



Activity Title and Number: Comparison of the current oenological practices in China and the EU A441-C3

Beneficiary: China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA)

Location and Date: EU and China, May to December, 2015

Stakeholders: National Standardization Center of Food & Fermentation Industry (NSCFFI), Wine Industry and Academic institutions

Brief Activity Report

Relevance and Impact

The implementation of the newly amended Food Safety Law of the People's Republic of China, effective as of 1st October 2016 mandated relevant competent government agencies to create new food safety standards or revise the existing standards that might not be aligned with internationally recognised ones. In this context, different rules and practices on the labelling and certification of wines become acts as additional technical barriers to the further development of trade in wine between the EU and China.

This comparative study on current oenological practices in China and the EU, counted on the joint effort of both sides. This study aimed at deepening the understanding of the differences and similarities that exist in the governance of the Chinese and EU oenological practices in order to promote wine trade between China and the EU. Furthermore, this study is within the framework of scientific cooperation in the field of food, agriculture and biotechnology between the EU and China. The study also sought to identify the differences between the Chinese and international standards for food additives used in wines and will support the revision of GB2760 Hygienic Standards for the Uses of Food Additives of China.

Activity Description

The study engaged Chinese and EU experts to compare the current oenological practices used in China and the EU and included the following topics:

- Wine regulatory framework in China and the EU,
- The competent EU and Chinese authorities in the wine sector (from production to control system),
- Rules and laws on manganese, iron, dry extract, among all the other oenological practices.
- Multiple technical comparisons between the EU and the Chinese standards, which might entail technical barriers to trade, e.g. the comparison between the list of authorized additives and processing aids in the EU with those recommended in China and those authorised by the general food standards.

Conclusion

The study provided a comprehensive reference tool for the understanding of the differences and similarities between the governance of the Chinese and the EU oenological practices.