

Industria conserva del Ecayas S.A. - Ecuador

stakeholder group: SME company

1. General questions

1.1 Market size and value?

Novel food as total Significant

Traditional food from 3rd countries (outside the EU) Significant

R&D based novel foods Significant

1.1 Specify: Pechiche ???

1.2 Import value?

Novel food as total Not applicable

Traditional food from 3rd countries (outside the EU) Significant

R&D based novel foods Not applicable

1.3 Staff 50

1.5 Time taken

Safety assessment of novel foods Long

Authorization decision on novel foods Long

Authorization procedure as a whole Long

1.6 Costs of administrative burden

Novel food as total Very significant

Traditional food from 3rd countries (outside the EU) Significant

R&D based novel foods Very significant

1.6 Specify: Because they reduce costs, authorisation times and thus the product cost.

2.1 Adjusted safety assessment and management for traditional food from 3rd countries

Opt 1: No changes 'One size fits all'

Impact on public health and food safety Not very beneficial

Impact on consumer rights Not very beneficial

Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries) Not at all beneficial

Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business Not at all beneficial

Impact on innovation and research Not at all beneficial

Impact on employment and jobs Not at all beneficial

Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries) Not very beneficial

Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular) Not very beneficial

Opt 2: Adjusted safety assessment for traditional food from 3rd countries

Impact on public health and food safety Not very beneficial

Impact on consumer rights Neutral

Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries) Not at all beneficial

Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business Not at all beneficial

Impact on innovation and research Neutral

Impact on employment and jobs Neutral

Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries) Not very beneficial

Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular) Not very beneficial

Opt 3: Adjusted safety assessment and management for traditional food from 3rd countries

Impact on public health and food safety Not very beneficial

Impact on consumer rights Neutral

<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 4: No pre-market safety assessment and authorisation for traditional food from 3rd countries

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Very beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

2.1.5 Preference: Option 4: No pre-market safety assessment and authorisation for traditional food from 3rd countries

2.1.6 Explanation of choice: Because they reduce costs and benefit small and medium-sized enterprises.

2.2 Safety assessment and Authorization procedure?

Opt 1: No changes (decentralised assessment and authorisation procedure)

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 2: Centralised risk assessment and authorisation procedure

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Very beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

2.2.3 Preference: Option 2: Centralised risk assessment and authorisation procedure

2.3 Authorisation decision?

Opt 1: No changes: Authorisation linked to the applicant (only applicant able to market)

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Not very beneficial

<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 2: Generic authorisation (all companies able to market in EU and abolishment of simplified procedure)

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Very beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 3: Generic authorisation + data protection for certain foods

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Neutral
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 4: Different types of authorisations (generic and for certain foods, applicant linked)

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Neutral
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Neutral
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Neutral
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

2.3.5 Preference: Option 2: Generic authorisation (all companies able to market in EU and abolishment of simplified procedure)

2.3.6 Explanation of choice: Because they reduce costs and benefit small and medium-sized enterprises. [Translator's note: as advised, the source text of this section is mostly incomprehensible. The translation is mostly guesswork.]

2.4 Submission of application for several food uses

Opt 1: No changes: Separate applications for different food uses

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Neutral
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Neutral
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

Opt 2: One application for all new foods for different uses

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Fairly beneficial

<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Neutral
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

2.4.3 Preference: Option 2: One application for all new foods for different uses

2.4.4 Explanation of choice: In order to reduce our costs and time, and also the administrative workload.

2.5 Legal act

2.5.1 *What would be the impact of the revision for your organisation?*

<u>Impact on public health and food safety</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Impact on consumer rights</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on competitiveness, markets and trade (including 3rd countries)</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on the administrative burden imposed on business</u>	Not at all beneficial
<u>Impact on innovation and research</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Impact on employment and jobs</u>	Fairly beneficial
<u>Environmental impact (EU and 3rd countries)</u>	Not very beneficial
<u>Socio-economic impact (3rd countries in particular)</u>	Not very beneficial

2.5.2 Explanation: Because it is beneficial to us with regard to the aspect of competitiveness and of reducing administrative costs and the costs of producing products. [Translator's note: as advised, the source text of this section is mostly incomprehensible. The translation is mostly guesswork.]