

UE- La fraude alimentaire: le miel et le poisson dans le collimateur

07-12-2015

Les niveaux de fraude de poisson dans l'UE ont chuté au-dessous de 6%. Mais les premiers résultats pour le miel sont estimés à 19% - et peut-être même jusqu'à 32% - de fraudes.

Un échantillonnage intensif dans les 28 Etats membres de l'UE ainsi que la Norvège et la Suisse fait partie d'un nouveau régime pour déterminer l'ampleur de la fraude dans les aliments à haut risque.

En tout, 2.237 tests sur le miel ont été réalisés entre Juin et Novembre 2015. Parmi ceux-ci, 61% étaient d'origine unique et 31% étaient des miels «mixte».

Près de 19% étaient non conformes dans l'un des quatre contrôles suivants :

- paramètres physico-chimiques tels que les méthodes de fabrication
- source
- teneur en sucre
- aspects d'étiquetage, telles que l'utilisation d'allégations santé non autorisées

Près de 30% des produits avaient été gonflé avec des sirops de sucre bon marché. Grâce à l'analyse de pollen, 37% avaient été étiquetés par une fausse mention de source botanique et 10% avec une indication géographique d'origine incorrecte.

Not surprising

The levels of noncompliance are high but expected, according to Fiona Dargie, head of food processing at Scotlandbased risk management company Acoura.

“People often associate food fraud with red meat and white fish, but with honey becoming less costeffective and more difficult to produce in the desired volumes it isn't surprising that we're seeing more cases of substitution and mislabelling,” she explained.

“[Honey] is a food stuff many assume will be completely natural [and] there's every chance buyers aren't examining their suppliers in enough detail.”

In addition, 13% of the 2,237 honey samples were classified as being *“unusual or questionable”*. This could mean that 32%, or very nearly one in three, of the honey products tested fall foul of EU laws.

Final results are expected in mid2016, in which a further 1,200 samples will be analysed using more advanced methods.

Fish fraud 6%

The analysis of fish products – in the same period – provided more reason or cheer. Of the 3,906 products tested, both processed and unprocessed, only 232 (6%) were not compliant with EU labelling laws.

Non compliance was slightly more frequent in samples from border inspection posts (7%), retail (7%) and mass caterers (8%) than for markets and traders (3%), cold stores (4%) and processors (4%), the European Commission noted.

Though cod and hake represented the largest number of noncompliant samples (30 and 27 respectively), they were the most commonly tested species. Grouper (31%), common sole (24%) and yellowfin sole (15%) actually had the highest noncompliance rates .

Looking at the countryspecific results, there are some areas for concern – not least Malta, Estonia and Latvia where noncompliance rates were 27%, 17% and 14% respectively. In Germany, too, more than one in 10 fish (11%) had been mislabelled.

At the other end of the table are Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal and, most notably, Ireland.

In 2010, researchers found that one in four cod and haddock products taken from supermarkets and restaurants in the capital, Dublin, were actually entirely different species. But every one of the 76 samples taken between June and November this year was correctly labelled.

The findings support research published last week . DNA testing of 1,563 supermarket products in six EU countries showed mislabelling rates of under 5% – which is “*almost expected by chance due to human error*”, according to project lead Professor Stefano Mariani from the Ecosystems and Environment Research Centre at the University of Salford.

Source : <http://www.foodqualitynews.com/Industry-news/Food-fraud-Honey-a-monster-fish-better-schooled>