

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

E

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.net

REP11/FFV

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

34th Session

Geneva, Switzerland, 4 – 9 July 2011

REPORT OF THE 16th SESSION OF THE
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Mexico City, Mexico

2 – 6 May 2011

NOTE: This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2011/12-FFV.

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.net

CX 5/95.2

CL 2011/12-FFV

May 2011

TO: - Codex Contact Points
- Interested International Organizations

FROM: Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius Commission,
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme,
Fax: +39 (06) 5705 4593
E-mail: codex@fao.org
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153,
Rome, Italy

SUBJECT: DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (REP11/FFV)

The report of the 15th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables will be considered by the 34th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Geneva, Switzerland, 4– 9 July 2011).

PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 34TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Draft and proposed draft Standards at Steps 8 and 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) of the Procedure

1. Draft Standard for Tree Tomatoes (para. 70 and Appendix III).
2. Proposed draft Standard for Chilli Peppers (para. 92 and Appendix IV).

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above draft and proposed draft standards, should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 3 – Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), preferably by email, to the above address before 15 June 2011.

Proposed draft Standards at Step 5 of the Procedure

3. Proposed draft Standard for Pomegranate (para. 122 and Appendix V)

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above proposed draft Standard, should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 3 – Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), preferably by email, to the above address before 15 June 2011.

PART B: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND INFORMATION

4. Methods of Analysis for the determination of dry matter content (Standard for Avocado) (para. 41 and Appendix II)

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above matter, should do so in writing, taking into account the General Criteria for the Selection of Methods of Analysis as set out in the Principles for the Establishment of Codex Methods of Analysis and the Relations between Commodity Committees and General Committees (Methods of Analysis and Sampling, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), preferably by e-mail, to the above address, before 31 March 2012.

5. Proposals for new work on fresh fruits and vegetables (para. 121)

Governments wishing to propose new work on Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 2 – Critical Review, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), preferably by e-mail, to the above address, before 31 March 2012.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 16th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables reached the following conclusions:

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 34TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Adoption of draft and proposed draft standards

The Committee agreed to forward:

- the draft Standard for Tree Tomatoes for adoption at Step 8 (para. 70 and Appendix III);
- the proposed draft Standard for Chilli Peppers for adoption at Step 5/8 with omission of Step 6/7 (para. 92 and Appendix IV); and
- the proposed draft Standard for Pomegranate for adoption at Step 5 (para. 122 and Appendix V).

Approval of new work

The Committee agreed to request the Commission approval of new work on a Standard for Golden Passion Fruit (para. 143).

Other matters for consideration

The Committee:

- noted the conclusion of the discussion on the change of the title of "UNECE" to "UN" standards and the recommendation of the Commission as regards cooperation and coordination of work with the UNECE (para. 7);
- agreed that there was no need to develop specific decision-making and priority setting criteria for the development (including revision and amendments) of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables (para. 12);
- agreed that the Codex Regional Standard for Chanterelles should be kept regional (para. 13);
- noted that the timeframe for the finalization of the revision of the Standard for Avocado was 2011 and agreed to retain the draft revised Standard at Step 7 waiting for the finalization of uniformity rules and other size-related provisions at its next session and to inform the Executive Committee accordingly (paras. 29 and 58); and
- agreed the Codex and UNECE Secretariats would work on a draft revised layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits vegetables taking into account the 2010 revision of the UNECE layout and highlighting the main differences between Codex and UNECE layouts (para. 137).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	page iii
REPORT OF THE 16 TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.....	page 1
SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK.....	page 14
	Paragraphs
INTRODUCTION.....	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION.....	2-3
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1).....	4
MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 2a)	
– Decisions of the Commission in regard to the work of the CCFFV.....	5
– Change of title of “UNECE” to “UN” Standards.....	6-7
– Development of Specific decision making and priority setting criteria for the development (including revision and amendment) of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.....	8-12
– Revision of the Codex Regional Standard for Chanterelles.....	13
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2b)	
– UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards.....	14-22
– OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables.....	23-26
UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2c).....	27
DRAFT STANDARD FOR AVOCADO (REVISION OF CODEX STAN 197-1995) (Agenda Item 3a).....	28-59
DRAFT STANDARD FOR TREE TOMATOES (Agenda Item 3b).....	60-70
PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR CHILLI PEPPERS (Agenda Item 4a).....	71-93
PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE (Agenda Item 4b).....	94-123
PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 5).....	124-138
POINT OF APPLICATION OF CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES INCLUDING QUALITY TOLERANCES AT IMPORT/EXPORT CONTROL POINTS (Agenda Item 6).....	139-144
PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 7).....	145
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 8).....	146
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 9).....	
APPENDICES	
Appendix I: List of Participants.....	page 15
Appendix II: Draft Standard for Avocado (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995).....	page 24
Appendix III: Draft Standard for Tree Tomatoes	page 28
Appendix IV: Proposed Draft for Chilli Peppers.....	page 32
Appendix V: Proposed Draft Standard for Pomegranate.....	page 36

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CCFFV) held its 16th session in Mexico City (Mexico) from 2 to 6 May 2011, at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. The Chairperson of the Committee, Mr Christian Turégano Roldán, Director General, General Bureau of Standards, Ministry of Economy appointed Ms Andrea Barrios, International Standardization Director, General Bureau of Standards, to chair the Session on his behalf. The Session was attended by 41 Member countries, 1 Member Organization and Observers from 2 international organizations and 2 regional organizations. The list of participants is given in Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Dr. Bruno Ferrari de Alba, Minister of Economy, welcomed the participants and opened the session on behalf of the Government of Mexico. Mr Mariano Ruíz-Funes Macedo, Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA) and Ms Maria del Carmen Culebro, FAO Assistant Representative in Mexico, also addressed the Committee.

Division of Competence

3. The Committee noted the division of competence¹ between the European Union and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)²

4. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as the Agenda for the Session and agreed to discuss Agenda Item 7 after finalization of Agenda Item 4.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 2a)³

PART 1: MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Decisions of the Commission in regard to the work of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

5. The Committee noted the final adoption of the draft Standard for Apples, the adoption of the proposed draft Standards for Avocados and Tree Tomatoes at Step 5 and the approval of new work on a Standard for Pomegranate.

Change of title of “United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)” to “United Nations (UN)” standards

6. The Committee noted the clarification provided at the Commission by the Representative of the WHO Legal Counsel concerning this matter: in 1998 the legal opinion of the Office of the Legal Affairs had stated that such change would be unlikely to be approved by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC) and that in February 2010, doubts on the possibility to come to a different conclusion than in 1998 were expressed by the Senior Legal Adviser of the United Nations Office in Geneva.

7. The Committee noted the recommendation of the Commission on the need for the CCFFV to cooperate and coordinate with the UNECE towards the elaboration of harmonized standards without duplication of effort. While avoiding any unnecessary duplication of work, the collaboration would also benefit UNECE by giving international recognition to its standards as the Terms of Reference of the Committee allows the Commission to use UNECE standards and recommend them for worldwide application

PART 2: DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIFIC DECISION MAKING AND PRIORITY SETTING CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING REVISION AND AMENDMENTS) OF CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

8. The Committee noted that when considering a study on the speed of the Codex standards-setting process, the Executive Committee noted that in some cases development of standards in the CCFFV had taken longer because of regional differences and the need to cooperate with the UNECE in compliance with its Terms of Reference. The Executive Committee also noted that the general recommendation to follow the requirements of the Critical Review would facilitate work of the CCFFV and invited the Committee to reconsider the need to develop specific decision making and priority setting criteria taking into account its previous discussion in this regard.

9. Some delegations disagreed with the statement that delays had been due to harmonization with the UNECE and were of the opinion that input from the UNECE could rather speed up the standard setting process in the CCFFV.

¹ CRD 1 (Annotated Agenda – Division of competence between the European Union and its Member States).

² CX/FFV 11/16/1. Comments: CRD 4 (Mexico).

³ CX/FFV 11/16/2; CX FFV 11/16/2-Add.1 (Comments from Argentina, Cuba, European Union, Jamaica and United States of America). Additional comments: CRD 4 (Mexico); CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 7 (European Union); and CRD 15 (Mali).

10. The Committee noted that the study on the speed of the Codex standards-setting process was carried out to analyze the efficiency of the standard development of different committees within the Codex system therefore had not compared the efficiency of the work output of the CCFFV vis-à-vis the UNECE Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. In this regard, a delegation indicated that it would not be possible to make a parallel between the efficiency of the standard setting process in the CCFFV and the UNECE Specialized Section on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables as they have different meeting intervals namely the CCFFV meets every 18 months while the UNECE Specialized Section meets twice a year.

11. A delegation suggested that delays might be due to countries attempting to include diverse and controversial issues in standards. They believed that a clear standard layout could help to avoid such delays. This view was supported by another delegation who also suggested that, if the output of the Committee was not meeting the expectations of the Executive Committee, the process used should be properly analyzed, the problems diagnosed and proposals should be made on how to improve the performance of the CCFFV.

12. The Committee agreed that there was no need to develop specific decision-making and priority setting criteria as the existing guidance in the Procedural Manual was sufficient and the delays in standard setting were not due to the absence of specific criteria.

PART 3: REVISION OF THE CODEX REGIONAL STANDARD FOR CHANTERELLES

13. The Committee agreed that the Standard should be kept regional as chantarelles were mainly traded within Europe and the volume of trade did not require a global standard. The Committee therefore agreed that there was no need for a worldwide Codex Standard for Chanterelles.

MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2b)⁴

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (UNECE)

Activities of the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards since the last session of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

14. The Committee noted the information provided by the Representative of the UNECE on the main issues of interest to its work arising from sessions of the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards and its Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

15. In particular, the Committee noted that the Working Party had decided to retain "UNECE" in the title of UNECE standards and to withdraw "United Nations Economic Commission for Europe" from the upper part of the cover page of the standards. This decision was based on the legal advice received from the Senior Legal Adviser of the UN Office at Geneva (see Agenda Item 2a).

16. The Representative of the UNECE informed the Committee on the outcome of the first Joint Codex/UNECE workshop held prior to the session. The purpose of the workshop was to promote the use of Codex and UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as international references, to show how the standards are interpreted and applied in practice in the European export markets, and to encourage closer cooperation between Codex and UNECE.

17. The Representative further informed the Committee that at the workshop, the Codex and UNECE Secretariats presented the role of each bodies in developing agricultural quality standards for international trade and an expert of the Central Office of Hungary made a presentation on the new EU regulation on marketing standards. The UNECE technical experts from Spain and South Africa presented the standards for table grapes, citrus fruit and apples pointing out the differences between Codex and UNECE standards. The presentations were followed by two practical sessions, on apples and oranges, at which the participants in the workshop were asked to evaluate and classify samples of each product.

18. The Representative reported that the participants found the workshop useful and asked the two Secretariats to promote the organization of practical workshops in the future, particularly for growers, traders and inspectors. The participants stressed the urgent need to harmonize Codex and UNECE standards which should start with the harmonization of the standard layouts and that the Secretariats should support and facilitate this process.

19. The Delegation of Mexico, as host country of the CCFFV, thanked the Codex and UNECE Secretariats for the organization of this event and stressed the need for harmonization of standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and layouts.

20. Other delegations mentioned the need for more training on quality inspection at country level and for more information on the differences between Codex and UNECE standards. The Committee noted that the Codex Secretariat did not provide technical assistance to Codex members in the implementation of Codex standards but participated in capacity building activities carried out by FAO/WHO and other international organizations.

⁴ CX/FFV 10/16/3. Comments: CRD 4 (Mexico) and CRD 16 (Indonesia).

21. The Committee also noted that efforts for harmonizing the standard layouts could facilitate harmonization of general requirements so that the Committee could better focus on the provisions particular to the produce that may differ between Codex and UNECE standards.

22. The Committee agreed that the harmonization of the standard layouts would be discussed under Agenda Item 5.

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

Activities of the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables since the last session of the Committee on Fresh Fruit and Vegetables

23. The Committee noted the information provided by Representative of the OECD on the main issues of interest to its work arising from meetings of the OECD Scheme in particular the interest to cooperate with Codex and FAO on different issues relating to the application of quality standards for fruits and vegetables as proposed in the working document.

24. The Representative informed the Committee that the Scheme had adopted the Codex Standard for Bananas as an OECD Standard in 2010 so that it can be used as a reference standard for the OECD quality inspection system applied by members of the Scheme. In this regard the Scheme's members had considered developing an OECD brochure for bananas and would like to receive the opinion of Codex members, especially banana producing countries, if such a brochure would be of use to them. The same consideration could be applied for the development of an OECD brochure on pomegranate in the future.

25. The Representative also informed the Committee that the Scheme would invite interested producing countries to participate in the development of the OECD brochure once the work was launched. He described the present OECD practice as regards participation of non-Scheme members in the development of an OECD brochure: observer countries would be invited to participate in the special working group meetings and electronic fora where the explanatory text and illustrations would be discussed. He clarified that the OECD brochure would not be an official interpretation of the Codex Standard however, it could serve as useful explanatory material for inspection services in producing and importing countries as well as for all parties involved in the international trade of bananas. He invited Codex members to contact the OECD Secretariat (csaba.gaspar@oecd.org) if they were interested in the development of an OECD brochure for bananas.

26. The Committee noted that this was an informal request from the OECD to Codex members with a view to examining possible ways of cooperation on the development of explanatory materials.

UNECE Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (Agenda Item 2c)⁵

27. The Committee noted that UNECE texts were made available as references for the development of corresponding Codex standards as directed by the Executive Committee. The Committee agreed that the UNECE texts would be taken into account when discussing the relevant agenda items.

DRAFT STANDARD FOR AVOCADO (Revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995) (Agenda Item 3a)⁶

28. The Delegation of Cuba, as leading country of the electronic working group on avocado, presented a summary of the work carried out by the working group in the revision of the Standard based on the information provided in CX/FFV 11/16/5.

29. The Chair of the Committee drew the attention of delegates that the timeframe for completion of the revision of the standards under consideration, i.e. avocado, tree tomatoes and chilli peppers, was 2011 and therefore, efforts should be made to reach consensus in the discussion of the provisions in the standards with a view to send them for final adoption by the 34th Session of the Commission in July 2011.

30. The Committee considered the Standard section by section and made the following comments and decisions:

Section 1 Definition of Produce

31. The Committee agreed to delete the reference to "cultivars" and to refer to "commercial varieties" only as not all cultivars were traded commercially. It was noted that this would provide for more flexibility in the application of the Standard as it would allow for new commercial varieties to be covered by the Standard even if the cultivar had not been identified therefore facilitating industry and marketing innovation. The Committee also agreed to remove the reference to the synonym as there were other synonyms for the botanical name hence the reference to the scientific name was sufficient to define the scope of the Standard.

⁵ CX/FFV 11/16/4. Comments: CRD 4 (Mexico).

⁶ CX/FFV 11/16/5; CX/FFV 11/16/5-Add.1 (Comments from Costa Rica, European Union, Jamaica, Kenya New Zealand and United States of America). Additional comments: CRD 4 (Mexico); CRD 5 (Switzerland); CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 8 (Burundi); CRD 9 (Malaysia); CRD 11 (Thailand); CRD 13 (United States); CRD 14 (Guatemala); CRD 15 (Mali); CRD 16 (Indonesia); CRD 17 (Ghana); and CRD 18 (Report of the in-session working group on sizing).

Section 2.1 Minimum Requirements

32. The Committee agreed to delete the provisions in footnote 1 allowing for smell caused by the use of preservatives or any other chemical substances since their use could affect the natural organoleptic characteristics of the fruit.

Section 2.1.1

33. The Committee agreed to remove the reference to “carefully picked” as compliance with this requirement cannot be verified at the point of inspection. In addition, the Committee noted the following considerations in support of this decision: the application of the Standard does not allow for differentiating each cause of physical damage of the fruit; Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, including avocado, apply to produce “after preparation and packaging” therefore handling requirements for harvest/post-harvest processes are excluded from the standards; and handling at harvest/post harvest may result in skin defects which are appropriately dealt with in the quality classes.

34. Based on the above, the Committee agreed to introduce consequential amendments in all Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables carrying this provision for consistency. The Committee further agreed that this issue should also be considered when discussing the Codex layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

35. The Representative of the UNECE informed the Committee that this requirement had been removed from the UNECE Layout and consequently from the relevant individual UNECE standards.

36. The Committee agreed to remove the reference to “commercial types” throughout the Standard as avocados were traded by variety and there were no provisions for commercial types in the Standard.

37. The Committee also considered the need to retain the provision by which mature avocados should be free of bitterness. Some delegations indicated that this provision was not necessary as maturity of avocado was already covered by the provisions in the first sentence by which avocados must be harvested when they have reached a stage of physiological development that will ensure the completion of the ripening process at the point of destination/sale. These delegations indicated that compliance with this provision would require destructive tests that would result in unnecessary loss of produce. Other delegations favoured the retention of this provision as it provided for additional assurance that the fruit was matured and was harvested in accordance with the provisions in the first sentence. It was noted that this provision already existed in the Standard in force and was in line with the UNECE Standard for Avocado. Based on these considerations, the Committee agreed to retain this provision in the Standard.

Section 2.1.2 Maturity Requirements

38. The Committee discussed whether or not to retain this section in the Standard. It was noted that this requirement could introduce more restrictive requirements for compliance than the Standard in force. It was also noted that the proposed varieties / percentages might exclude other commercial varieties of avocados that are currently being traded or could be traded thus limiting innovation in industry and marketing practices. It was further noted that the Standard should facilitate market access as opposed to creating technical barriers to trade.

39. In addition, it was questioned whether the measurement of dry matter content was a quality parameter used in trade of avocados and whether provisions in Section 2.1.1 already provided for inclusiveness and flexibility in the application of maturity requirements as they applied to varieties in general taking into account the peculiarities associated with them and the growing area (e.g. soil, climate conditions, etc.). It was noted that dry matter content was a usual method to assess maturity of avocados but that there might be other methods used by trading operators therefore the possibility to remove this requirement from the Standard could be considered. In this regard, it was explained that dry matter content provides for an objective method to determine maturity of avocados as it is related to the oil content therefore it is an additional tool to ensure maturity of the fruit.

40. Furthermore, if the maturity requirements in Section 2.1.2 were to be retained, the scientific basis for the percentages associated to the varieties should be provided. In particular, the 18% allocated to the Antillean varieties was requested to be deleted as dry matter content for Antillean/West Indian/Guatemalan and other not defined varieties had not been scientifically validated within the main producing regions/countries and they were usually marketed as one variety since their physical characteristics were indistinguishable. Therefore, there were no scientific grounds to support the establishment of distinct maturity requirements for these varieties.

41. Based on the above considerations, the Committee agreed to retain the provisions for maturity requirements while deleting the dry matter content of 18% for Antillean varieties and amending the provisions for dry matter content for other varieties excepting Antillean/West Indian/Guatemalan and other not defined varieties which may have lower dry matter content. In this connection, the Committee agreed to delete the provisions for methods of analysis for Antillean varieties as described in footnote 2 and to include a reference analytical method for the determination of dry matter content in a separate section on methods of analysis and sampling. The Committee also agreed to delete the reference to the varieties “Ettinger” and “Zutano”.

42. The delegations of Colombia and Kenya expressed their reservation on the percentages values of dry matter content presented in the section.

Section 2.2 Classification

43. The Committee agreed to delete the reference to “shape and colouring” in Classes I and II as avocado must be characteristic in all aspects related to the variety. Some delegations were of the opinion that this would make the provision too general and would not facilitate the application of the Standard as to the characteristics that should be inspected and thus may add unnecessary burden to inspection agencies. It was noted that some other characteristics like smell or texture may also be relevant depending on the variety therefore the Standard should remain flexible in the implementation of this provision.

Section 3 Provisions concerning sizing

44. The Committee agreed to replace the provisions for sizing with a new proposal that provides for better clarity in the interpretation of the provisions. The Committee agreed that avocados can be sized by weight or by count of fruits or by diameter. It was explained that the size codes represent the number of avocados that can fill in a tray of 4 kg with fruits of different weight bands i.e. the size code multiplied by the average weight range were approximately equal to 4 kg for each of the row in the sizing table.

45. The Committee noted that for avocados sized by count, uniformity rules should be further developed in Section 5.1. It was explained that this would allow for different sizing count practices applied by trade operators to be covered by the Standard while ensuring uniformity of presentation in the package by establishing maximum differences in size between fruits in the same package in relation to the size indicated on the package.

46. In view of the above considerations, the Committee agreed to place the provisions for size (Section 3), size tolerances (Section 4.2), uniformity (Section 5.1) and size labelling (Section 6.2.4) into square brackets waiting for the finalization of the uniformity rules and size tolerances. The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group led by Spain and working in English and Spanish to provide a proposal for uniformity rules and size tolerances for finalization by the next session of the Committee.

Section 4.1 Quality Tolerances

47. The Committee considered a proposal to introduce tolerances for decay and internal breakdown at the point of destination in the 3 quality classes. It was indicated that due to the highly perishable nature of avocados these tolerances were necessary to allow a certain degree of deterioration due to the development and tendency of the fruit to perish especially during transportation following export. The Delegation of Thailand did not agree with the statement that avocado was a “*highly*” perishable fruit.

48. Some delegations expressed concern that provisions for decay may allow the introduction of pests/diseases in the importing country which would be against the national plant protection regulations. Other delegations questioned the need for such provisions as it was not the common practice in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and reminded the Committee that the current provisions for internal breakdown and decay in the Codex Standard for Apples were not supported by all Codex members who participated in the development of that Standard.

49. Some other delegations felt that they could agree on the introduction of tolerances for decay as provided for in the UNECE layout and consistently applying in individual UNECE standards. It was explained that tolerances for decay as generally applied in UNECE standards were not sufficient to address the particular characteristics of avocados therefore higher tolerance percentages for decay including internal breakdown were necessary to provide for flexibility in the implementation of the Standard. This view was supported by some delegations who indicated that tolerances for decay and internal breakdown was a realistic recognition of what happened in practice with shipping of fresh fruits and vegetables and also reflected current industry and marketing practices.

50. A delegation stated that internal breakdown was associated with the senescence of the fruit while decay was associated with non-pathogenic microbial contamination therefore these provisions were not contradictory with the international phytosanitary standards developed by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) or the national plant protection regulations in force.

51. The Committee could not agree on the introduction of tolerances for decay and internal breakdown and agreed to reconsider this issue at its next session based on the technical justification for the inclusion of such tolerances and the associated figures that would be presented by those countries interested in having these provisions included in the Standard. In addition, the Committee noted that this was a general issue that should also be addressed in the framework of the discussion of the layout.

Section 5.2 Packaging

52. The Committee noted a comment on the need for clearer guidance on how to interpret the provisions in the first paragraph of this section in particular what should be the requirements associated to the “quality” of the materials used inside the package that must be ensured for compliance with this provision.

53. It was noted that the term “new” was restrictive and should be changed to “appropriate”. In this regard, the Committee was informed that the UNECE layout and the individual UNECE standards had removed the reference to “clean” as with current packaging technologies the quality of packages and associated materials did not require they should necessarily be new.

54. However, the Committee noted that the footnote applying to the term “new” provides for flexibility in the application of this provision by allowing re-cycled packaging materials as long as they are of food-graded quality. The Committee further noted that this provision consistently applied to Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and therefore decided to leave the section unchanged and to consider this issue further when discussing the layout.

Sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.2 Marking or labelling of retail and non-retail packages

55. A delegation questioned the need for labelling provisions for retail and non-retail containers in sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.2 as they belong to the domestic market while Codex standards only applied at export/import control points. The Committee noted that Codex standards, including Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, applied to domestic and imported foods as evidence by the provisions contained in the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods and that the provisions as currently presented in the Standard were consistent with the marking and labelling provisions applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

56. Other countries questioned whether the name of the produce should apply in all cases and not only when the package is not visible from the outside. The Committee noted that provisions in section 6.1.1 relating to consumer packages might be not in line with the General Standard as it prescribed mandatory labelling of the name of the product regardless of the visibility of the contents of the package. The Committee noted that this wording consistently applied to Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and that a general decision should be made when discussing the layout in this regard. The Committee also noted that the provisions in Section 6.2.2 as regards labelling of non-retail packages if the product is not visible from the outside also corresponds to the standardized language applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

57. Based on the above considerations the Committee agreed to leave both sections unchanged. The Committee however noted that the issue of labelling packages in all cases (sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.2) could be further examined when considering the layout as this was a matter of general nature that will have implications in the other Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

STATUS OF THE DRAFT STANDARD FOR AVOCADO (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995)

58. The Committee agreed to retain the Standard at Step 7 waiting for the completion of the provisions on size uniformity with a view to finalizing the Standard by the next session of the Committee (Appendix II).

59. The Committee further agreed that the next session will focus its discussion on the finalization of the sizing provisions and associated provisions i.e. tolerances and labelling as well as the possibility of including tolerances for internal breakdown and decay in the quality classes with a view to finalize the Standard for adoption by the Commission in 2013 and to inform the Executive Committee accordingly.

DRAFT STANDARD FOR TREE TOMATOES (Agenda Item 3b)⁷

60. The Delegation of Colombia, as leading country of the electronic working on tree tomatoes introduced the document and summarized the discussions that took place in the working group as provided in document CX/FFV 11/16/6. The Delegation informed the Committee that the revised provisions on sizing and their tolerances were presented for consideration by the Committee.

61. The Committee considered the Standard section by section and made the following comments and amendments:

Section 1 Definition of produce

62. The Committee noted that the botanical name for tree tomato had an alternative name and therefore agreed to retain the two names “*Cyphomandra betaceae* Sendt” and “*Solanum betaceum* Cav.” in the Standard.

Section 2.1 Minimum requirements

63. The Committee agreed to delete footnote 2 relating to foreign smell and/or taste for consistency with the decision taken for avocado for a similar provision (see Agenda Item 3a).

64. In Section 2.1.1, the Committee agreed to delete the reference to “carefully picked” for consistency with the decision taken for avocado for a similar provision (see Agenda Item 3a).

Section 3 Provisions concerning sizing

65. The Committee discussed the sizing provisions that remained in square brackets for further consideration. It was considered that the provisions should maintain the necessary level of harmonization to facilitate international trade in tree tomatoes and at the same time to allow for flexibility to choose between alternative methods of sizing and not be overly restrictive.

⁷ CX/FFV 11/16/6; CX/FFV 11/16/6-Add.1 (comments of Costa Rica, European Union, Kenya and the United States of America); Additional comments: CRD 4 (Mexico); CRD 5 (Switzerland); CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 7 (European Union); CRD 9 (Malaysia); CRD 11 (Thailand); and CRD 14 (Guatemala).

66. The Committee revised the provisions to reflect that tree tomatoes could be sized by diameter, weight and count to provide for flexibility in the application of sizing requirements. The Committee deleted the column for sizing by number of fruit (count), noting that this requirement was overly restrictive as only trays with the count ranges indicated in the column could be used. Instead, the Committee agreed to provide for a more flexible provision for counting by only referring to the number of fruit per package without applying any specific size range.

67. The Committee also agreed to add minimum values for size by diameter and by weight, as 45g and 35mm respectively, to specify commercially accepted minimum size.

Section 4.2 Size tolerance

68. A delegation pointed out that the current text did not allow any fruit that was much smaller or larger than the size groups immediately above and/or below, and proposed a modification of the provision. The Committee noted that the text was used in most of the Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and agreed to leave the text as such. The Committee noted that proposals for changes could be made in the discussion on the layout.

Section 6.2.4 Commercial Identification

69. The Committee agreed to maintain all options for sizing in the second indent in order to leave the maximum flexibility to trade.

STATUS OF THE DRAFT STANDARD FOR TREE TOMATOES

70. The Committee agreed to forward the Standard to the 34th Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix III).

PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR CHILLI PEPPERS (Agenda Item 4a)⁸

71. The Delegation of Mexico, as leading country of the electronic working group on chilli peppers, introduced working document CX/FFV 11/16/7 containing a summary of the discussion held and the main issues debated in the working group in particular on classification (Section 2.2) and sizing (Section 3).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

72. Many delegations stressed the fact that different varieties of chilli peppers with different characteristics were grown all over the world and that Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should be open to new varieties without the need to amend it each time a new variety was commercialized. Other delegations mentioned that the indication of the six varieties in the sizing table and the annex was meant to be indicative (table) and to give a description of these varieties (annex) which was important information for traders and consumers. Therefore, the list of varieties had not been intended to exclude any other commercial varieties but to present the most traded varieties however the list could be updated and eventually completed at a later stage.

73. The Committee recalled that it had noted at its 15th Session that any comprehensive listing of varieties would require a significant amount of resources in its development, which the Committee had tried to avoid during the consideration of standards for table grapes and apples. The Committee also recalled that the Executive Committee had observed that the use of lists in Codex texts would in general delay the progress of work.⁹

74. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to replace the term “commercial type” with “variety” throughout the text and to replace the present sizing table with a general table independent of the variety to provide for more inclusiveness in the application of sizing provisions. The Committee also agreed to replace the present annex on varieties with a new annex containing a classification of pungency into four classes based on the content of capsaicinoids as this being the relevant parameter to differentiate among different varieties of chilli peppers.

75. The Committee considered the Standard section by section and made the following comments and decisions:

Section 1 Definition of produce

76. The Committee agreed to delete the words “hot ajies” from the English version as this term was only used in Spanish speaking countries. The Committee also agreed to change the minimum Scoville Index in the footnote from 1000 to 900 to accommodate preferences of consumers for milder chillies in different countries. The Committee also agreed to add an additional sentence to the footnote to make reference to the new annex.

77. The Committee noted that the expression “grown from *Capsicum spp*” allowed the Standard to cover different species within the same family therefore providing for a broad scope in the application of the Standard.

⁸ CX/FFV 10/16/7; CX/FFV 10/16/7-Add.1 (comments of Argentina, Costa Rica, European Union, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Philippines and Switzerland); additional comments: CRD 4 (Mexico); CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 9 (Malaysia); CRD 10 (Cuba); CRD 11 (Thailand); CRD 14 (Guatemala); CRD 15 (Mali); CRD 16 (Indonesia); and CRD 17 (Ghana).

⁹ ALINORM 10/33/35, para. 79.

Section 2.1 Minimum requirements

78. The Committee agreed to delete the indent concerning signs of de-hydration as it was contradictory with the minimum requirement for firmness. The Committee noted that the inclusion of "disease" in addition to damage caused by pests was already considered by previous sessions of the CCFV and the Committee had agreed not to change the current wording as the definition of "pests" already encompassed "disease" and "parasites" in the relevant phytosanitary standard developed by the IPPC¹⁰.

79. In Section 2.1.1, the Committee agreed to include an additional sentence to address the maturity of the fruit and noted that this was also in line with the standard language used in other Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Section 3 Provisions concerning sizing

80. The Committee agreed to delete the present sizing table as it was complex, only covered six varieties, was very specific and could be difficult to apply. The Committee also agreed that sizing of chilli peppers was commonly done by length and therefore agreed that size should be determined by length.

81. Several delegations were of the opinion that a simple mention to the length was sufficient and leave the Standard flexible to allow different sizing tables to be used. Other delegations felt that a sizing table should be included to be in line with the standard presentation for sizing in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and to give an indication to users of the standard how sizing could be implemented.

82. Based on the above considerations, the Committee agreed that sizing be determined by length and to include a sizing table with five size codes independent of the varieties.

Section 4 Quality tolerances

83. A delegation stated that in their view the indication of tolerances of "5%" and "10%" by number or weight in Extra Class and Classes I and II was misleading and could open the door for fraudulent practices and proposed to add the words "not more than" at the beginning of the provisions to be clear about the nature of the tolerances. The Committee noted that these tolerances consistently apply in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables agreed to discuss this as a horizontal issue when considering the layout.

Section 4.1 Size tolerances

84. The Committee agreed to align this provision with the standard language applying to most of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables i.e. 10% by number or weight for all classes.

Section 5.1 Uniformity

85. The Committee agreed to delete provisions concerning chilli peppers transported in bulk throughout the Standard as this was not appropriate for this produce.

86. The Committee noted an intervention that the term "emballage" (= packaging) was not used correctly in the French version and that the term "colis" (= package) was more appropriate to interpret properly the provisions relating to packages in this section. The Committee also recalled its previous discussion on avocado on the terms "new" and "of a quality" (see Agenda Item 3a).

Section 5.3 Presentation

87. The Committee agreed to delete the entire section as it may limit other forms of presentations used in other countries / regions.

Sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.2 Marking or labelling of retail and non-retail packages

88. The Committee recalled its discussion on this matter when considered the Standard for Avocado (see Agenda Item 3a). In addition, the Committee agreed to require mandatory labelling of the variety and the pungency as important information to the consumer and in view of the broad scope of the Standard.

Section 6.2.4 Commercial identification

89. The Committee agreed to add a new indent to require labelling of pungency as important information for trader operators in view of the broad scope of the Standard.

Annex

90. The Committee agreed to delete the existing annex and to include a new annex containing a classification of chilli peppers by pungency through the establishment of four classes (mild, medium, hot and extra hot) indicating for each class the relevant ranges of Scoville index and equivalent capsaicinoid content.

¹⁰ ALINORM 08/31/35, para. 29.

91. The Committee noted that internationally validated methods for the determination of pungency existed that could be included in the Standard subject to endorsement by the Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS).

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR CHILLI PEPPERS

92. The Committee agreed to advance the Standard to Step 5/8, with omission of Step 6/7, for adoption by the 34th Session of the Commission (Appendix IV).

93. The delegation of Thailand reserved their position on this decision.

PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE (Agenda Item 4b)¹¹

94. The Committee noted that the Delegation of Iran, leading country of the electronic working group on pomegranate, was not able to attend the meeting and that the summary of the discussions of the working group was available in document CX/FFV 11/16/8.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

95. Many delegations noted that the annex containing a table on the percentage of certain defects allowed in the different quality classes was confusing and difficult to understand. The Committee therefore agreed to delete the annex and remove all references to it from the Standard.

96. The Committee noted that for pomegranates the term “arils” was more appropriate to designate the edible part of the fruit but could not reach an agreement on whether to leave the term “flesh” or replace it with either “edible part” or “arils” and consequently decided to leave the three terms in square brackets wherever flesh was mentioned for further discussion.

97. The Committee also agreed to delete the reference to “cultivars” in the whole text as trade of pomegranates related to commercial varieties and the term “cultivar” was used in this Standard as a synonym of “variety”.

98. The Committee considered the Standard section by section and made the following amendments and comments:

Section 1 Definition of Produce

99. The Committee noted that there might be a need to review the family name as “Punicaceae” corresponded to a sub-family of the “Lythraceae” family.

Section 2.1 Minimum requirements

100. The Committee agreed to delete the indent on the absence of dead insects as this was already covered by the indent addressing pests and damaged caused by pests. It was also agreed to delete the indent on cracking as this was a common defect for pomegranates which in most cases did not affect the edible part of the fruit therefore this defect could be better dealt with in the quality classes. It was also agreed to delete the indent on external shrivelling and wilting as they were already covered by the maturity requirements in Section 2.1.1.

101. There was some discussion as to whether to include an indent on damages due to sunburn as some delegations felt that this was already covered under the indent on damages caused by high temperatures. It was clarified that this was a singular defect specifically caused by exposure of one part of the fruit to the sun which impacted on colouring and could also affect the edible part of the fruit. The Committee therefore agreed to include provisions for sunburn that affect the edible part of the fruit.

102. There was also some discussion concerning the indent on damage caused by frost vis-à-vis low temperatures. It was clarified that damages caused by low temperatures did not refer to freezing temperatures (i.e. below 0°C) and may address damages caused by bad management of the cold storage or low temperatures associated with climatic conditions. It was further clarified that damages caused by freezing temperatures may also occur due to the factors explained in the previous sentence but the damages caused to the fruit were different than those caused by low temperatures and in both cases there could be damage to the flesh of the fruit. In view of this, the Committee agreed to split the indent into one addressing damage by frost and another covering damages caused by low and/or high temperatures.

103. The Committee agreed to align the text of the first sentence in Section 2.1.1 with the standard language and clarified that the words “in accordance with the growing region” were necessary to allow for diverse geoclimatic conditions under which pomegranates could be grown.

Section 2.2 Classification

104. As a consequence to deleting “cracking” from the minimum requirements, the Committee agreed to amend Classes I and II by including cracking as a skin defect.

¹¹ CX/FFV 10/16/8; CX/FFV 10/16/8-Add.1 (comments of Colombia, Costa Rica, India, European Union and Thailand); additional comments: CRD 4 (Mexico), CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 9 (Malaysia); CRD 11 (Thailand); CRD 12 (European Union); CRD 14 (Guatemala); and CRD 15 (Mali).

105. The Committee noted a proposal to include a colour chart to indicate diverse acceptable colouring of pomegranates. In this regard, the Committee noted that it was presently not its Terms of Reference to develop colour charts and other explanatory materials but if the Committee wished to include such work in its Mandate it could be proposed to the Commission. However, the Committee did not agree to include a colour chart in the Standard.

106. The Representative of the OECD Scheme reiterated the interest of the Scheme in developing an explanatory brochure in parallel with the development of the Codex Standard for Pomegranate and invited interested Codex members to contact the OECD Secretariat if they wished to participate in this work.

Section 3 Provisions concerning sizing

107. The Committee discussed whether more detailed sizing provisions should be included in the Standard. Several delegations were of the opinion that this was important to ensure uniformity. As different sizing systems were used across the world it was proposed to apply uniformity rules that would allow for flexibility in the application of different sizing practices while ensuring uniformity in the package. The Committee noted the clarification that sizing was not meant to exclude or penalize smaller fruit as these could also present good colouring and eating quality and that the rationale for having sizing provisions was precisely to ensure uniformity in the package.

108. The Committee agreed that uniformity was an important aspect and provisionally agreed to include sizing provisions by weight and diameter as well as corresponding sizing tables but to leave the whole section in square brackets for further discussion.

Section 4.2 Size tolerances

109. The Committee agreed to align this section with the standard language applying in most of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Section 5.1 Uniformity

110. The Committee agreed to delete the words "(if sized)" as a consequence to including sizing provisions in Section 3.

111. The Committee discussed the provisions concerning packages with mixed sizes and varieties. Some delegations proposed that varieties in mixed packages should be distinctly different to allow the consumer to easily distinguish the products. Other delegations were of the opinion that this was not necessary but that country of origin should be indicated for the varieties contained. A delegation proposed to delete the provisions on mixed packages entirely as Codex standards applied only to international trade. The Committee noted that Codex standards could apply at all levels of the distribution chain and that there was not restriction to apply them only in international trade.

112. Another delegation proposed to delete the provisions for mixed packages as application of traceability could be more difficult and was against the uniformity requirements. In this regard, it was noted that mixing different varieties of pomegranates in sales packages or packages containing sales packages was a common practice and should be acknowledged in the Standard.

113. In view of the discussion on mixed packages, the Committee agreed to maintain the whole section in square brackets for further consideration.

Section 6.1.1 Nature of produce

114. The Committee agreed to keep the first part of the section concerning visibility of the produce from the outside in square brackets for further discussion in the framework of the layout (see also Agenda Item 3a).

115. The Committee also agreed to delete the words "(if used)" as a consequence to including sizing provisions under Section 3.

Section 6.2.4 Commercial identification

116. Some delegations proposed to delete the indent relating to declaration of use of preservatives as most of the products used in post-harvest treatments were classified as pesticides (e.g. fungicides) to preserve the shelf-life of the produce and therefore their use was covered by the provisions in Section 7.2.

117. The Committee noted that for the purposes of Codex preservatives were food additives regulated by the General Standard for Food Additives and that the GSFA provides for the use of food additives for surface-treated fresh fruits when the surfaces of certain fresh fruit were coated with glazes or waxes or were treated with other food additives acting as protective coatings and/or helping to preserve the freshness and quality of the fruit. If this was the case, when referring to "preservatives" reference could be made to the GSFA or a specific section of food additives identifying the relevant technological function/food additives could be established.

118. Some delegations were against making reference to the GSFA as preservatives were not used in fresh fruits and vegetables but only as post-harvest treatments. A delegation noted that if preservatives were meant to refer to chemical substances used in post harvest treatment the labelling requirement might imply labelling of pesticides which was not a common labelling practice. Another delegation stated that the use of preservatives was important information for the consumer.

119. The Committee noted an intervention that net weight should be mandatory. It was noted that net weight should be kept optional as pomegranates were also sold by count.

120. Based on the above considerations the Committee agreed to delete the labelling requirements for preservatives and to keep the declaration of net weight optional. The Committee also agreed to delete the additional marking requirements in the last indent as not necessary.

Section 7 Contaminants

121. It was mentioned that for pomegranates no pesticides were currently authorized thus the section on pesticides could be deleted. The Committee noted that the Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was currently considering the establishment of grouping MRLs that could be applied to minor use/specialty crops therefore it would be more prudent to maintain the section in the Standard.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE

122. The Committee agreed to advance the Standard to Step 5 for adoption by the 34th Session of the Commission (Appendix v).

123. The Committee also decided to establish an electronic working group led by the United States and working in English that would work on the sizing provisions (Section 3) and uniformity rules (Section 5.1) with a view to make proposals for consideration by the next session of the Committee.

PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 5)¹²

BACKGROUND DOCUMENT ON POINT OF APPLICATION OF CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES INCLUDING QUALITY TOLERANCES AT IMPORT/EXPORT CONTROL POINTS (Agenda Item 6)¹³

124. The Committee noted that issues relating to the point of application of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables were closely linked to the layout in particular as regards the inclusion of different quality tolerances at shipping/destination point. The Codex Secretariat introduced document CX/FFV 11/16/10 and briefly summarized its contents as follows:

125. The Terms of Reference of the Committee establishes *"to consult with the UNECE ... in the elaboration of worldwide standards ... with particular regard to ensuring that there is no duplication of standards ... and they follow the same broad format"*. As UNECE standards applies at the export control point while Codex standards applies at all points of the distribution chain, the Commission agreed to insert a footnote to the definition of produce by which *"Governments when indicating the acceptance of a Codex standard for fresh fruits and vegetables should notify the Commission which provisions of the standard would apply at the point of import and which provisions of the Standard would apply at the point of export"*. However, in 2005 the Committee deleted the footnote since the notification procedure for the acceptance of Codex standards was abolished as it was taken up by parallel rules in the WTO.

126. In recognition of the problem of perishability of fresh products especially when they are stored and transported for a long period of time the Committee developed the Code of Practice for the Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables to *"recommend proper packaging and transport of fresh fruits and vegetables in order to maintain produce quality during transportation and marketing"*. Therefore, the Code takes into account the basic responsibilities of growers, packers, shippers, marketers, etc. to ensure that all necessary steps are taken concerning quality and safety of the produce so that the standards can apply at points of export, import, wholesale and retail sale.

127. As regards quality tolerances, the Committee had considered some options to address the need to differentiate between quality tolerances at import/control points at previous sessions, for instance to apply the same quality tolerances at import/export control point, to apply higher tolerances at import control points or to leave it up to buyers and sellers to decide at which point the tolerances should apply. However, the Committee noted that in many cases a great amount of transport time was required in the shipment of perishable produce but that governments commonly harvest and export produce in order to arrive at import in compliance with established tolerances on the basis of minimum requirements in product standards and that compliance with such tolerances was often the responsibility of buyers and sellers therefore decided not to pursue this issue further.

128. The working paper therefore provides a framework to further discuss point of application in relation to quality tolerances due to perishability of fresh fruits and vegetables especially during storage and transport following export. The document also proposes ways forward how to address this issue in the layout including a revised wording of the above mentioned footnote that could address this matter.

¹² ALINORM 10/33/35, Appendix VII; CX/FFV 11/16/9 (comments of Argentina, Switzerland and the United States of America); Additional comments: CRD 2 (India); CRD 3 (Philippines); CRD 4 (Mexico); CRD 6 (Paraguay); CRD 7 (European Union); CRD 9 (Malaysia); CRD 13 (United States of America); CRD 15 (Mali); and CRD 17 (Ghana).

¹³ CX/FFV 11/16/10.

129. The Secretariat further informed the Committee that Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables are currently presented in a combination of the UNECE layout and the Format of Codex Commodity Standards by which the Committee had “*emphasized that it would continue to adhere to the previous decision of the Commission, whereby UNECE format would be respected for quality characteristics elaborated under Codex standards, while the Codex format would be respected for those provisions not dealing exclusively with commercial quality*”¹⁴.

130. A delegation noted that Codex standards were voluntary and that nothing prevented member countries from adopting / adapting them as their national legislation. The delegation further noted that Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables were developed for application at the export control stage with no adjustments made in the quality tolerances for arrival at destination. However, when standards developed for application at shipping point, are applied throughout the distribution channel without added tolerances for some deterioration in quality due to the perishable nature of fresh fruits and vegetables such applications, the application of the standard could become a trade barrier. Therefore quality tolerances adjustments for the application of the standards are necessary.

131. Another delegation recommended the development of standards applicable at import and export control points. In this regard, the Delegation noted that drawing up provisions, particularly tolerances, according to different application points, would make the standards more complex and subject to interpretation. The Delegation considered that provisions concerning tolerances were flexible enough and took already into account possible damages resulting from transport.

132. Several delegations expressed the view that it should be clarified what was meant by “consultation” with the UNECE in the elaboration of worldwide standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and whether harmonization of Codex and UNECE standards implied alignment with the UNECE standards. These delegations drew the attention of the Committee that the UNECE was a regional economic commission of the United Nations for the European region, and that in the same way as the UNECE, other regional commissions might engage in the development of standards and create duplication of work. In this regard, it was noted that this was a singular situation by which two UN bodies were engaged a similar work when rationalization of the UN resources was a priority within the UN system.

133. It was also noted that developing countries did not have the resources to participate in the various standardization bodies and that it was already difficult to keep up with the different national food regulations when dealing with exporting products to foreign markets. It was further noted that reciprocity in the consultation process between Codex and UNECE was needed, as the UNECE had just completed the revision of the UNECE Layout without consultation with the CCFFV.

134. Following a question, whether the UNECE had similar recognition in their mandate to consult with the CCFFV in the elaboration of the UNECE standards, the Representative of the UNECE Secretariat informed the Committee that the Terms of Reference of the Working Party for Agricultural Quality Standards required the Working Party to cooperate with other standard-setting bodies, particularly the Codex Alimentarius Commission to avoid duplication of work and divergence of standards.

135. Other delegations expressed the view that cooperation with the UNECE should be seen as a positive input to the work of the Committee and that the consultation referred to in the mandate did not necessarily mean adoption of UNECE standards as Codex standards but taking them as a starting point in the development of Codex standards to the extent they meet the needs of Codex members.

136. A delegation noted that issues related to the mandate should be discussed separately from the technical aspects associated with the consideration of the layout, and that a decision should be made how to move forward with the layout taking into account that several issues applying horizontally to Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables had come up during the discussion of individual standards at this session.

137. The Committee recognized that there was no time to continue discussing the matter at this session. Therefore, the Committee agreed that the Codex and UNECE Secretariats would work together on a draft layout taking into account the 2010 revision of the UNECE layout, showing the differences between the standard language used currently in Codex standards and the revised UNECE layout to facilitate the consideration of this matter at its next session.

138. Some delegations did not support this decision as there would be no so much value in discussing the layout if the basic question of the mandate and the consultation process between Codex and UNECE was not clarified.

PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 7)¹⁵

Golden Passion Fruit

139. The Delegation of Colombia presented a project document for the development of a Codex Standard for Golden Passion Fruit. Many delegations expressed their support for the development of a worldwide standard for this produce.

¹⁴ ALINORM 93/35, paras. 15 and 19.

¹⁵ CX/FFV 11/16/11.

140. The Committee noted that the proposed scope of the Standard was not clear and that it should be clearly stated that the scope was limited to golden passion fruit. Several delegations suggested not to limit the scope to golden passion fruit and to include other varieties commonly traded.

141. The delegation of Colombia clarified that there are more than 500 species of the family Passifloraceae Ligularis and that the scope of the Standard is limited to golden passion fruit (*Passiflora ligularis* Juss) as different species of the *Passifloraceae* family may vary widely in botanical and other characteristics that would make not possible to manage the development of the Standard within a reasonable period of time. In addition, if other species are to be included, this would not allow the presentation of a project document in time for the next session of the Commission. The Delegation also noted that if member countries would like to provide information on other commercial varieties, they could include them in the project document.

142. With regard to the critical review, the Committee noted that the project document needed to be elaborated in more detail, in particular concerning Section 4: Assessment against the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities in order to clearly justify whether the absence of a standard for this produce may have the potential to create obstacles to trade. It was agreed that the delegation of Colombia will submit the revised project document directly to CCEXEC for the critical review.

143. The Committee agreed to recommend new work on a Codex Standard for Golden Passion Fruit and to establish an electronic working group led by Colombia and working in English and Spanish to prepare a proposed draft Standard for consideration by the next session of the Committee subject to approval by the Commission.

Other proposals for new work

144. The Committee noted that new work proposals for vanilla (Mexico), okra (India) and cashew (Senegal) would be submitted for consideration at the next session of the Committee.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 8)

145. The Committee noted that there were no matters for consideration under this Agenda Item.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 9)

146. The Committee was informed that the 17th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was tentatively scheduled to be held in Mexico in approximately 18 months. The exact time and venue would be decided between the Codex and the Mexican Secretariats.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject Matter	Step	Action by	Document Reference REP11/FFV
Draft Standard for Tree Tomatoes	8	Governments 34 th CAC	Para. 70 and Appendix III
Proposed draft Standard for Chilli Peppers	5/8	Governments 34 th CAC	Para. 92 and Appendix IV
Draft Standard for Avocado (Revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995)	7	eWG (Spain) Governments (size uniformity and other size-related provisions) 17 th CCFFV	Para. 58 and Appendix II
Proposed draft Standard for Pomegranate	5	Governments 34 th CAC eWG (USA) Governments 17 th CCFFV	Para. 122 and Appendix V
Proposed draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit	1/2/3	34 th CAC eWG (Colombia) Governments 17 th CCFFV	Para. 143
Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (including matters relating to point of application and quality tolerances at import/export control points)	----	Codex/UNECE Secretariats Governments 17 th CCFFV	Para. 137
Proposals for new work on Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables	----	Governments 17 th CCFFV	ALINORM 10/33/35, para. 121

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairperson: Mtro. CHRISTIAN TURÉGANO ROLDÁN
Président: Director General de Normas
Presidente: Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
Estado de México
C.P. 53950
Tel: 57 29 93 00 Ext. 43200-43201
Fax: 55 20 97 15
E-mail: christian.turegano@economia.gob.mx

Assistant to the Chairperson: Mtra. ANDREA BARRIOS VILLARREAL.
Assistant du Président: Directora de Normalización Internacional
Asistente del Presidente: Dirección General de Normas
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
Estado de México
C.P. 53950
Tel: 57 29 93 00 Ext. 43216
Fax: 55 20 97 15
E-mail: andrea.barrios@economia.gob.mx

ANGOLA

MELO Fatima
CODEX Angola
Coordinadora do Comité de Frutas e Hortaliças
Tel: (+244) 9 24 05 26 40
Fax: (+244) 2 22 32 37 24
Email. ftmamel@yahoo.com.br

SANAZENGE María Antonia
CODEX Angola
Coordinadora de Subcomite Productos Elaborados
Tel n oo244923653695
sanazenge@hotmail.com

MORAIS Lidia
CODEX Angola
Segunda Secretaria Ejecutiva Adjunta
Tel: (244) 9 23 31 66 78
Fax: (244) 2 22 32 37 24
Email. lidiamorais43@hotmail.com

CRVZ Teresa
CODEX Angola
Coordinadora de Subcomité Técnico de Productos Elaborados
Tel: (244) 9 27965925
Fax: í
Email. tetearsenio@yahoo.com

ALGERIA
ALGÉRIE
ARGELIA

RACHID Bouzidi
Sous-Directeur / Direction de la Regulation et du Developpement
des Productions Agricoles
Ministere de L'Agriculture et du Developpement Rural
Tel: 00 213 552 48 71 87
Fax: 00213 21 74 61 68
Email. bouzidi.rachid@yahoo.fr

ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE

CAMPANA Beatriz María Remedios
Profesional
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA)
Dirección Nacional de Inocuidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria
Av. Paseo Colón 367, 3er Piso Frente (1063)
Ciudad Autónoma de Bs.As.
Tel: (+54) 1141215299 / 96 / 93
Fax: (+54) 1141215299
Email. bcampana@senasa.gov.ar

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE

O'SULLIVAN Angela
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and
Forestry.
Manager, International Food Standards
18 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra, ACT, Australia 2601
Tel: (+61) 262723871
Email. angela.o'sullivan@daff.gov.au

CHILE
CHILI

URRUTIA Anabalón Antonieta
Negociaciones Internacionales
División Asuntos Internacionales.
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero.
Av. Bulnes 140 Santiago, Chile
Tel: 00562 3451585
Fax: 00562 3451578
E-mail: antonieta.urrutia@sag.gob.cl

PANIAGUA Ramírez Karla
Asistente del comercio agrícola
Embajada de Chile, Consejería Agrícola
Calle del Río 23, Col. Barrio de Santa Catalina
Del. Coyoacán, C.P.04100 México, D.F.
Tel: 56 58 49 28
E-mail: karla.paniagua@consejagri.org

ESCUADERO MIRA Paulina
Departamento de Frutas y Hortalizas.
Asociación de Exportadores de Chile, A.G.
Cruz del Sur 133 piso 2. Las Condes Santiago, Chile
Tel: 00562 4724 720
E-mail: pescudero@asoex.cl

ECHEVERRÍA VÁSQUEZ Héctor Andrés
Consejero Agrícola
Embajada de Chile, Consejería Agrícola
Calle del Río 23.Col. Barrio de Santa Catarina
Del. Coyoacán. C.P. 04100 México D.F.
Tel: 5658 4928

COLOMBIA
COLOMBIE

MUÑOS Ibarra Javier
Asesor
Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Turismo
Calle 28 N° 13 A 15 piso 3, Bogotá Colombia
Tel: 571-6067676 Ext. 1205
Fax: 571-6064777
E-mail: jmunoz@mincomercio.gov.co

MUNAR León Ricardo Enrique
Profesional de Normalización
Instituto Colombiano de Normas Técnicas y Certificación ICONTEC
Carretera 37 N°52-95 Bogotá D.C.
Tel: 571 6078888 Ext. 1442
Fax: 571 3150613
E-mail: rmunar@icontec.org

COMOROS
COMORES
COMORAS

ATTOUMANI Ali
Commissariat en charge de la production/ANJOUAN
Directeur de la protection des vegetaux/ ANJOUAN
Comores -ANJOUAN -MUTSAMUDU- BP-313
Tel: (+269) 3321024
Email: attabdai@yahoo.fr

COSTA RICA

HIDALGO Zamora Maria Amelia
Ministra Consejera y Consul General
Embajada de Costa Rica en Mexico
Tel: (55) 5208-3361
Email: ahidalgo@consulado.decostaricaenmexico.org

CUBA

RODRIGUEZ Odríguez Martínez Alicia
Especialista Principal en Gestión de la Calidad
Instituto de investigaciones Hortícolas "Liliana Dimitova"
Carrera Quivicán-Bejucal, km 33 ½, Municipio Quivicán,
ProvinciaMayabaque, Cuba
Tel: 047682601
E-mail: nc@ncnorma.cu c/c aliciar@liliana.co.cu

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE
REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA

Montes de Oca Daniel
Encargado División Evaluación y Seguimiento.
Departamento de Inocuidad Agroalimentaria (DIA), en el Ministerio
de Agricultura.
Ave. John F. Kennedy, Km. 6, Urb. Jardines del Norte, Santo
Domingo, D. N.
Tel: 1+ 809-547-3888, ext. 6024
Email: codexsespas@yahoo.com
codexsespas@yahoo.com
montesdeoca.master@gmail.com

EGYPT
ÉGYPTE
EGIPTO

ELHADDAD Safwat
Agricultural Counselor
Embassy of Egypt in USA
3521 Intl Court, NW Washington D.C. 20008
Tel: (001) 202 966 2080
Email: safwar.el_haddad@usa.com

EUROPEAN UNION
UNION EUROPÉENNE
UNIÓN EUROPEA

HOLMA Risto
Administrator Responsible for Codex Issues
Directorate General Health and Consumers
Rue Froissart 101 2/48
B-1049 Brussels
Tel: (+32 2) 2998683
Fax: (+ 32 2) 2998566
E-mail: risto.holma@ec.europa.eu

GAMBIA
GAMBIE

LANDING Sonko
Plant Protection Services.
Deputy Director
Yundum Agriculture Station
Tel: (+220) 9344 003
E-mail: sonkokebba@gmail.com

GHANA

ADARKWA-ADDAE EUGENE

Acting Director
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Box MB 47, Ministries, Accra-Ghana
Tel: +233 244690 703
Email: heyadarkwaaddae@gmail.com

HONDURAS

PAGUADA Rubio Juan Carlos

Jefe de Sección Frutas SENASA/DIA
SAG/SENASA
Blvd. Miraflores Av. La FAO, Injupem
Tel: (+504) 95815357
Fax: (+504) 22310786
E-mail: jcpaguada@yahoo.com

HUNGARY

HONGRIE

HUNGRIA

ISTVÁN Ecsedi

Head of Unit
Hungarian Agricultural Office
1118 Budapest, Budaörsi ut 141-147
Tel: 361 3091 086
E-mail: ecsed.istvan@ontsz.hu

Palotásné Gyöngyösi Ágnes

Chief Counselor
Ministry of Rural Development
1055 Budapest, Kosuth ter 11, Hungary
Tel: 361 7553677
E-mail: agnes.gyongyosi@vu.gov.hu

ATAZ Antonio.

Council of the EU
Administrator.
Rue de la Loi 175, 1048 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: (+32 2) 2814964
Fax: (+ 32 2) 22816198
E-mail: antonio.ataz@consilium.europa.eu

INDIA

INDE

SINGH Gorakli

Horcorticulture Commissioner
Department of Agriculture and cooperation
Ministry of agriculture
New Dehli
Tel: 91 - 11 – 23281012, 23383712
Email: singh_gorakh@yahoo.co.in
gorakh.singh@nic.in

DAVE Sanjay

Director
APEDA, Government of India
Ncuibuilding 3rd floor, 3, Siri Institutional área, August Kranti Marg,
New Delhi, India
Tel: (91) 1126 51 3162
Fax: (91) 1126 51 9259
Email: director@apeda.gov.in directorapeda@gmail.com

KHURANA Suresh Chander

Dy Agricultural Marketing Adviser
Directorate of Marketing and Inspection
Departament of agriculture and cooperation, Govt of India
(CGO.NH IV)
FARIDABAD 121001
Tel: 91-129-2415316
Email: khurana183@gmail.com

INDONESIA

INDONÉSIE

BUDI Gardjita

Director of Quality and Standarization
Directorate General of Processing and Marketing of Agricultural
Products, Ministry of Agriculture
Building D, 3rd Floor, JL Harsono RM. NO.3, Ragunan, Jakarta,
Tel: 62 21 7815 881
Fax: 62 21 78 11468
Email: gbudi@deptan.go.id

ERVANDIARI Islana

Head of Biosafeti for Plant, Division
Agency of Agricultural Quarantine, Ministry of Agriculture
Building E, 5th Floor, JL Harsono RM. NO.3, Ragunan, Jakarta
Tel: (62) 21 7816 482
Fax: (62) 21 781 6482
Email: islanaervandiari@yahoo.com

ITALY

ITALIE

ITALIA

LO TURCO Brunella

Codex Contact Point
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry
Via XX, Settembre 20, 00187 Roma, Italy
Tel: +39 46656042
Fax: +39 4880273
E-mail: b.loturco@politicheagricole.gov.it

IMPAGNATIELLO Ciro

Italian Codex Committee
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies
Via XX Settembre, 20, 1-00187 Roma, Italy
Tel: +39 06 46656046
Fax: +39 06 4880273
E-mail: c.impagnatiello@politicheagricole.gov.it

JAMAICA

JAMAÏQUE

HARVEY Shelia Yvonne.

Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Inspector.
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries.
193 Old Hope Rd, Kingston 6.
Tel: (+876) 9770637
Fax: (+876) 9776992
E-mail: syharvey@moa.gov.jm

JAPAN
JAPON
JAPÓN

KONDO Yoshikivo
Associate Director (International Affairs)
Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo,
Japan, 100-8950
Tel: (+81) 3 35 02 87 32
Fax (+81) 3 35 07 42 32
Email: yoshikiyo_kondo@nm.maff.go.jp

KENYA

Oteko John Otieno
QUALITY Assurance Officer
Kenya Bureau of Standards
Tel: +254 051 2210553; +254 720-613116
Email: otekoj@kebs.org

Onjolo Samuel Omolo
Assitant Manager Agriculture
Kenya Bureau of Standards
Tel: +254 722315165
Email: onjolos@kebs.org
onjolo@yahoo.com

LESOTHO

TJELELE Esaiah
Senior Research Officer
Department of Agricultural Research, Ministry of Agriculture and
Food Security
PO Box 829, Masery, 100, Lesotho
Tel: 266 22 31 2395
Fax: 266 2231 0362
Email: etjelele@yahoo.co.uk

MALAYSIA
MALAISIE
MALASIA

ISHAK Abbas
Senior Director (Regulatory)
Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority
LOT 17304, JLN Persarian 1, BDR Baru Selayang 68100 Batu
Caves, Selangor, Malaysia.
Tel: (+60) 0123994210
Fax: (+60) 36120 2064
E-mail: ishale@fama.gov.my

MALI
MALÍ

SAKO Mahamadou
Directeur Général Adjoint
Ingénieur Technologue Alimentaire, M.Sc Expert Industriel
BP 2362E Bamako- Mali
Tel: (223) 66799979
(223) 77214788
E-mail: scodexmali@yahoo.fr
mahamadousako@yahoo.fr

MOROCCO
MAROC
MARRUECOS

LAAOUANE Lahbib
Etablissement Autonome de Contrôle et de Coordination des
Exportations (E.A.C.C.E)
72 Rue mohamed smiha casablanca
MAROC
Tel: (212) 528834496
Fax: (212) 528338914
Email: laaouanelahbib@gmail.com

MEXICO
MEXIQUE
MÉXICO

TREVIÑO Alcántara Simón
Director General de Fomento a la Agricultura
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y
Alimentación
Municipio Libre 377, Piso 2 Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac, Del. Benito
Juárez, Mexico, D.F., C.P. 03310
Tel: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext, 33331
Fax: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext 33359
Email: strevial@sagarpa.gob.mx

Jiménez Rodríguez Gabriela Alejandra
Subdirectora de Normas/Dirección de Cultivos
Agroindustriales/DGFA
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y
Alimentación
Municipio Libre 377, Piso 2 Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac, Del. Benito
Juárez, Mexico, D.F., C.P. 03310
Tel: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext, 28313
Fax: 52 55 + 38 71 10000 extensión 28313
Email: gjimenez.dqvdt@sagarpa.gob.mx

Álvarez Jiménez María Elena
Jefe de Departamento de Frutales Tropicales y Responsable de
Marcas Colectivas
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y
Alimentación
Municipio Libre 377, Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac, Del. Benito Juárez,
Mexico, D.F., C.P. 03310
Tel: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext, 28314
Fax: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext 33359
Email: malvarez.sa@sagarpa.gob.mx

AGUIRRE Ramirez Adriana
Facilitadora Nacional del CONAPROCH
Comité Nacional Sistema Producto Chile A.C.
Av. Prolongación Ignacio Zaragoza #3303 Trojes de Oriente 1a
Sección Aguascalientes, Ags
Tel: 52 449 996 75 93
Email: conaproch@prodiqy.net.mx

GONZÁLEZ Estrada Tomas
Director General
Consejo de Ciencia y Tecnología del Estado de Yucatán 60 Note
no, 301 Depto. 210, col revolución centro citi, Anexo centro de
convenciones siglo XXI
Tel: 999-93-80-451
Fax: 999 93 80 04 00
Email: tomas.gonzalez@yucatan.gob.mx

RAMIREZ-Meraz Moises

Investigador
 Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias
 Carr. Tampico-Mante km 55, Cuauhtémoc, Tam, México cp 859610
 Tel: 52-8362760168
 Fax: 52-8362760023
 Email: mramirezmx@yahoo.com.mx

Fabián Canales Alejandro

Jefatura de verificación de Distintivo H
 Manuel Ma. Contreras No. 133 piso 6 Col Cuauhtémoc México DF
 Tel: 55464546
 Fax: 57053686
 Email: afabian@imnc.org.mx

González Bautista Iris

Técnico verificador
 Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
 Manuel Ma. Contreras No. 133 piso 6 Col Cuauhtémoc México DF
 Tel: 55464546
 Fax: 57053686
 Email: igonzaalez@imnc.org.mx

LEON Félix Marco Antonio

Director General
 LEFIX Y ASOCIADOS
 Calle 28 de diciembre no. 87 Col Emiliano Zapata Coyoacan DF
 Tel: 56843301
 Fax: 56843889
 Email: lefix04@yahoo.com.mx

PAZ Lemus Esmeralda

Director General
 LEFIX Y ASOCIADOS
 Calle 28 de diciembre no. 87 Col Emiliano Zapata Coyoacan DF
 Tel: 56843301
 Fax: 56843889
 Email: lefix04@yahoo.com.mx

ALVAREZ DEL TORO JESÚS ALEJANDRO

Representante no Gubernamental del sistema de producto
 Aguacate
 Sistema producto Agrícola Nacional
 Calzada la Fuente No 56-113 Col la Mora Cp: 60130, Uruapan,
 Michoacán
 Tel: (01) 452 52 34 219
 Fax: (01) 452 52 35 364

Gallardo Barrón Lizbeth Mayra

Técnico verificador
 Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C
 Manuel Ma. Contreras No. 133 piso 6 Col Cuauhtémoc México DF
 Tel: 55464546
 Fax: 57053686
 Email: imgallardo@imnc.org.mx

NAJAR Estrella Luis Carlos

Director de Cultivos Agroindustriales
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
 Municipio Libre 377, Piso 2 Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac, Del. Benito Juárez, Mexico, D.F., C.P. 03310
 Tel: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext. 33294
 Fax: (55) 38-71-10-00 ext 33359
 Email: luis.najar@sagarpa.gob.mx

CANCHE CANCHE EDUARDO

Gerente de Producción
 Industria Agrícola Maya, S.A de C.V
 Calle 62 no 304entre 35 y 37, Col Centro, 9700, Mérida, Yucatán
 Tel: 01 999 912 42 22
 Email: ecanche@habanero-yucatan.com

Ochoa Ascencio Salvador

Profesor Investigador Titular
 Facultad de Agrobiología/Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolas de Hidalgo
 Paseo Lázaro Cardenas, Esquina Berlin s/n, C.P.60090 Uruapan, Michoacan
 Tel: 452 52 46 520
 Fax: 452 52 36 474
 Email: sochoa@umich.mx

Vázquez Morales Mateo

Miembro Vitalicio del Subcomité 13 Frutas y Hortalizas Frescas del CMCAC
 Consultor
 José Antonio Torres 804 Departamento 8, Col. Viaducto Piedad, Delegación Iztacalco
 Tel: 47 53 60 29
 Email: mateo36@live.com.mx

NEPAL**NÉPAL****BHANDARI Megh Raj.**

Senior Food Research Officer.
 Department of Food Technology and Quality Control. CODEX
 Contact Point
 Babar Mahal, Kathmandu, Nepal.
 Tel: (+977) 14262430
 Fax: (+977) 14262337
 E-mail: mrjbandari@yahoo.com

NETHERLANDS**PAYS-BAS****PAÍSES BAJOS****NUYTENS-VAARKAMP Gabrielle**

Agricultural Counselor
 Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
 Vasco de Quiroga 3000-7, Col. Santa Fé, CP. 01210 México.
 Tel: 52 55 52 58 99 21 Ext: 215
 Email: Mex-lnv@minbuza.nl

HAMMER Leonora

Agricultural Assistant
 Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
 Vasco de Quiroga 3000-7, Col. Santa Fé, CP. 01210 México.
 Tel: 52 55 52 58 99 21 Ext: 205
 Email Mex-lnv@minbuza.nl

NEW ZEALAND**NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE****NUEVA ZELANDIA****Fawcet Phil**

Principal Adviser (International Standards)
 Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry – Food Safety
 Level 6, Telecom House South Tower, 86 Jervois Quay, PO Box 2835 Wellington 6011, New Zealand.
 Tel: (+64) 4894 2656
 E-mail: phil.fawcet@maf.govt.nz

NIGERIA
NIGÉRIA

NWAGBARA Charles Emeka
Standard Organisation of Nigeria
Plot 1687, Lome St. Wuse Zone 7, Abuja
Tel: 234 807 2801 989
Email: Charles_nwagbara@yahoo.com

PAKISTAN
PAKISTÁN

MALIK Zahoor Ahmad
Director General
National Animal & Plant Health Inspection Services
Ministry of Food, & Agriculture
Government of Pakista
Islamabad
Tel: 92 (0) 51 9292508376
Fax: 92519205790
E-mail: malikzahoor@gmail.com

PARAGUAY

Pintos Cortessi Carmen Viviana
Jefa de Calidad de Productos Vegetales- Dirección de Calidad e Inocuidad Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE)
Humaita 145 c/ Nuestra Señora de Asunción
Tel: 021/441/549 -0981-310/314 – 0991/686/815
Email: cfranco@iica.org.py
vivi-pintos@hotmail.com

PHILIPPINES
FILIPINAS

GUIANG Edna
Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture
Chairperson, Sub. Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables
692 San Andres St., Malate, Manila, Philippines
Tel: (632) 5240779
Fax: (632) 5217650
Email: edna.guiang@yahoo.com

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA
REPÚBLICA DE MOLDOVA

Cumpanici Andrei
Associate Professor
Technical University of Moldova
Faculty of Technology and Management in Food Industry
Tel: (+373) 2252-15-45
Fax: (+373) 2252-99-60
E-mail: acumpanici@yahoo.com

SENEGAL
SÉNÉGAL

HANNE Alhousseynou Moctar
Chef de Bureau Quarantine des Plantes GEST PNI/SPS
Ministère de l'agriculture DVP
Tel: 221 776 4075 17
Email: almhane@yahoo.fr
almhane@yahoo.fr

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

CABALLERO HIERRO Francisco Javier
Consejero Técnico (Dirección General De Recursos Agrícolas y Ganaderos)
C/Alfonso XII, 62; 28071 Madrid; España
Tel: +34 91 347 66 60
Fax: +34 91 347 67 20
E-mail: fcaballe@mapa.es

CAMPS ALMIÑANA Jaime
Jefe de área
Secretaría de Estado de Comercio Exterior (Ministerio de Industria, Turismo y Comercio)
Pº de la castellana, 162. 28046 Madrid. España
Tel: 34 91 3493669
E-mail: icamps@comercio.mityc.es

CALDERÓN MORENO Manuel
Consejero de Medio Ambiente, y Medio Rural y de la embajada de España en Mex.
Embajada de España/Consejería de Medio Ambiente, y Medio Rural y Marino
Hegel 713, col. Bosque de Chapultepec, México, DF
Tel: 52033263

SUDAN
SOUDAN
SUDÁN

ALI Izzelsharaf
Horticulture
Ministry Of Agriculture
Ministry Of Agriculture- Horticulture Sector Administration
Tel: 249912984648
Email: Fiad51@yahoo.com

TAHA Mohamed Agla Mustafa
Departament Director – Industrial Production
Ministry of Industry P.O BOX 2184 Khartoum Sudan
Tel: 249912453678
Email: aqlamustafa@hotmail.com

SOUTH AFRICA
AFRIQUE DU SUD
SUDÁFRICA

MOSOME Mooketsi Lucas
Chief Food Safety and Quany Assyriance Officer
Departament Of Agriculture, Forestry \$ Fisheries
Departament Agriculture, Forestry \$ Fisheries P/BAYX334
Tel: +2712 3197334
Fax: +2712 3196055/ 6265
E-mail: MooketsiMo@daff.gov.za

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

WÜRZNER Michaël
Scientific Officer.
Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG.
Plants Products Unit, mattenhofstrasse 5, 3003 Bern.Tel: (+41) 313222526
Fax: (+41) 313222634
E-mail: Michael.wuerzner@blw.admin.ch

**THAILAND
THAÏLANDE
TAILANDIA**

KOSIYAchinda Suraphong
Chairman of Subcommittee on FFV
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
(ACFS)
50 Phaholyothin Rd, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 551 227 ext. 1413
Fax: 662 561 7357

PHONKLIANG Korwadee
Standard Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
50 Phaholyothin Rd, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 561 227 ext. 1413
Fax: 662 561 7357
Email: korwadeep@hotmail.com

RATANACHinakornHINAKORN Benjamas
Senior Researcher
Department of Agriculture
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 579 5582
Fax: 662 579 5582
Email: benjamas@cscs.com

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

MU Dongmin
Alternate Delegate
Food and Drug Administration
5100 Paint Branch Parkway college Park, MD 20740
Tel: 001 240 402 1775
E-mail: dongmin.mu@fda.hhs.gov

LOWERY Kenneth
International Issues Analyst
U.S. Codex Office
1400 Independence Avenue SW, Room 4861, Washington DC
20250
Tel: 202 690 4042
E-mail: kenneth.lowery@fsis.usda.gov

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES**

**Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
(OECD)**
Organisation de coopération et de Développement
Economiques (OCDE)
Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económico
(OCDE)

GASPAR Csaba Peter
Agricultural Policy Analyst
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
2 Rue André-Pascal 75775 Paris, Cedex 16
Tel: (+33) 145249553
Fax: (+33) 132306117
Email: Csaba.gaspar@oecd.org

**United Nations Organization (UNO)
Organisation des Nations Unies (ONU)
Organización de las Naciones Unidas (ONU)**

Dhoria Manjit
Chief Food Rations UNIT
UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN SUDAN (UNIMIS)
UNIMIS, ALKHATEM ROAD, KHARTOUM.
SUDAN
Tel: (249) 912 170145
Email: dhoria@un.org

**REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS RÉGIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES REGIONALES**

**Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)
Institut Interaméricain de coopération pour l' Agriculture (IICA)
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura
(IICA)**

DIAZ Rodríguez Alejandra
Especialista Internacional en Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad de
Alimentos
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)
San José, Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 2216-0313
E-mail: alejandra.diaz@iica.int
alejandradiaz20@gmail.com

TRELLES Zárate Sacha
Especialista Nacional en la Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad de
los Alimentos
Oficina IICA Costa Rica
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)
San José, Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 2216-0255
E-mail: sacha.trelles@iica.int
sachinat@yahoo.com

**United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
Commission Économique pour l'Europe des Nations Unies
(CEE-ONU)
Comisión Económica de las Naciones Unidas para Europa
(CEPE)**

MALANITCHEV Serguei
UN Economic Commission for Europe
Chief Agriculture Quality Standards
Office 440 palais des Nation CH 1214 Geneva 10 Switzerland
Tel: 41229174146
Email: serguei.malanitechev@unece.org

**FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT
SÉCRÉTARIAT FAO/OMS
SECRETARÍA FAO/OMS**

BRISCO López Gracia Teresa
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 570 52700
Fax: +39 06 570 54593
E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

HEILANDT Tom

Senior Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06570 54384
 Fax: +39 06570 54593
 E-mail: tom.heilandt@fao.org

KIM Heesun

Food Standards Officer
 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06570 54796
 Fax: +39 06570 54593
 E-mail: heesun.kim@fao.org

**TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT
 SECRÉTARIAT TECHNIQUE
 SECRETARÍA TÉCNICA**

Carla Resendis Caraza

Subdirectora para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius y otros Organismos
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: carla.resendis@economia.gob.mx

Vizueth Chávez Michelle

Jefe de Departamento para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: codexmex@economia.gob.mx

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT
 SUPPORT TECHNIQUE
 SOPORTE TÉCNICO**

Reyes Pérez Mario Alberto

Jefe de Oficina para la Atención de la ISO
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6
 Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
 C.P. 53950, Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9300, Ext. 43220
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: mario.reyes@economia.gob.mx

Alejandro Galindo Hernández

Técnico Especializado
 Dirección de Informática
 Dirección General de Normas, Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9300 Ext. 43205
 E-mail: alejandro.galindo@economia.gob.mx

Alvarado Rios Lizbeth

Prestador de Servicio Social
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 Email: codexmex2@economia.gob.mx

Legorreta Davila Yolanda Isabel

Prestador de Servicio Social
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: codexmex1@economia.gob.mx

Negrete Pérez de Lara Rafael

Prestador de Servicio Social
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: codexmex1@economia.gob.mx

Rodríguez Sánchez Alma Delia

Prestador de Servicio Social
 Dirección De Normalización Internacional
 Secretaría de Economía
 Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 CP. 53950
 Estado de México
 Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
 Fax: 5520 9715
 E-mail: codexmex2@economia.gob.mx

Tiburcio Palma Jorge Alberto
Asistente para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius
Dirección De Normalización Internacional
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: codexmex1@economia.gob.mx

DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR AVOCADO
(Revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995)
(At Step 7)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of avocados grown from *Persea americana* Mill., of the *Lauraceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Parthenocarpic fruit and avocados for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the avocados must be:

- whole;
- sound, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- practically free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures;
- having a stalk not more than 10 mm in length which must be cut off cleanly. However, its absence is not considered a defect on condition that the place of the stalk attachment is dry and whole.

2.1.1 The avocados must have reached a stage of physiological development which will ensure the completion of the ripening process, in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and to the area in which they are grown. The mature fruit should be free of bitterness.

The development and condition of the avocados must be such as to enable them:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.1.2 Maturity requirements

The fruit should have a minimum dry matter content¹ at the harvest, according to the variety, to be measured by drying to constant weight:

- 21 % for the variety Hass;
- 20 % for the varieties Torres, Fuerte, Pinkerton, Edranol and Reed;
- 19 % for other varieties except for Antillean/West Indian/Guatemalan and other not defined varieties which may show a lower dry matter content;

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Avocados are classified in three classes defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Avocados in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package. If present, the stalk must be intact.

2.2.2 Class I

Avocados in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

¹ This requirement applies to a fruit lot and not to individual fruits.

- slight defects in shape and colouring;
- slight skin defects (corkiness, healed lenticels) and sunburn; the maximum total area should not exceed 4 cm².

The defects must not, in any case, affect the flesh of the fruit.

The stalk, if present, may be slightly damaged.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes avocados which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the avocados retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape and colouring;
- skin defects (corkiness, healed lenticels) and sunburn; the maximum total area should not exceed 6 cm².

The defects must not, in any case, affect the flesh of the fruit.

The stalk, if present, may be damaged.

[3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Avocados can be sized through one of the following options:

- a) By weight of the fruit, in accordance with the following table:

Size Code	Weight (in grams)
2	> 1220
4	781 – 1220
6	576 – 780
8	456 – 576
10	364 – 462
12	300 – 371
14	258 – 313
16	227 – 274
18	203 – 243
20	184 – 217
22	165 – 196
24	151 – 175
26	144 – 157
28	134 – 147
30	123 – 137
32	80 – 123 (only Hass type)

The minimum weight for avocados of Antillean/West Indian/Guatemalan and other not defined varieties is 170 g.

- b) By count of fruits

Uniformity rules to be developed in Section 5.1]

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent by number or weight of avocados not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of avocados not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of avocados satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting, marked bruising or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10% by number or weight of avocados corresponding to the size immediately above or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

[5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only avocados of the same origin, variety, quality and size. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

Uniformity rules to be developed]

5.2 PACKAGING

Avocados must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new², clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Avocados shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the avocados. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment. For produce transported in bulk, these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)³.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety (optional).

² For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

³ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size expressed in minimum and maximum weight in grams;
- [Code number of the size scale and count of fruits when it is different from reference number;
To be finalized based on the completion of the sizing provisions (uniformity rules)]
- Net weight (optional).

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995)

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

8.2 The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

9. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

Provision	Method	Principle	Type
Dry Matter Content	[To be determined]		

DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TREE TOMATOES¹

(At Step 8)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of tree tomatoes grown from *Cyphomandra betacea* Sendt or *Solanum betaceum* Cav. of the *Solanaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Tree Tomatoes for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the tree tomatoes must be:

- whole;
- sound, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean and practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- firm;
- fresh in appearance;
- with the stalk present to to the first knot.

2.1.1 The tree tomatoes must have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness² account being taken of the characteristics of the variety and the area in which they are grown.

The development and condition of the tree tomatoes must be such as to enable them:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Tree tomatoes are classified in three classes defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Tree tomatoes in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

2.2.2 Class I

Tree tomatoes in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- slight defects in shape;
- slight defects of the skin such as scratches and blemishes, not exceeding more than 10% of the total surface area of the fruit.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the pulp of the fruit.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes tree tomatoes which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the tree tomatoes retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

¹ Commonly known in certain regions by tamarillo.

² The maturity of the tree tomatoes can be gauged visually from its external colouring and confirmed by examining flesh content and using the iodine test.

- defects in shape, such as extension or flattening of the apex;
- defects in colouring and of the skin such as scratches and blemishes, not exceeding 20% of the total surface area of the fruit.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the pulp of the fruit.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Tree tomatoes may be sized by diameter, weight or count.

- A) When sized by diameter, size is determined by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section in accordance with the following table:

Size code	Diameter (in millimeters)
A	≥ 61
B	60 – 55
C	54 – 51
D	50 – 46
E	35 - 45

- B) When sized by weight, size is determined by the weight of each individual fruit in accordance with the following table:

Size code	Weight (in grams)
1	> 125
2	101 – 125
3	75 – 100
4	45 - 75

- C) When sized by count, size is determined by the number of individual fruit per package.

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent by number or weight of tree tomatoes not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of tree tomatoes not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of tree tomatoes satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, ten percent by number or weight of tree tomatoes corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only tree tomatoes of the same origin, variety, quality, colour and size. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

Tree tomatoes must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new³, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Tree tomatoes shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the tree tomatoes. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to the name of the variety.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)⁴.

6.2.2 Nature of produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside.

6.2.3 Origin of produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial identification

- Class;
- Size (size code or diameter or weight range or count);
- Net weight (optional).

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

³ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

⁴ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

8.2 The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR CHILLI PEPPERS

(At Step 5/8)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of chilli peppers¹ grown from *Capsicum spp.*, of the *Solanaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Chilli peppers for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the chilli peppers must be:

- whole, the stalk (stem) may be missing, provided that the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged;
- sound, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- firm;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures.

2.1.1 Chilli peppers must be harvested at an appropriate degree of development in accordance with the criteria proper to the variety and the area in which they are grown. The development and condition of the chilli peppers must be such as to enable them:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Chilli peppers are classified in three classes defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Chilli peppers in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects affecting an area of up to 0.5% of the produce surface, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

2.2.2 Class I

Chilli peppers in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. Slight defects, however, may be allowed, affecting an area of up to 2.0% of the product surface, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes chilli peppers which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. Defects, however, may be allowed, affecting an area of up to 3.0% of the product surface, provided the chilli peppers retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by length of the chilli pepper in accordance with the following table:

Size code	Length (in centimetres)
1	≤ 4
2	$4 < 8$
3	$8 < 12$
4	$12 < 16$
5	> 16

¹ Chilli peppers presenting a minimum pungency of 900 Scoville Index. For levels of pungency see Annex.

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package (or in each lot for produce presented in bulk) for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent by number or weight of chilli peppers not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of chilli peppers not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of chilli peppers satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10% by number or weight of chilli peppers corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only chilli peppers of the same origin, quality, size and variety. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

Chilli peppers must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new², clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Chilli peppers shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the chilli peppers. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce, the variety and the pungency.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)³.

² For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

³ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety and pungency.

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size;
- Variety;
- Pungency.

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

8.2 The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

ANNEX

LEVELS OF PUNGENCY

PUNGENCY	SCOVILLE UNITS	TOTAL CAPSAICINOIDS (microg/gm dry weight)
MILD	900 – 1,999	60 - 133
MEDIUM	20,000 - 19,999	134 - 1,333
HOT	20,000 - 100,000	1,334 - 6,600
EXTRA HOT	> 100,000	> 6,600

Note: 15 Scoville heat units = 1 microgram/grams dry weight

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE

(At Step 5)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to fruits of commercial varieties of pomegranates grown from *Punica granatum* L., of the *Punicaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer after preparation and packaging. Pomegranates for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the pomegranates must be:

- whole;
- sound; produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, free of any visible foreign matter;
- free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- free of damage caused by frost;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures;
- free of sunburns affecting the [flesh/edible part/arils] of the fruit.

2.1.1 The pomegranates must have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the varieties and to the area in which they are grown.

The development and condition of the pomegranates must be such as to enable them:

- to withstand transport and handling; and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Pomegranates are classified in three classes as defined below:

2.2.1 "Extra" Class

Pomegranates in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

2.2.2 Class I

Pomegranates in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- slight defects in shape;
- slight defects in coloring;
- slight skin defects including cracking.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/edible part/arils] of the fruit.

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes pomegranates which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the pomegranates retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape;
- defects in coloring;
- skin defects including cracking.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/edible part/arils] of the fruit.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the weight of each fruit or by measuring the maximum diameter of the equatorial section of the fruit. The average size (weight or diameter) of the fruit in the lot shall be declared on the label or non-retail container.

A) When sized by weight, size is determined in accordance with the following table:

Size Code	Weight (g)
A	501 and above
B	401 – 500
C	311 – 400
D	251 – 310
E	191 – 250
F	151 – 190
G	125 – 150

B) When sized by diameter, size is determined in accordance with the following table:

Size Code	Diameter (mm)
A	101 and above
B	86 - 100
C	71 - 85
D	61 - 70
E	51 - 60
F	46 - 50
G	40 - 45

]

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

Five percent by number or weight of pomegranates not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of pomegranates not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of pomegranates satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10% by number or weight of pomegranates corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only pomegranates of the same origin, variety, quality and size. Sales packages may contain mixtures of varieties and sizes provided they are uniform in quality and for each variety concerned, its origin. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents except for mixed sizes and varieties.]

5.2 PACKAGING

Pomegranates must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new¹, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Pomegranates shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the pomegranates. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), the following specific provisions apply:

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

[If the produce is not visible from the outside,] each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety, class, size code and size/weight or the number of pieces presented in rows and layers.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)².

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety (where appropriate).

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (if sized);
- Net weight (optional).

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CODEX STAN 193-1995).

¹ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

² The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

7.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

8.2 The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).