

**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO  
THE FRUIT JUICES AND FRUIT NECTARS (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT)  
REGULATIONS 2011**

**2011 No. 1135**

1. This explanatory memorandum has been prepared by the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and is laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

This memorandum contains information for the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments.

2. **Purpose of the instrument**

2.1 This Instrument introduces changes to the current Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 in order to better align current EU rules on fruit juice with the worldwide Codex Standard on Fruit Juices and Nectars. Its primary aim is to ensure consistency in the minimum quality for products labelled as fruit juices and fruit nectars and that consumers are not misled in their purchases. Three relatively minor changes are being made, the primary one being the introduction for the first time of minimum Brix levels for certain fruit juices from concentrate.

3. **Matters of special interest to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments**

3.1 The Regulations will insert a review clause in the 2003 Regulations requiring the Secretary of State to review the 2003 Regulations within a period of five years beginning with 9<sup>th</sup> May 2011 and in each successive five year period. The Secretary of State will be obliged to publish a report setting out their conclusions from the review. The vires for this provision is in section 48(1)(c) of the Food Safety Act 1990, which enables Regulations made under that Act to include such supplementary and incidental provisions as the Secretary of State considers necessary or expedient.

4. **Legislative Context**

4.1 This Instrument implements Commission Directive 2009/106/EC which introduces two amendments to Council Directive 2001/112/EC laying down EC rules on fruit juices and fruit nectars. Directive 2001/112/EC is currently implemented in England by way of the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 and an amendment to these Regulations is therefore required.

5. **Territorial Extent and Application**

5.1 This amending Instrument applies to England only.

5.2 Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are introducing their own separate but parallel amending Instruments at the same time.

## **6. European Convention on Human Rights**

6.1 As the Instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure and does not amend primary legislation, no statement is required.

## **7. Policy background**

- What is being done and why

7.1 The Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2011 introduce three relatively small amendments:

- A linguistic change in relation to the naming of mixed juice products containing fruit juice and fruit juices produced from concentrate, which will help to alleviate translational difficulties across Member States;
- a new Annex laying down minimum Brix levels (sugar content) for the most popular fruit juices from concentrate traded in the EU; and
- a further amendment is also being made to correct an error in the current regulations where it should refer to Schedule 5 rather than Schedule 4.

7.2 The minor linguistic change will require a small change to the current labelling of mixed juice products containing fruit juice and fruit juices from concentrate to read “partially from concentrate” instead of “partially made with concentrate”. This aligns the text for these products with the terminology already in use for single fruit juices and makes for more consistent translation across the EU. It will require re-labelling for those mixed juices; however these types of products are not common in the UK and account for only a very small proportion of the market.

7.3 The introduction of minimum Brix levels for certain fruit juices from concentrate is in the interests of both the fruit juice industry and consumers. Brix values provide a measure of quality by setting minimum soluble solids level (sugar content) for fruit juices. The Brix to acid ratio is an easy way to tell if a juice is sweet or acidic (sour); the higher the ratio, the sweeter the juice. Brix levels can vary naturally but most fall within a certain range and the levels being set are broadly similar to those used across Europe. UK fruit juice manufacturers are very supportive of this new measure as it provides a level playing field and ensures everyone is working to the same standard. The consumer will benefit as they will be guaranteed consistency and a minimum quality product, any inferior or poor quality juices not meeting the Brix level will not be able to use the description “fruit juice from concentrate. Overall this measure will provide more consistency in the trade of juices from concentrate across the EU with consequent benefits for the consumer.

- Consolidation

7.4 Further more substantial amendments to Council Directive 2001/112/EC on fruit juice are currently being discussed within the EU. It is likely that when agreed, further significant changes to the current Regulations will be required. When these changes are implemented in around 2-3 years time a consolidation of the Regulations is envisaged.

## **8. Consultation outcome**

8.1 A non formal six week written consultation was held from 22 December 2010 to 1 February 2011. A reduced consultation period was conducted in view of the fact that these amending Regulations introduce relatively minor changes, impact on a very small number of niche businesses, and the key stakeholders were already fully aware of the changes proposed. Three replies were received, one had no comment, one suggested minor editorial changes to the Impact Assessment and one, a blackcurrant juice processor, suggested the Brix level being set for blackcurrant juice was rather low. However the Brix levels set in the Regulations are minimum levels and there is nothing to prevent a supplier working to higher levels. The level for blackcurrant juice is actually higher than that set in the worldwide Codex standard on fruit juices. The level is also the same as that in the current industry code of practice and is used informally across Europe.

## **9. Guidance**

9.1 Guidance notes to the current fruit juice Regulations will be updated to reflect the new changes. All enforcement authorities will be notified when the amending regulations come into force.

## **10. Impact**

10.1 There will be a small impact on business estimated to be around £0.07m. There will be a one-off familiarisation cost to manufacturers of fruit juices and canned fruit of approximately £283 and to English local authorities of approximately £9000. There will also be a re-labelling cost to one affected England-based fruit juice manufacturer, of approximately £7200, due to the linguistic change on the labels of mixed fruit juices containing both “not from concentrate” and “from concentrate”. Lastly, there will be further relabelling costs to England-based canned fruit manufacturers, of up to £144,000, due to the setting of minimum Brix levels.

10.2 The impact on the public sector is zero.

10.3 An Impact Assessment is attached to this memorandum and will be published alongside the Explanatory Memorandum on [www.legislation.gov.uk](http://www.legislation.gov.uk).

## **11. Regulating small business**

11.1 The legislation applies to small business.

11.2 To minimise the impact of the requirements on firms employing up to 20 people, the approach taken is to provide further guidance to help in the understanding of Brix levels and that new minimum levels have been set. Most juice suppliers will already be using Brix levels as a measure of the quality of a juice in their supply and marketing of juices.

11.3 The final decision was taken based on the limited number of small business supplying fruit juices and that the Brix levels are based on current manufacturing practices and also the routine nature of the technique involved in the measurement of Brix. Updated guidance will help provide any further advice needed.

## **12. Monitoring & review**

12.1 Negotiations are currently underway to make further more detailed technical amendments to Council Directive 2001/112/EC on fruit juice to align further with international standards. A revised directive is therefore likely to be adopted later this year by the Council and European Parliament. Hence there will be a natural opportunity to review the domestic Regulations when the next EU amendment is implemented in the future, particularly as a consolidation is likely to be required. In addition a review clause has been included in the Regulations in line with the Government's Guiding Principles for EU legislation.

## **13. Contact**

Michelle McQuillan at Defra, Tel: 0207 238 4352 or email: [michelle.mcquillan@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.mcquillan@defra.gsi.gov.uk) who can answer any queries regarding the Instrument.

<b>Title:</b> <b>The Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2011</b> <b>Lead department or agency:</b> Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs <b>Other departments or agencies:</b>	<b>Impact Assessment (IA)</b>
	<b>IA No:</b> DEFRA 1040
	<b>Date:</b> 14/04/2011
	<b>Stage:</b> Final
	<b>Source of intervention:</b> EU
	<b>Type of measure:</b> Secondary legislation
<b>Contact for enquiries:</b> Michelle McQuillan 0207 238 4352	

## Summary: Intervention and Options

### What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 require revision to implement Commission Directive 2009/106/EC of 14<sup>th</sup> August 2009 which introduces two amendments to EC Directive 2001/112/EC laying down rules on fruit juice. The changes discussed are:

- 1) A small linguistic change in relation to mixed juice products containing fruit juices and fruit juices from concentrates, which will help to alleviate translational difficulties across Member States.
- 2) The introduction of minimum Brix levels for fruit juices from concentrate. (Brix values provide a measure of quality by setting minimum soluble solids (sugar content) for fruit juices.)

Government intervention is necessary in order to ensure consistency for industry across the EU and ensure consumers are guaranteed a minimum quality product.

### What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

- 1) The policy objectives are to protect consumers and provide the consistency and a level playing field for the fruit juice industry particularly when trading in fruit juice from concentrate.
- 2) The intended effects are :
  - a linguistic clarification removing any ambiguity with the labelling of mixed juices containing both fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate where the words “partially **made with** concentrate” are replaced with “partially **from** concentrate”.
  - To introduce minimum Brix values for fruit juice from concentrate which will help ensure better consistency in product quality and that industry are applying the same minimum levels.

### What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

Option 1- Do Nothing. Failure to update the Fruit Juice and Fruit Nectar Regulations to keep them in line with Council Directive 2001/112/EC may lead to infraction procedures against the UK. This could also leave industry at a disadvantage against other Member States who are applying the Brix levels enshrined in directive 2009/106/EC, leaving the UK no legal basis in cases of dispute.

Option 2 - Introduce changes now. This will allow for consistency in labelling across the EU for juice mixtures of "not from concentrate" and "from concentrate". The introduction of minimum Brix levels will ensure that all manufacturers will have to comply with the levels previously governed by voluntary codes of practice thereby creating a more level playing field.

Option 2 is the chosen option as this delivers additional consumer protection measures to ensure a minimum fruit juice quality. Manufacturers are also keen to see a level playing field across Europe with rules aligned where possible with the FAO/WHO worldwide Codex standard on fruit juices and fruit nectars. This is also the only option which ensures our EU obligations are fully met; failure to implement the measure could lead to infraction proceedings. Results of the consultation exercise raised no objections to this course.

Will the policy be reviewed? It will be reviewed. If applicable, set review date: 2-3 Years

What is the basis for this review? PIR. If applicable, set sunset clause date: Month/Year

Are there arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review?

Yes

**SELECT SIGNATORY Sign-off** For final stage Impact Assessments:

***I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that (a) it represents a fair and reasonable view of the expected costs, benefits and impact of the policy, and (b) the benefits justify the costs.***

Signed by the responsible Minister:

Jim Paice

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> April 2011

# Summary: Analysis and Evidence

# Policy Option 2

Description: Introduce the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2011

Price Base Year 2009	PV Base Year N/A	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: -0.01
<b>COSTS (£m)</b>		<b>Total Transition (Constant Price) Years</b>	<b>Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)</b>	<b>Total Cost (Present Value)</b>	
Low		0.016	N/A	N/A	N/A
High		0.16	N/A	N/A	N/A
Best Estimate		0.07 <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0.07
<b>Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</b>					
<p>There will be one-off familiarisation cost to manufacturers of fruit juices and canned fruit of approximately £283 and to English local authorities of approximately £9000. There will also be a re-labelling cost to one affected England-based fruit juice manufacturer, of approximately £7200, due to the linguistic change on the labels of fruit juices containing juice both "not from concentrate" and "from concentrate". Lastly, there will be further relabelling costs to England-based canned fruit manufacturers, of up to £144,000, due to the setting of minimum Brix levels.</p>					
<b>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</b>					
<b>BENEFITS (£m)</b>		<b>Total Transition (Constant Price) Years</b>	<b>Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)</b>	<b>Total Benefit (Present Value)</b>	
Low		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
High		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Best Estimate		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</b>					
<p>No monetised benefits have been identified.</p>					
<b>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</b>					
<p>The inclusion in law of defined Brix levels will help further ensure consistency in product quality, allowing England-based fruit juice and canned fruit juice manufacturers to compete with EU-based counterparts on the same terms. This should ensure product quality for consumers and provide trading standards officers with a benchmark against which to judge the authenticity and quality of fruit juices.</p>					
<b>Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks</b>				<b>Discount rate (%)</b>	3.5

<sup>1</sup> Our best estimate of transitional costs is the mid-point of the identified total transitional cost range of approximately £16k to £160k. Please See Evidence Base for further detail.

## Assumptions

- There will be familiarisation costs for both industry and English local authorities.
- There will be relabelling costs for mixtures of juices containing both fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate. Relabelling costs are based on one identified affected manufacturer.
- There will be no relabelling costs associated with the setting of minimum Brix values for fruit juices from concentrate, as UK producers already adhere to a code of practice which recommends the same levels as now required by law.
- There will be costs for affected canned fruit manufacturers, associated with the setting of minimum Brix levels, and these manufacturers will re-label or reformulate in response to the amended regulations. Affected manufacturers will choose the lowest cost option where reformulation has no material impact on consumers' perception of products.

## Risks

- There is a strong risk of infraction proceedings against the UK if these Regulations are not implemented. Failure to transpose the amending Commission Directive into national legislation could result in this course of action.

<b>Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:</b>			<b>In scope of OIOO?</b>	<b>Measure qualifies as</b>
<b>Costs: 0.001947-0.019262</b>	<b>Benefits: N/A</b>	<b>Net: - 0.001947-0.019262</b>	No	NA

## Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			England		
From what date will the policy be implemented?			TBC Est01/04/2011		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Local Authorities		
What is the annual change in enforcement cost (£m)?			nil		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			Yes		
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			No		
What is the CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)			<b>Traded:</b> N/A	<b>Non-traded:</b> N/A	
Does the proposal have an impact on competition?			No		
What proportion (%) of Total PV costs/benefits is directly attributable to primary legislation, if applicable?			<b>Costs:</b> N/A	<b>Benefits:</b> N/A	
Distribution of annual cost (%) by organisation size (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	<b>Micro</b>	<b>&lt; 20</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>
Are any of these organisations exempt?	No	No	No	No	No

## Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Set out in the table below where information on any SITs undertaken as part of the analysis of the policy options can be found in the evidence base. For guidance on how to complete each test, double-click on the link for the guidance provided by the relevant department.

Please note this checklist is not intended to list each and every statutory consideration that departments should take into account when deciding which policy option to follow. It is the responsibility of departments to make sure that their duties are complied with.

Does your policy option/proposal have an impact on...?	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Page ref within IA</b>
--	---------------	---------------------------



<b>Statutory equality duties<sup>2</sup></b> <u>Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
<b>Economic impacts</b>		
Competition <u>Competition Assessment Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
Small firms <u>Small Firms Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
<b>Environmental impacts</b>		
Greenhouse gas assessment <u>Greenhouse Gas Assessment Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
Wider environmental issues <u>Wider Environmental Issues Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
<b>Social impacts</b>		
Health and well-being <u>Health and Well-being Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
Human rights <u>Human Rights Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
Justice system <u>Justice Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
Rural proofing <u>Rural Proofing Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16
<b>Sustainable development</b> <u>Sustainable Development Impact Test guidance</u>	No	16

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes

### References

No.	Legislation or publication
1	<u>Consultation stage: <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/fruit-juice/index.htm">www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/fruit-juice/index.htm</a></u> Consultation stage IA – Dec 2010
2	<u><a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2003/1564/contents/made">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2003/1564/contents/made</a></u> Fruit Juice Regulations 2003
3	<u><a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:212:0042:0044:EN:PDF">http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:212:0042:0044:EN:PDF</a></u> Fruit Juice Directive 2009/106/EC
4	

### Evidence Base

#### Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits\* - (£m) constant prices

	Y <sub>0</sub>	Y <sub>1</sub>	Y <sub>2</sub>	Y <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>4</sub>	Y <sub>5</sub>	Y <sub>6</sub>	Y <sub>7</sub>	Y <sub>8</sub>	Y <sub>9</sub>
<b>Transition costs (EAC)<sup>3</sup></b>	0.009	0.009h	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009
<b>Annual recurring cost</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total annual costs</b>	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009
<b>Transition benefits</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Annual recurring benefits</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Total annual benefits<sup>4*</sup></b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<sup>2</sup> Public bodies including Whitehall departments are required to consider the impact of their policies and measures on race, disability and gender. It is intended to extend this consideration requirement under the Equality Act 2010 to cover age, sexual orientation, religion or belief and gender reassignment from April 2011 (to Great Britain only). The Toolkit provides advice on statutory equality duties for public authorities with a remit in Northern Ireland.

<sup>3</sup> Equivalent Annual Costs – the profile shows the EACs for the mid-point of the identified total cost range of approximately £16k to £160k.

# Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

## Problem under consideration

It is proposed to revise the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 to implement Commission Directive 2009/106/EC which introduces two amendments to EC Directive 2001/112/EC. EC Directive 2001/112/EC lays down rules on fruit juices and fruit nectars. These changes were introduced to better align current EU rules on fruit juice with the worldwide Codex Standard on Fruit Juices and Nectars.<sup>5</sup> Its primary aim is to ensure consistency in the minimum quality for products labelled as fruit juices and fruit nectars and that consumers are not misled in their purchases. The changes discussed are:

- 1) A small linguistic change in relation to mixed juice products containing fruit juices and fruit juices from concentrates, which will help to alleviate translational difficulties across Member States.
- 2) The introduction into the Regulations of minimum Brix levels for fruit juices from concentrate<sup>6</sup>.

## Rationale for intervention

Intervention is required to implement EU Directive 2009/106/EC. The Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 require two amendments. These regulations apply to England only separate but parallel Regulations will be implemented in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The amendments are:

- 1) *Linguistic change to the description of mixed juices containing fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate*

This is a very minor linguistic change for the labelling of mixed juices containing both fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate where the words “partially **made with** concentrate” are replaced with “partially **from** concentrate”. This aligns the text with terminology already in use elsewhere in the directive when describing juices from concentrate and allows for more consistent translation into national legislations across each Member State.

- 2) *Brix levels*

One of the functions of setting specific compositional standards for certain food and drink products is to ensure consumers can be assured of a minimum quality when making purchasing decisions. The introduction of minimum Brix levels for fruit juice from concentrate is important as it ensures such juices meet a minimum value associated with that particular variety of fruit juice. Brix levels can vary naturally but most fall within a certain range. In the UK, an industry code of practice ensures that signatories produce fruit juice from concentrate which already adhere to minimum Brix values. The values being set in the proposed amending regulations are in line with what the industry currently works to and represent levels which produce a juice of acceptable quality for the consumer. Government intervention is necessary in order to ensure consistent standards for industry across the UK and EU to work to, and also to ensure consumers are guaranteed a juice of at least a minimum quality standard.

Guideline Brix values for fruit juices from concentrate have recently been agreed in the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the European Commission was keen to adopt similar Brix standards in the EU to ensure EU manufacturers were not disadvantaged in international trade.

---

<sup>4</sup> For a description of non-monetised benefits, please see summary pages and main evidence base section.

<sup>5</sup> Codex is a WHO/FAO body which sets international food standards to facilitate trade and protect consumers. The Codex General Standard on Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars is STAN 247-2005

<sup>6</sup> Brix values provide a measure of quality by setting minimum soluble solids (sugar content) for fruit juices. The Brix to acid ratio is an easy way to tell if a juice is sweet or acidic (sour); the higher the ratio, the sweeter the juice.

## Policy objective and intended effect

- 1) To remove ambiguity from the description of juice mixtures containing both fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate, and to reduce the time and costs associated with the translation of descriptions across Member States.
- 2) The introduction of minimum Brix values will ensure consistency across fruit juice products, and assure consumers of a minimum quality when purchasing a fruit juice from concentrate. It will also assist with detecting adulteration and testing of juices, with consequent benefits for the consumer.

## Options considered

- 1) Do nothing - Do not adopt the proposal
- 2) Introduce proposed changes as above

Option 2 is the chosen option.

## Background to the changes proposed

The aim of the amending Regulations is to introduce changes to the existing rules on fruit juices which arise as a result of an amendment to Council Directive 2001/112/EC on Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars. These changes were proposed and agreed by Member States in order to further align EU rules with the Codex Standard on Fruit Juices. This will help ensure a level playing field in international trade and assures consumers additional protection in terms of fruit juice quality. The Commission Directive introduces only two amendments: a very minor linguistic change to the naming of mixed juices consisting of fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate; and the introduction of minimum Brix levels (sugar content) for fruit juices from concentrate.

Other more technical and detailed changes are also currently being discussed in Europe but these will take much longer to agree and will require consideration by the European Parliament. Thus a much longer timescale of around 2-3 years is envisaged before further changes are required. The Commission has been keen to progress this first set of amendments to ensure Europe has in place its own minimum Brix requirements. Although the Brix levels are broadly similar to that recently set in the Codex standard, there are some fruits where the levels differ and are more appropriate to the fruit varieties and growing conditions found in Europe. In the absence of legal European rules manufacturers could be forced to accept the levels in Codex and therefore creating disadvantage.

The major fruit juice manufacturers and packers in the UK already adhere to an industry Code of Practice (COP), which recommends minimum Brix levels for fruit juice from concentrate. The values laid down in the proposed amending Regulations are identical to that set out in that COP, and the industry has indicated that these can be implemented at low cost. The proposals are supported by industry and, indeed, were put forward by the trade themselves.

### *1) Linguistic change –*

For consistency, a minor change to the labelling of mixtures of fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate is proposed. The UK can accept this is more consistent with the terminology used in the reserved descriptions<sup>7</sup> but has, during discussions, questioned the overall benefit. It will require re-labelling for mixtures of juices containing **both** fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate; however these products account for only a very small proportion of the UK market (thought to be around four products).

*2) Addition of Brix levels –* The EU currently has no legally specified Brix levels for fruit juices from concentrate so it is important that the figures are in line with EU manufacturing practices. Brix levels, broadly speaking, represent the sweetness of a juice. Fruit juice can be made in two distinct ways. It can be obtained directly from the pressing of the fruit, in which case it is known as ‘not from concentrate’ and the reserved description “X juice” is used (where X represents a type of fruit). Alternatively, to

---

<sup>7</sup> Reserved descriptions are names set out in law for certain commodities which define their composition and often require specific labelling requirements. The Fruit Juice and Fruit Nectar Regulations lay down reserved descriptions for fruit juice products.

minimise cost, the juice may be extracted and concentrated in the country of origin and transported to processors in various countries, where it is reconstituted by the addition of the same amount of water originally removed. This type of juice is described as ‘from concentrate’ and the reserved description “X juice from concentrate” must be used. The Brix levels being proposed are to be applied to “from concentrate juice” only and are required to ensure that restored juices meet a minimum Brix level.

The inclusion of Brix levels in law will have direct benefits for the consumer, at a minimal additional cost. It will help guarantee product quality and ensure that competitive international trade in fruit juice is supported by consistent quality standards across the EU. It will also assist with detecting adulteration and testing of juices by setting down legal minima not previously in place. The values being proposed are in line with UK trade practices. UK fruit juice manufacturers already adhere to Brix levels, which have been laid down across Europe through an Association of the Industry of Juices and Nectars from Fruits and Vegetables of the European Union Code of Practice (AIJN). The AIJN represents the major European fruit juice manufacturers, and its code represents a consensus on minimum Brix values manufacturers must achieve in order to ensure product quality and meet minimum standards. The values in the amending Regulations have been derived directly from the code, so in practice there will only be small associated costs arising from the inclusion of Brix levels in UK law.

## **Options**

Option 1- Do nothing. Failure to update the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 to keep them in line with Council Directive 2001/112/EC may lead to infraction procedures. This would also leave UK industry at a competitive disadvantage against other Member States as its current code of practice would have no legal basis.

Option 2 - Introduce amending regulations. This is the chosen option. This will allow for consistency in labelling across the EU for mixed juices and juices made from concentrate. The introduction of minimum Brix levels will ensure that all manufacturers will have to comply with the levels previously governed by voluntary codes of practice.

While we note that these Regulations apply to England only, separate but parallel regulations will be implemented in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. **Therefore, the geographic scope of this impact assessment is England only.**

## **The markets affected by the amended regulations**

### **Fruit juice manufacturing**

According to the Inter-Departmental Business Register (IDBR) from the ONS there are 40 fruit and vegetable juice manufacturers in the UK; 35 of these are located in England and 5 in Wales. Based on the number of employees<sup>8</sup> 30 are defined as micro businesses, 5 as small and 5 as medium. There are also 235 soft drinks manufacturers in the UK, some of which may also produce fruit juices as part of their range.

The market for fruit juices is quite concentrated. Own label brands account for approximately 60% of sales, with a further 32% accruing to just 6 brands<sup>9</sup>.

Retail value of all fruit juice sales was approximately £1.8bn in 2009, down by 4.5% on 2008 figures. In volume terms, consumption of fruit juice peaked in 2007, before year-on-year falls of 3.4% and 3.1% respectively in 2008 and 2009<sup>10</sup>. The sector breakdown between chilled and ambient juices<sup>11</sup>, based on litres consumed, is given in the table below

---

<sup>8</sup> Standard definitions of business size based on number of employees are as follows: Micro - less than 10; Small – less than 50; Medium – less than 250; Large – 250 or more.

<sup>9</sup> Mintel, *Fruit Juices and Fruit Juice Drinks*, November 2008.

<sup>10</sup> The 2010 UK Soft Drinks Report, BSDA: <http://www.britishtsoftdrinks.com/PDF/2010%20soft%20drinks%20report.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> Ambient juice does not need to be refrigerated before opening but can be stored at room temperature. Ambient juice tends to be from concentrate.

Types of Juice	Percentage share
Ambient juice	45
Chilled 'Not From Concentrate'	25
Chilled 'From concentrate'	21
Smoothies	5
Freshly squeezed	4

Source: 2010 UK Soft Drinks Report, BSDA.

Given that the amended regulations affect mixed juices, blended from fruit juice and juice from concentrate, and juices from concentrate, approximately 66% - the ambient juice and chilled 'from concentrate' sectors - of the fruit juices market will be affected by this legislation. The value of the fruit juice export market was worth £48.3 million in 2010. (Source: FDF Food and Drink export performance report, March 2011)

### **Canned fruit manufacturing**

Current estimates suggest that there are approximately 10 manufacturers of canned fruit in the UK<sup>12</sup>, and we assume that these are all based in England. These Regulations will also apply to canned fruit preserved in fruit juice. Retailer own brands account for approximately 67% of the canned fruit market, with brand leader Del Monte accounting for approximately 13%; however other brands such as Princes and SPC Nature's Finest have seen the biggest growth recently<sup>13</sup>.

### **Costs and Benefits of the options**

Option 1 forgoes the benefit of having clear legislation consistent with other Member States, and the benefits of introducing Brix levels, namely: ensuring product quality, supporting competitive international trade in fruit juice, detecting adulteration and testing of juices.

Option 2 will result in benefits to both industry and consumers. To our knowledge, introducing Brix levels for fruit juice from concentrate juices will have negligible impact, as packers and suppliers of such juices already comply with minimum Brix levels through voluntary codes of practice. However, we are aware that canned fruit packers who pack fruit in a juice medium will be affected and may face some additional costs.

Option 2 is the chosen option, as this ensures industry and consumers benefit from legislated minimum standards at little cost to the fruit juice industry. An 18-month timescale since adoption of the Directive has allowed producers to prepare for label changes in the relatively small amount of products affected and to work towards exhausting current label stocks.

### **Option 1**

#### **Costs**

There would be no change to the regulatory environment for England-based industry and therefore there are no immediate costs. However, the absence of consistency of product descriptors and quality standards across fruit juice products may cause lost business for England-based fruit juice and canned fruit manufacturers beyond 2011.

#### **Benefits**

There is no change to the regulatory environment, and therefore no incremental benefits.

### **Option 2**

#### **Costs**

##### **Costs to industry**

<sup>12</sup> Based on market analysis we have identified the key manufacturers in canned/package fruit as: Del Monte, Princes, SPC Nature's Finest, John West and own-label manufacturers. This has been rounded up to 10. As we have no further information, and in order to be cautious, we assume that these are all in England.

<sup>13</sup> Mintel, (2007), Frozen and Canned Fruit and Vegetables UK

## *Familiarisation costs*

Fruit juice and canned fruit manufacturers will need to read and become familiar with the new Regulations. However, as industry has been aware of the proposed changes for over 2 years and is already working to the Brix level through their own code of practice, it is likely that relatively little time will be required for this.

We estimate that it will take one manager approximately 15 minutes to read and become familiar with the Regulations (based on 4 pages of text). The average hourly pay rate for *production managers* is £19.38<sup>14</sup>. This is up-rated by 30% to account for overheads, in line with standard cost model methodology<sup>15</sup>, to a wage rate of £25.19<sup>16</sup>. For a reading time of 15 minutes this represents an average cost per business of £6.30.

For the 35 fruit and vegetable juice producers in England, this represents a total familiarisation cost of approximately £220. Using the same per business cost of familiarisation as outlined above, this represents a total familiarisation cost to the identified 10 England-based canned fruit manufacturers of £63.

**Therefore, the total one-off familiarisation cost to fruit juice and canned fruit manufacturers is £283.**

## *One-off costs associated with the linguistic change*

### Re-labelling

The linguistic change will require minor re-labelling for mixtures of juices containing both fruit juice **and** fruit juice from concentrate; however these products account for only a very small proportion of the UK market. Information from the industry trade association representing the large fruit juice manufacturers, the British Soft Drinks Association (BSDA), indicates that there are very few stock keeping units (SKUs) which will require to be changed. BSDA has indicated that only one of their member manufacturers will be affected by the linguistic change resulting in four of their products requiring label changes. **We assume that this manufacturer is England-based.** All of the BSDA's other member companies (21 in total), manufacturing fruit juices, have indicated no changes will be needed.

Based on the results of recently-commissioned Defra research<sup>17</sup>, we estimate that re-labelling costs of £1800 per SKU. **For the four affected SKUs, this represents a re-labelling cost of approximately £7200.** Additionally, this commissioned work also highlights the importance of lead-in times. The longer the implementation time allowed for a given mandated label change, the higher the probability of its alignment with business-as-usual (for instance, marketing driven) label changes, and, therefore, the greater the consequential cost saving to the manufacturer. **Therefore, we suggest that actual re-labelling costs would be below £7200**, but do not attempt to quantify the saving which would accrue to any lead-in time for the amended regulations.

## *One-off costs associated with the setting of minimum Brix levels for juices from concentrate*

For fruit juice manufacturers

**These Regulations are unlikely to affect fruit juice products, as major fruit juice manufacturers and packers in England and the rest of the UK already adhere to an industry code of practice (COP) which recommends minimum Brix levels for fruit juice from concentrate.** The values set out in the proposed amending Regulations are identical to those in the COP, and industry stakeholders have

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme\\_labour/ASHE-2009/2009\\_occ4.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_labour/ASHE-2009/2009_occ4.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file44503.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Costs are estimated by multiplying wage rates uplifted by 30% to account for overheads in line with standard cost model methodology. This means that wage rates reported in the text are rounded to 2 decimal places and when grossed may result in rounding errors.

<sup>17</sup> *Developing a framework for assessing the costs of labelling changes on the UK* (Campden BRI, forthcoming for Defra). The key finding from Campden BRI's research is that the costs of labelling changes vary across a number of parameters, and these were found to be: product shelf life, complexity of label change, firm size and printing technique employed (which, in turn, is influenced by the type of packaging used). Campden BRI suggests that the average cost of implementing a minor labelling change, such as minor a linguistic change, is £1800.

indicated that there is unlikely to be a reformulation or re-labelling cost associated with this part of the Regulations.

For canned fruit manufacturers

Canned fruit may be packed in several types of liquid mediums such as syrup, water or fruit juice. The new Brix requirements would mean that packers would need to ensure that those fruits packed in fruit juice would meet the minimum Brix levels. We are aware that for certain canned fruits packed in juice made from concentrate a Brix level may sometimes be used that is lower than that laid down in the industry's code and that which will be required by the new Regulations. This is particularly an issue for apple and grape juices where the milder flavour of such juices are required so as not to impinge on the flavour of the fruit.

**Businesses whose products do not meet the minimum Brix levels set out in the Regulations will either have to reformulate in order to meet the new minimum Brix levels, or re-label products using different descriptors.**

**Reformulation** - The cost of reformulation varies widely on a product-by-product basis. Reformulation of fruit juice in order to meet minimum Brix levels is likely to impose a one-off cost to manufacturers associated with changes in production processes. There may also be an increase in on-going costs if a higher volume of concentrate is required for each unit of output produced. **However, based upon industry stakeholder feedback received during initial discussions of the proposed amendments, we suggest that both one-off and recurring reformulation costs would be negligible in this case.**

**Re-labelling** - it is estimated that approximately 80 canned fruit SKUs<sup>18</sup>, produced by the 10 canned fruit manufacturers identified as being England-based, could be affected by these Regulations. Assuming average re-labelling costs (for a minor label change) of £1800 per SKU, and if all canned fruit manufacturers were to re-label affected products, they would incur a re-labelling cost of £144,000. Given both the importance of lead-in times highlighted above, and the significant lead-in time that the industry has had in this case - industry has been aware of these Regulations since August 2009, and so may have taken the proposed changes into account when planning routine label changes. We suggest that actual re-labelling costs would be below a maximum (if all canned fruit manufacturers re-labelled in response to the Regulations) of £144,000.

The decision to re-label or reformulate canned fruit SKUs, in response to the Regulations, would vary on a product-by-product basis across manufacturers. We currently have no information on the number of products that would be re-labelled in response to the Regulations being imposed. **Therefore, we assume that the true cost associated with the setting of minimum Brix levels for juices from concentrate for canned fruit manufacturers would be between zero (if all SKUs were reformulated in response) and £144,000 (if all SKUs were re-labelled in response, and with no alignment of mandated label changes with business-as-usual label changes).**

#### Costs to English local authorities

##### *Familiarisation Costs*

Local authorities will also need to become familiar with the new Regulations. It is estimated that it would take one Trading Standards officer, and one public analyst, 1/2 hour each to read and become familiar with the Regulations, and disseminate them to key staff.

The average hourly pay rate for *inspectors of factories utilities and trading standards* is £15.58, and for public analysts is £19.38 per hour. These are up-rated by 30% to account for overheads, in accordance with the standard cost model, to £20.25 and £25.97, respectively. This represents a familiarisation cost per local authority of £23.11.

To estimate the total familiarisation costs, this is multiplied out by the number of local authorities in the UK, as per below.

---

<sup>18</sup> Based on products available from the three leading supermarkets according to mysupermarket.com on 02/07/10. Included are all canned fruit, fruit pots and fruit jars which contain fruit in fruit juice – excluding pineapple in its own juice and grapefruit in its own juice.

<b>Number of English local authorities</b>	389
<b>Familiarisation cost per local authority</b>	approximately £23
<b>Total local authority familiarisation cost for England</b>	<b><u>£8991</u></b>

### *Enforcement Costs*

The Regulations will be enforced by Trading Standards officers in local authorities. Brix levels will require testing in order to demonstrate compliance. The test required uses standard techniques measuring soluble solids by refractometer already in everyday use by Public Analysts and so we anticipate that these Regulations will result in no additional enforcement costs.

### **Summary of one off costs incurred**

#### Familiarisation costs

##### **Industry**

England	£283
---------	------

##### **Local authorities**

England	£8,991
---------	--------

#### Costs associated with the linguistic change

Relabelling costs for fruit juice manufacturers	£7,200
---	--------

#### Costs associated with the setting of minimum Brix levels

Reformulation costs for canned fruit manufacturers	£negligible
--	-------------

Relabelling costs for canned fruit manufacturers	£144,000
--	----------

England-based canned fruit manufacturers	£nil to £144,000
--	------------------

### ***Equivalent Annual Costs (EACs)***

In order for 'one-off' transition costs to be compared on an equivalent basis across policies spanning different time periods, it is necessary to 'equivalently annualise' costs using a standard formula<sup>19</sup>. Under standard HMT Green book guidance<sup>20</sup>, a discount rate of 3.5% is used.

### **Total EACs for industry and local government**

#### Where all canned fruit manufacturers relabel in response to the setting of minimum Brix levels

Total costs for England	£160,474
-------------------------	----------

Equivalent annual cost (over a 10-year appraisal period)	£19,296
--	---------

#### Where all canned fruit manufacturers reformulate in response to the setting of minimum Brix levels

Total costs for England	£16,474
-------------------------	---------

Equivalent annual cost (over a 10-year appraisal period)	£1,981
--	--------

The total EACs of the policy are therefore presented as a range, where the range spans £1,981 (where all canned fruit manufacturers reformulate in response to the setting of minimum Brix levels) and £19,296 (where all canned fruit manufacturers re-label in response). The true EAC of the policy will lie in the range identified.

<sup>19</sup> The equivalent annual cost formula is as follows:  $EAC = PVC/A$ , where  $A = [1 - 1/(1+r)^t]/r$ , where PVC is the present value of costs, r is the social discount rate and t is the time period over which the policy is being appraised.

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/data\\_greenbook\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/data_greenbook_index.htm)



## **Benefits**

### *Consumer*

The inclusion in law of defined Brix levels will ensure consistency in product quality by providing a clearly-defined, pan-European minimum quality standard for UK manufacturers to adhere to. The proposal will assist with detecting adulteration and testing of juices, as minimum Brix figures are now laid down in law, with consequent benefits for the consumer in terms of consistency and quality of product. Consumers can now be assured that the reconstitution of concentrated fruit juice with water to make fruit juice from concentrate will be carried out to meet minimum Brix levels when previously no such values were laid down in law.

### *Industry*

The proposal to include Brix values will provide regulatory certainty for manufacturers. There are currently no specified Brix levels set in UK law, and it is therefore important to ensure that UK manufacturers are not disadvantaged in the international trade of affected fruit juice and canned fruit products. Brix levels are also laid down in a Codex standard covering fruit juices meaning that in the absence of European or UK rules industry could be forced to accept these levels. The Regulations, in certain instances, set levels which are slightly different to the Codex standard in order to take account of European fruit processing practices. This provides a more secure basis for UK manufacturers in any trade disputes given that the fruit juice export market was worth £48.3 Million in 2010.

### *Local authorities*

Local authorities now have a further analytical bench mark to judge the authenticity and quality of a juice product, by ensuring a juice from concentrate meets a legal minimum Brix level.

## **Risks and assumptions**

### Risks

- There is a strong risk of infraction proceedings being taken out by the Commission. Failure to transpose this amending Commission Directive into national legislation could result in this course of action.

### Assumptions

- There will be familiarisation costs for both industry and English local authorities.
- There will be relabelling costs for mixtures of juices containing both fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate. Relabelling costs are based on one identified affected manufacturer.
- There will be no relabelling costs associated with the setting of minimum Brix values for fruit juices from concentrate, as UK producers already adhere to a code of practice which recommends the same levels as now required by law.
- There will be costs for affected canned fruit manufacturers, associated with the setting of minimum Brix levels, and these will re-label or reformulate in response to the amended regulations. Affected manufacturers will choose the lowest cost option where reformulation has no material impact on consumers' perception of products.

## **Administrative Burden Costs**

Food Labelling is an administrative burden, but any incremental changes to the administrative burden of this proposal should be minimal.

## **Wider Impacts**

It is not foreseen that there are any wider impacts, other than those outlined in this Impact Assessment.

## **Consultation**

An informal consultation was carried out in August 2007 when the Commission first indicated that it intended to move forward with revision of the Fruit Juice Directive. The responses received were used to develop the UK's negotiating position. Responses to that consultation indicated overwhelming support by industry and LACORs for the introduction of Brix values. The linguistic change was proposed later, in response to translation problems in other languages. Stakeholders have been regularly informed and updated on progress with the Commission's plans. Interested Party letters have also sought stakeholders' views on the issues as they arose, and there have also been stakeholder meetings to talk through the changes which the new amending regulations would bring about.

A non formal written six week consultation was carried out from 22 December 2010 to 1 February 2011 which sought additional views on the impact of the proposed amending regulations. There were three responses to the consultation. One commented on the Brix level being set for blackcurrant juice, one made minor editorial changes and the other had no comment. The British Soft Drinks Association a key stakeholder also indicated informally that they had no comments to make on the consultaion and agreed with the preferred option 2. As a result option 2 to amend the Fruit Juice Regulations is being taken forward.

## **Enforcement**

The Regulations will be enforced by Trading Standards officers in local authorities. Brix levels will require testing in order to demonstrate compliance. The test required uses standard techniques measuring soluble solids by refractometer already in everyday use by Public Analysts.

## **Simplification**

There are no simplification measures as part of these proposals.

## **Implementation**

The changes will be implemented by an amendment to the current Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) 2003 Regulations. It is proposed to bring the Regulations into force as soon as is practical to allow products meeting the new labelling requirements to co-exist with the current requirements during a transitional period. The required implementation date is 1st January 2011. Review of the new requirements of the proposed Regulations is possible during the second phase of further amendments of fruit juices and nectars currently in the early stages of discussion at European level.

## **Summary and preferred option**

Option 2 is considered to be the preferred option to be taken forward.

Option 2 provides consumers with improved measures for the minimum quality for juices. Option 2 provides regulatory certainty for manufacturers and ensures that UK industry has a level playing field and can compete on the same legal basis with its EU counterparts. It also will help avoid trade disputes, as levels are similar to that in the Codex standard. The costs of imposing option 2 are minimal for all stakeholders. Those most affected, the fruit juice manufacturers and processors, are in favour of the proposed amending Regulations.

## Annexe 1: Post Implementation Review (PIR) Plan

**Basis of the review:** These Regulations include a review clause which require them, and its parent regulations, the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 , to be reviewed after 5 years from the date of coming into force and the conclusions of the review to be set out in a published report. The Commission have also published a new proposal on 22 September 2010 which will introduce further amendments to the Fruit juice Directive in order to further align with Codex and make any necessary technical adaptations. Negotiations are taking place over the next year with a view to adoption of the proposal by the end of 2011. This will be required to be implemented into UK law within 18 months and will provide a further opportunity for a review of the current amending Regulations and whether there are any issues arising from the introduction of this legislation or indeed whether they are still necessary.

**Review objective:**

1. Check that the new minimum Brix levels are not causing any issues for manufacturers or local authorities.

**Review approach and rationale:**

1. Re evaluate the estimated costs and benefits.
2. Consider feedback from industry, enforcement and consumers as a result of informal discussions in the normal course of business.
3. A further re-evaluation of the impact at the time of introduction of additional measures in approximately 3 years.

**Baseline:**

Option 2 ( preferred) will be the baseline for review if new Regulations put in place.

**Success criteria:**

1. Success will be measured by positive feedback from manufacturers and local authorities
2. A measure of success could also be determined by any enforcement actions been taken by local authorities due to introduction of newly defined Brix levels
- 3 The industry also conduct their own surveillance of the quality of juices on the UK market and this information could inform on whether the measure is working

**Monitoring information arrangements:**

Monitoring is carried out through normal "business as usual" activities via routine discussions and meetings as well as feedback and enquiries from consumers, industry, enforcement bodies and NGOs. These exchanges with stakeholders will be documented and will help to assess whether the policy aims have been met, and to identify positive and negative impacts

**Reasons for not planning a PIR: N/A**

## **Annexe 2: Specific Impact Tests**

### **Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test**

#### **Race equality issues**

No impacts on specific ethnic groups have been identified from the policy options.

#### **Gender equality issues**

No gender specific issues related to the policy options have been identified.

#### **Disability equality issues**

No disability specific issues related to the policy options have been identified.

### **Competition Assessment Impact Test**

The proposed legislation applies to all relevant UK food and drink manufacturers equally, allowing them to trade across EU Member States, if appropriate. It should not limit the number or range of suppliers either directly or indirectly or reduce the ability of, or incentives to, suppliers to compete. Therefore, it is not expected to significantly impact on competition.

### **Small Firms Impact Test**

It is acknowledged that the market for fruit juices is dominated by small and micro businesses. However, as industry is in favour of these Regulations and has been informally consulted during the policy development stage, we do not envisage these Regulations imposing a significant or disproportionate burden on small businesses.

### **Sustainable Development Impact Test**

We do not envisage that either option outlined in this IA will have a significant impact on sustainable development. There are no significant environmental impacts or social benefits associated with this policy and we do not anticipate that our actions will have any impact on future generations.

## TRANSPOSITION NOTE

This Note shows how the requirements of Commission Directive 2009/106/EC (OJ No. L 212, 15.8.2009, p. 42) (“Directive 2009/106/EC”) have been implemented in England.

### Approach of the Regulations

Directive 2009/106/EC is an amending Directive. It amends Council Directive 2001/112/EC (OJ No. L 10, 12.1.2002, p. 58) relating to fruit juices and certain similar products intended for human consumption (“the Fruit Juices Directive”).

The Fruit Juices Directive was implemented in England by the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) Regulations 2003 (S.I. 2003/1564) (“the 2003 Regulations”).

The 2003 Regulations are being amended by the Fruit Juices and Fruit Nectars (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2011 Regulations (“the 2011 Regulations”) to implement the amendments made to the EU Fruit Juices Directive by Directive 2009/106/EC. This means that all the provisions needed in England to implement the EU Fruit Juices Directive, as amended, will be contained in the 2003 Regulations, as amended.

The requirements of the 2009 Directive will be implemented by the 2011 Regulations as follows:

2009 Directive Article	Objective	Provision in the 2011 Regulations
Article 1.1, amending paragraph 6 of Article 3 of the EU Fruit Juices Directive	To make the way in which reconstituted fruit juice is labelled follow the internationally recognised terms laid down in the Codex Standard for fruit juices and nectars.	Regulation 2(3) of the 2011 Regulations, amending regulation 5 of the 2003 Regulations.
Article 1.2, amending paragraph 1(b) of Part I of Annex I to the EU Fruit Juices Directive	To establish minimum Brix levels for a list of fruit juices from concentrate. This will facilitate the testing for minimum quality requirements.	Regulation 2(5) of the 2011 Regulations, amending Schedule 1 to the 2003 Regulations.
Article 1.3, adding Annex V to the EU Fruit Juices Directive	This is the list setting out the minimum Brix levels for the fruit juices from concentrate listed in the list.	Regulation 2(6) of the 2011 Regulations, inserting Schedule 6 to the 2003 Regulations.

European scrutiny: Not applicable. The Directive, having been made by the Commission using delegated powers, was not deposited.