



## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD IMPORT AND EXPORT INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

#### Twenty-seventh Session

#### DRAFT GUIDELINES ON THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF FOOD FRAUD

(Prepared by Brazil with the supported from Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, México, Paraguay and Uruguay)

#### Proposed text for Section 2: Purpose/Scope of application

CCLAC members have concerns about the scope of the document, as the prevention and control of food fraud is broader and could go beyond the Codex mandate. To avoid the inclusion of issues outside the scope of the Codex Alimentarius, CCLAC provides suggested new language to the scope of the food fraud document as follows:

#### Text:

Purpose/Scope: "The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to competent authorities and FBOs on the prevention, detection, mitigation and control of food fraud within the scope of the Codex Alimentarius in order to help protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade.

Aspects related to food fraud that have already been addressed in existing Codex texts as well as issues outside the Codex mandate should not be addressed in this document. These guidelines are intended to support or complement existing Codex texts by providing additional specific guidance on food fraud that could be considered within the NFCS."

#### Rationale:

Some actions to prevent, detect, mitigate and control food fraud are not within the Codex mandate, so the scope of the guidelines should make it clear that all actions addressed in this text are within the Codex mandate. This document is intended to work with existing Codex texts, such as texts dealing with labeling.

Given the proposed new scope text, there is no need for language that includes animal feed or a footnote that excludes geographical indicators, as the scope is sufficiently clear only to address issues within the Codex mandate. In this sense, the need to reformulate the language presented in the scope of this document is clear, as is the removal of footnote 2, which mentions the exclusion of Intellectual Property from this document.