibit any comparative claims for those products in comparison with the fruits they originate from or 'normal' fruit juices (AM 36)?

SE is cautiously positive to this AM**.**

What is the opinion of the Member States on the proposal to introduce origin labelling for fruits and sugar in jams (AM 39)?

We are of the opinion that origin labelling is a valuable consumer information that can help consumers make conscious choices, but we believe it should be on a voluntary basis in this case. We cannot therefore support the proposal for mandatory production of fruit and sugar in jam and marmalade. We support Finland's argument here too.

In addition, there is a risk that mandatory origin requirements for these products would result in many companies entering a bland type of 'EU and non-EU' labelling because they sometimes have to use raw materials of a different origin than the one used, whereas the companies using only one origin are likely to indicate this if there is a consumer interest.