

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 4(b)

CX/FFV 06/13/8-Add.1

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

13th Session, Mexico City, Mexico, 25 - 29 September 2006

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES

(AT STEP 3)

E

ARGENTINA

Argentina appreciates the efforts performed by the working group for making this document, as well as the possibility to perform the following detailed comments.

It is suggested the incorporation of **bold** text and the removal of ~~cancelled~~ text.

It is suggested to remove the first paragraph in section 2.1.1 ~~“The apples must have been carefully picked and have colour that is characteristic of the variety and to the are in which they are grown”~~ and transfer to Section 2.2 Maturity Requirements.

It is also recommended the removal of a part of the second paragraph in item 2.2 ~~“If refractometric indices of the flash are used, the Brix degree must be greater than or equal to [] should be used from information only and not as a requirement”~~. The indication of a defined Brix degree minimum value for all varieties is not considered suitable, and even less that if it is incorporated, it should be used for information only. In the same way, it is suggested to change the word ~~several~~ in this second paragraph and replace it by **“some”**. Remove the word ~~taste~~ because it results in a subjective value.

-In Section 2.3.1 “Extra” Class, the following changes are suggested in order to improve the Spanish redaction: to specify the aspects to be taken in account, remove “commercial type” because it does not exist for apples, and to add the quality aspects such as firmness and sound flesh, as well as the stalk (stem), which is considered necessary for this Class.

“Apples in this class must be of superior quality **and they must be characteristic of the variety in shape and colour, exterior aspect and development.** ~~The flash must be perfectly sound. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type in shape and colour.~~ 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 and presentation in the package . **Furthermore, their flesh must be firm and sound, and their stalk (stem) must be whole.**”

-In Section 2.3.2 Class I, those changes are proposed for the same reasons indicated in the last Section.

“Apples in this class must be of good quality and **must be characteristic** of the variety ~~and/or commercial type in shape and colour....”~~

- In Section 4.1.2 Class I and in Section 4.1.3 Class II the following changes of words are indicated due to they are considered more proper for the phrase in Spanish.

“Included therein shall be allowed not more than 2% for apples affected by decay or internal-breakdown.”

Moreover, in Section 4.1.3 Class II is suggested to say:

“- cork like blemishing or **bitter pit** (~~cork like blemishing~~ (bitter pit))”; since the disease is known in Spanish as “bitter pit”.

“- slight damage or ~~un~~unhealed broken skin/cracks” because the unhealed damages allows a quickly decay, which is not proper even in a Class II.

“- presence of ~~internal~~ feeding pests **into the** fruit and/or damage to the fruits ~~flesh~~ caused by **pests**”. It is not advisable to be restricted to alive pests only.

-In section 4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES, it is suggested to remove the first paragraph.

“... ~~When size is designated by the numerical count per container ...~~”, since it is not understandable, and without this part the paragraph is comprised perfectly. The footnote number 3 is removed too “~~3 apples presented in layers the tolerances is for the master container and not individual layers~~”, since it can not be considered in a different way than the total contain into the package.

In Section 5.1 UNIFORMITY, Argentina is not agree with the proposals in this point, so we suggest the following:

“The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, quality, size and with the same degree of ripeness. For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform as possible. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

Mixed varieties will be allowed in consumer packages with a net weight no more than 5 kilograms”

In Section 5.2 PACKAGING, it is suggested to include the following text at the end of the second paragraph. “... **The self-adhesive labels fixed directly on the produce must not leave visible traces of glue**”. Specifically, it is proper to establish this explanation because of the presence of this adhesive trace could create distrust for the consumer when label is removed.

Section 5.3 ~~PRESENTATION~~ is not an item considered by the Codex Standards for this product.

In Section 6. MARKING OR LABELLING it is suggested that the information for the Consumer Packages and the Non-Retail containers is removed as well as the item 6.1.1.

In Section 6.2.2 Nature of Produce it is suggested to remove that cancelled due to it is suitable that the name is always present considering that several consumers do not know the produces and/or their names.

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

Moreover, after the Name of the variety or varieties (when appropriate) the following text should be added.

In case the consumer packages contain a mixed variety of apples, their names must be indicated, so that the consumer is able to know the different varieties consumed.

In Section 6.2.3. Origin of Produce, the cancelled words “and, optionally” should be removed because it is considered that the data must be mandatory.

The word “recovery” in footnote number four must be changed by “recycled” due to it could be understood as reused.

ANNEX I

Colour classification of apples.

It is considered as suitable to remove this ANNEX because the colour aspects have been included in the item UNIFORMITY, so that apples must respond to the variety characteristics. The incorporation of this ANNEX is not justified due to the variety classification per group according to the colour, in case of being added, creates confusion specially in varieties with superimposed colours, both self-coloured or striped. Moreover, several varieties acquire the colouring according to the archeological conditions of the area where they are grown, so they could appear with characteristics different to those established.

Argentina supports the existence of the “Non Exhaustive” Varieties List in order to identify the different varieties but without grouping per colour, and adding their synonymous.

ANNEX II

Argentina is not agree with the contents in Table MAXIMUM ALLOWANCE FOR DEFECTS even though it is considered important from the practical point of view. It is suggested to assess its content in detail due to the mentioned defects are not defined in section 2.3 CLASSIFICATION, neither in section 4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES. In that case, it is suggested to make a terms glossary as well as to specify the dimensions of each blemish in surfaces, if so.

The proposed draft text is detailed next according to the modifications proposed by Argentina.

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES
(AT STEP 3)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to fruits of commercial varieties/cultivars of apples grown from *Malus domestica Borkh.*, of the *Rosaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Apples 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 apples must be:

- whole, ~~the stalk (stem) may be missing, provided 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;
- 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;
- practically free of signs of dehydration;
- **free of signs of dehydration and/or starchy;**
- **practically free of bruises and/or large scars due to cuts on the husk.**

2.1.1 ~~The apples must have been carefully picked and have colour that is characteristic of the variety and to the area in which they are grown.~~

The development and condition of the apples 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 MATURITY REQUIREMENTS

Apples **must be carefully collected and to have reached** a proper grade of development and ripeness that enables them to continue the ripening process taking into account the characteristics of the variety/cultivare, the time of harvest and the area where they are grown.

In order to verify the minimum maturity requirements ~~several~~ **some** parameters such as morphological aspects, ~~taste, firmness, and refractometric index, etc.,~~ can be considered. ~~If refractometric indices of the flesh are used, the Brix degree must be greater than or equal to [] should be used for information only and not as a requirement.~~

2.2 3 CLASSIFICATION

Apples are classified in three classes defined below :¹

2.2-3.1 “Extra” Class

Apples in this class must be of **superior** quality, **and they must be characteristic of the variety in shape and colour, exterior aspect and development**. ~~The flesh must be perfectly sound. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type in shape and colour.~~ They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided **that** these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package ². **Furthermore, their flesh must be firm and sound, and their stalk (stem) must be whole.**

2.2-3.2 Class I

Apples in this class must be of good quality and **must be** characteristic of the variety ~~and/or commercial type in shape and colour~~. 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 ² :

- a slight defect in shape, development and colouring;
- slight skin or other defects.

2.2-3.3 Class II

This class includes apples 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, ² provided the apples retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation :

- defects in shape, development and colouring;
- skin or other defects.

¹
~~These classifications do not preclude mixed class consignment.~~

²
~~Skin and other defects must not exceed the limits as defined in Annex II.~~

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by maximum diameter of the equatorial section or by weight of each apple.

For all varieties and all classes the minimum size is 60 mm if measured by diameter or 90 gr if measured by weight. Fruit of smaller sizes may be accepted provided the Brix level of the produce meets or exceeds 11°Brix and the size is not smaller than 50 mm or 70 gr..

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 apples 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 apples not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

Included therein shall be allowed not more than 2% for apples affected by decay or internal breakdown.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of apples not satisfying 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.

Within the 10% tolerance, not more than 3% by number or weight is allowed for apples by decay or internal breakdown.

Within the 10% tolerance, a maximum of 2% by number or weight of fruit is allowed which may show the following defects:

- cork like blemishing **or bitter pit** (~~cork like blemishing~~ (bitter pit))
- slight damage or ~~un~~healed broken skin/cracks;
- presence of ~~internal~~ feeding pests **into the** fruit and/or damage to the fruits ~~flesh~~ caused by **pests**

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes of fruit subjected to rules of uniformity, 10% by number or weight of apples not meeting the size indicated on the package. ~~When size is designated by the numerical count per container,~~ not more than 10% of the packages in the lot may fail to be fairly uniform³.

³ ~~Apples presented in layers the tolerances is for the master container and not individual layers.~~

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

Proposal (1)

~~The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, quality, size (if sized) and may be of mixed varieties. For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform as possible. If different varieties, classes and/or sizes of apples are sold in the same package, uniformity of variety and/or size is not required. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.~~

Proposal (2)

~~To ensure there is uniformity of size within a package, the difference in diameter/weight between fruit in the same package shall be limited to:~~

- ~~–12.5 mm for all fruit classes packed in rows and layers or 25% of the average individual fruit weight in the package.~~
- ~~–15.0 mm for fruit packed in bulk or in pre-packing, or 30% of the average individual fruit weight in the package.~~

Proposal (3)

~~The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, quality, size and degree of ripeness. For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform as possible. Sales packages (of a net weight not exceeding 5 kg) may contain mixtures of varieties, provided they are uniform in quality, and for each variety concerned, in origin. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents except for mixed sizes and varieties.~~

~~The difference in diameter or weight between fruit in the same package shall be limited to:~~

- ~~–Under a diameter of 60 mm (90 gr): 5 mm / 20 gr.~~
- ~~–from a diameter of 60 mm (90 gr) a 90 mm (290 gr): 10 mm / 40 gr.~~
- ~~–over a diameter of 90 mm (290 gr): 15 mm / 75 gr.~~

~~The difference in blush collared surface between the apples in a package must not exceed:~~

- ~~–10% for “Extra” Class.~~
- ~~–15% for Class I.~~

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, quality, size and with the same degree of ripeness. For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform as possible. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents. Mixed varieties will be allowed in consumer packages with a net weight no more than 5 kilograms”

5.2 PACKAGING

Apples must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new⁴, 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. **The self-adhesive labels fixed directly on the produce must not leave visible traces of glue.**

Apples shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packing and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995, Emd. 1-2004).

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 apples. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell. .

5.3 PRESENTATION

~~{To be developed}~~

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, Rev. 1-1991), the following specific provisions apply:~~

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

~~If 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 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, legible 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)5.~~

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

~~Name of the variety or varieties (where appropriate).~~

In case the consumer packages contain a mixed variety of apples, their names must be indicated, so that the consumer is able to know the different varieties consumed.

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;

⁴ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes **recycled** material of food-grade quality.

- Size (if sized)/size code.

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

Apples shall comply with those maximum pesticide residue limits established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity

7.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

Apples shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity

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, Rev. 4-2003), 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).

⁵-

~~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.~~

ANNEX I

COLOUR CLASSIFICATION OF APPLES

~~This Annex describes four broadly accepted colour classification of apples. Included are percentages/fractions of surface colour requirement for red apple varieties.~~

~~GROUP A – VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING~~

~~“Extra” Class At least 2/3 of the surface of the fruit is red in colour~~

~~Class I At least 1/2 of the surface of the fruit is red in colour~~

~~Class II At least 1/4 of the fruit is red in colour~~

~~GROUP B – VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING~~

~~“Extra” Class At least 1/2 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring~~

~~Class I At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring~~

~~Class II At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring~~

~~GROUP C – VARIETIES WITH STRIPES AND SLIGHT RED COLOURING~~

~~“Extra” Class Blush-check~~

~~Class I Tinge of colour~~

~~Class II Tinge of colour~~

~~GROUP D – GREEN AND YELLOW VARIETIES~~

ANEXO II

This Annex sets the physical limits of the defects listed in the Standard thereby Establishing uniform application of the Standard, thereby reducing the subjective/normative nature of the interpretation of the defects. Listed are some of the most common apple defects. It also attempts to resolve the issue of russetting.

Russetting can be simply described as a “brownish roughened area or streaks on the skin of the apple”. In some apple varieties russetting is a characteristic of the variety and for others a quality defect.

MAXIMUM ALLOWANCE FOR DEFECTS

Defects Allowed	“Extra” Class		Class I	Class II
Limb Rub (brown or Light brown in colour)	0.5 cm ²		-----	-----
Russetting outside, Calyx/stem cavity	- smooth net-like	5% of surface area	15% of surface area	25% of surface area
	- smooth solid	0.5 cm ²	5% of surface area	10% of surface area
Slight bruising, with slight discoloration ⁽¹⁾	1.5 cm ²		2 cm ²	2.5 cm ²
Light Blemishes	5 cm ²		2 cm ²	2.5 cm ²
Scabs (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), dark blemishes, healed hall marks, and similar blemishes	----		0.5 cm ²	1 cm ²
Stem Calyx cracks (healed or well cured)	----		0.5 cm	1 cm
Bruising with discoloration ^(*)	----		----	2.5 cm ²
Dark blemishes not blending with skin colour	-----		-----	2.5 cm ²
Maximum length of elongated shaped defects	----		2 cm	4 cm

(*) Bruises shall be visible or detectable without removal of the peel.

Any combination of defects on an apple, excluding russetting, shall not exceed that of the largest single defect allowed in the class.

Condition after Storage or Transit: Decay and other deterioration which may have Developer in apples after they have been in storage or transit shall be considered as affecting condition and not the quality in any of the classes.

AUSTRALIA

Please find below comments from Australia in response to CX/ FFV/ 06/13/8 on the Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples. The Australian Government would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to make comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Australia considers that Codex standards should focus on consumer health and include only definitions and essential technical criteria that facilitate fair trade and safe food. The Codex Standard for Apples should thus only be concerned with ensuring that the product is clean, safe and fit to eat and should not relate to issues that are a commercial standard set by customers.
- Australia has removed many quality parameters from its food standards in order to maximise industry flexibility and innovation – as driven by market need – and to minimise trade restrictions. Australia has ensured that information needed by consumers to make an informed choice in respect to food safety and quality is readily available by strengthening many of its food labelling requirements. Australia considers this approach is optimal for protecting the safety and quality of foods available to consumers while minimising regulatory burden on food producers.
- If used, Australia believes that quality requirements in Codex commodity standards must be representative of global compositional variation.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Section 3 Provisions Concerning Sizing

Australia particularly considers that sizing should not be included in the standard because it does not allow for niche markets of small size apples or for very large size apples. Australia has found that reference to prescriptive sizing requirements restricts innovation and presents a trade barrier. Sizing and Size Tolerances are a specification set by customers and represent a commercial consideration, not a regulatory one.

Section 5.1 Uniformity

In line with concerns raised under ‘General Comments’ Australia’s preference with regard to Uniformity is that this provision is negotiated between supplier and consumer and should not be included in a Codex standard.

Annex I

Australia remains concerned that colour classifications are included in a Codex standard. Different customers have different preferences for colour - which should therefore remain a customer specification.

Annex II

Australia has the following comments with respect to this Annex :

- Limb rub is really a light blemish or a dark blemish depending on severity and could be deleted as a stand-alone defect.
- Concerning ‘russet’, Australia has two comments
 - Firstly, calculating russet on the basis of percentage of the surface area, while conceptually appealing is, in practice, extremely difficult.
 - It is the experience of industry in Australia that attempting to limit provisions around russetting is very difficult. Varieties such as Fuji and Golden Delicious are more prone to russet and greater allowances should be considered to accommodate this.

INDIA**2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

In the first indent, the words in square bracket, “the stalk (**stem**) may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged³” may be deleted as it is felt that removal of the stalk (stem) may cause bacterial contamination inside the fruit.

A new indent reading, “ – *firm* ” may be added after the first indent to reflect the firmness of the produce, as this attribute is important in ensuring that the quality of the produce remains in good condition until it reaches the final consumer, specially in cases where the transit is for a long period. Firmness is an indication of the freshness. Firmness can also be measured with the help of pressure testing equipment.

In the 5th indent, the word, “*and diseases*” may be added at the end. This is suggested as there may be situations where pests could be killed by providing treatment to the produce, but the sign of the disease can still remain on the produce.

A new indent may be added after the fifth indent stating, “ - *free of damage caused by high and/or low temperature.*”

2.3 CLASSIFICATION**2.3.1 “Extra” Class**

The square bracket around the words, “*The flesh must be perfectly sound*” may be deleted:

In the second para, the word, “superior” may be replaced by the word, “*general*”.

2.3.2 Class I

A new indent as follows may be added :

“ - *must conform to the colouring set out in Annex I.*”

2.3.3 Class II

At the end of the paragraph, the words, “*in the package*” may be added after the word, “presentation”.

A new indent as follows may be added :

“ - *must conform to the colouring set out in Annex I.*”

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

The square bracket around the title may be removed.

The second paragraph may be replaced by the following to take into account both large and small varieties of apples as well as the consumer preferences for different sizes of the fruit:

“*A minimum size by diameter and/or weight shall be required for all categories according to the following table; or based on pre-established geographical market size preferences as specified.*”

Minimum diameter and weight for all classes of apples

Fruit Varieties	“Extra” Class		Class I		Class II	
	Diameter	Weight	Diameter	Weight	Diameter	Weight
Large Fruit Varieties	70 mm	220 g	65 mm	150 g	60 mm	130 g
Other Varieties	65 mm	150 g	60 mm	120 g	55 mm	90 g

Apples should also be classified according to the following size codes to be determined by diameter or weight :

Size Code	Diameter (in mm.)	Weight (in g)
A or 1	> 80	> 240
B or 2	71-80	191-240
C or 3	66-70	151-190
D or 4	61-65	121-150
E or 5	< 61	< 121

”

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

In Codex standards, provision for tolerance with respect to quality and size is a standard practice. However, there is no practice of providing tolerance over and above such tolerances as are specified under the relevant standard provisions. It is, therefore, proposed that, while framing the document, care may be taken that this is avoided.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.2 Class I

Decay of one fruit leads spoiling of other fruits. It is, therefore proposed that the indent may be deleted.

4.1.3 Class II

It is proposed that the second and third paragraphs with the three indents may be deleted as these defects are covered under the Appendix-II.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

In the Appendix-I, flexibility in colour has already been provided. There is also a reference to different varieties and/or sizes of apples in a package. It is, therefore, not necessary to explain this in the main text. However, proper labeling becomes necessary with a view to providing relevant information to the purchaser of such packages. This aspect should be reflected in para 6.1.1 concerning labeling. In light of this, it is proposed that only the first para reading, “The contents mixed varieties;” may be retained and the rest be deleted.

5.3 PRESENTATION

The entire paragraph along with its title may be deleted as it is not necessary.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

This para covers consumer packages and para 6.2 covers non-retail containers. It is proposed that both kinds of packages may be defined because in certain countries, even a 20 kg package may be considered a consumer (retail) package. Moreover, there is a need to have uniformity in the titles of paras 6.1 and 6.2.

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

In certain situations, a package may contain different varieties and/or sizes of apples. Since relevant information is needed by the purchaser for business decisions, it is proposed that the paragraph may be modified to read as follows :

“If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package, or lot for produce presented in bulk, shall be labeled as to the name of the produce and ~~may be labeled~~ as to name of the variety, class and size/weight. ~~or the number of pieces presented in rows and layers.~~ If the package contains apples of different varieties, the names of varieties and their respective size codes shall also be mentioned on the label.”

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

As mentioned in 6.1 above, the minimum size of a non-retail package may need to be defined so as to determine whether the package also needs to be labeled with varieties, class and size/weight.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

It is proposed that the second indent may read as follows :

“ – *Size Code (if sized).*”

7. CONTAMINANTS

PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The words, “or as per national legislation” may be deleted as this clause could lead to dilution of the Codex standard.

APPENDIX-I

GROUP A : VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING

In “Extra” Class, “2/3 ” may be modified to “3/4 ”.

IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES, THERE ARE VARIETIES WITH SEMI RED OR MIXED COLOURING. HENCE GROUP-B MAY NEED TO BE RETAINED AS FOLLOWS:

GROUP B : VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING

Extra Class: At least 2/3 of the surface of the fruit is red in colour.

Class I: At least 1/2 of the surface of the fruit is red in colour.

Class II: At least 1/6 of the surface of the fruit is red in colour.

APPENDIX II

ALLOWANCE FOR DEFECTS MAXIMUM DEFECTS ALLOWED

The following amendments are proposed in the table given in Appendix II :

DEFECTS ALLOWED	EXTRA CLASS	CLASS I	CLASS II
Limb Rub (brown or light brown in color)	0.5 cm ²	<u>0.5 cm²</u>	<u>0.5 cm²</u>
Russetting outside Calyx /stem cavity smooth net-like	5 <u>2</u> % of surface area	15 <u>5</u> % of surface area	25 <u>10</u> % of surface area
smooth solid	5 <u>1</u> % of surface area	5 <u>2</u> % of surface area	10% of surface area
Slight bruising, with slight discoloration ⁽¹⁾	1.5 <u>0.5</u> cm ²	2 <u>1</u> cm ²	2.5 <u>1.5</u> cm ²
Light Blemishes	5 cm ²	2 <u>1</u> cm ²	2.5 <u>1</u> cm ²
Scabs (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), Dark blemishes, healed hail marks, and similar blemishes	----	0.5 cm ²	1 cm ²
Stem Calyx cracks (healed or well cured)	----	0.5 cm	1 <u>0.5</u> c m
Bruising with discoloration ⁽¹⁾	----	----	2.5 <u>1</u> cm ²
Dark blemishes not blending with skin color	-----	-----	2.5 <u>1</u> cm ²
Maximum length of elongated shaped defects	----	2 cm	4 cm

Further, any kind of pre-existing disease or defective post harvest handling or storage can lead to decay or other deterioration and would become an affecting condition. It would, consequently, lead to a decline in the quality of the fruits in any of the classes. It is, therefore, proposed that the last paragraph reading, “**Condition After** any of the classes.” may be deleted.

IRAN

DEFECTS ALLOWD		EXTRA CLASS	CLASS I	CLASS II
Russting outside Calyx/stem cavity	Smooth net-like	0% Of surface area	0% Of surface area	10% Of surface area
	Smooth solid	0% Of surface area	0% Of surface area	10% Of surface area

NEW ZEALAND

GENERAL COMMENTS

New Zealand appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Draft Standard for Apples, and participated in the working group meeting, though not listed. We would like to make the following comments on points raised in the working group's report.

We will comment separately on the proposed Codex Layout when it is available, and will provide New Zealand information on apple maturity indicators.

SECTION 2.1

New Zealand supports the wording as drafted by the working group relating to the stalk and freedom from pests, and supports the deletion of the wording relating to watercore. The wording reflects normal commercial practice, and will ensure that apples are of good quality.

SECTION 2.1.1

New Zealand supports the wording as drafted by the working group relating to colour, i.e. the fruit must be characteristic of the variety. Prescriptive colour requirements should not be included because they may restrict trade when a variety's colour differs between regions, and because colour does not relate to the value or desirability of the fruit. Nevertheless it may be desirable for another organisation to develop information on typical colour of apples.

SECTION 3

New Zealand believes that in principle no minimum size or minimum Brix is necessary as fruit of any size can reach full maturity and be a satisfactory eating experience. However we accept that this is not the view of other Codex members and agree to the working group's compromise.

Nevertheless it is important that commercial practices and innovation should not be stifled. We note that to supply certain markets New Zealand growers employ management practices that deliberately grow small fruit. This is best achieved by choosing the right variety; managing water, nutrients, light and fruit load; and growing the fruit in the right region, in the right soil, and on the right rootstock.

SECTION 5.1

New Zealand's first preference is Proposal (1). In this proposal, the second sentence should be deleted since colour is covered by minimum requirements. The wording should be rationalised with section 4.2 to remove redundant material.

Proposal (3) may be acceptable, but it should be considerably simplified. In regard to size, we suggest allowing a tolerance of $\pm 10\%$ of the median size of a sample. This would avoid the need to sample the largest and smallest fruit in a package to establish the difference, and it can be used no matter the fruit sizes.

In regard to colour, the proposal is much tighter than the former Annex I. We therefore suggest that any colour bands proposed as replacements for prescriptive variety lists must be similar to the bands in Annex 1.

An example is:

Extra class: The difference in blush colour surface area between the apples in a package must not exceed 40%. Nil tolerance (i.e no apples outside of band).

Class I: The difference in blush colour surface area between the apples in a package exceeding 50%: 10% tolerance (i.e I in 10 apples could be outside of band).

SECTION 6.2.3

The *General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods* (Codex Stan 1) requires declaration of the country of origin only if its omission would mislead or deceive the consumer. The Standard for Apples should be consistent with the GSLPF and should not require mandatory labelling with country of origin.

SWITZERLAND

13th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables, Mexico City, Mexico, 25-29 September 2006. Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples.

We wish to thank the Codex Committee on fresh fruits and vegetables for the opportunity to offer our comments on the aforementioned proposed draft. Likewise, we are thankful to the working group under the direction of the United States of America for writing the proposed draft shown in document CX/FFV/O6/13/8. The draft as well as the issues identified in it, do call for the following comments and proposals:

Section 2.1 Minimum requirements

Watercore

Watercore is a physiological disorder characterized by an accumulation of fluid in the gaps separating the cells. The main potential causes are elevated temperatures during growth, too wide a difference in night-day temperatures or late harvest. The transparent sections containing fluid near or in the core of the fruit appear and might cause internal decay within 2 to 3 months during storage, especially under controlled atmospheric conditions. Those fruits showing internal decay are not edible, this defect being already covered by the minimal requirement: "sound".

Only very slight watercore conditions can, in the case of certain varieties, disappear under certain storage conditions (slow cooling, slowly applied controlled atmosphere), but then, the flesh of the fruits softens and their quality is likewise altered.

Watercore being considered a defect on our markets, those apples showing the condition are not deemed sound unless the defect is a varietal characteristic (radial watercore being admitted for the Fuji variety and mutants).

Proposal: In the light of the above considerations, we favour retaining the following minimum requirement:

- *Free of watercore*¹

¹ (footnote) *Due to the varietal characteristics of the Fuji variety and mutants, radial watercore is admitted as long as it is restricted to the fibrovascular bundle of each fruit.*

2.2 Maturity requirements

Maturity parameters and indicators for apples must be established. We do not, however, believe that one refractometric index could be established to adequately reflect the minimum maturity requirement for every apple. The danger lies in considering the threshold index for varieties genetically less sweet and extending it to the remaining varieties.

In the light of the above considerations, we recommend deleting the final part of the paragraph stating: *If refractometric indices of the flesh are used, the Brix degree must be greater than or equal to [] should be used for information only and not as a requirement.*

2.3.1 "Extra" Class

We support the Working Group's proposal concerning the condition of flesh. We propose the following wording in order to match the standard terminology:

Proposal: ...*The flesh must be perfectly sound. The flesh must be free of damage.*

We wholly reject the maximum allowance for defects proposed in Annex II. The proposed limits are incoherent relative to one another, as well as commercially unrealistic. Allowing in “Extra” class defects more serious than in Class I would be tantamount to deceiving the consumers.

2.3.2 Class I

As for the proposal in Annex II, we favor defining measurable limits for skin defects. Those limits proposed are, however, incoherent relative to one another, as well as commercially unrealistic. We propose matching both content and form to the homogeneous phrasing of the Codex standards and the EU/UN standard for apples.

Proposal:

~~skin and other defects~~ slight skin defects not exceeding:

- 2cm maximum length for elongated shaped defects
- 1cm² total surface for other defects, excluding scabs (*Venturia inaequalis*), the surface of which shall not exceed 0.25cm²
- 1cm² for slight bruising, with no discoloration.

2.3.3 Class II

We favor, in Appendix II, the definition of measurable limits for skin defects. We propose matching both content and form to the homogeneous phrasing of the Codex standards and the EU/UN standard for apples.

Proposal:

- ~~skin and other defects~~ skin defects not exceeding:

- 4cm maximum length for elongated shaped defects
- 2.5cm² total surface for other defects, excluding scabs (*Venturia inaequalis*), the surface of which shall not exceed 1cm²
- 1.5 cm² for slight bruising, with no discoloration.

3. Provisions concerning sizing

We maintain that a link exists, for a given variety under certain climactic conditions, between size and maturity as well as size and quality of produce. Along those lines, we favor maintaining separate minimum diameters for the group comprising large fruited varieties and for the group comprising all the other varieties. The simplification proposed by the working group does not account for the genetic diversity of apples (e.g. the triploid varieties).

Proposal:

Size is determined by maximum diameter of the equatorial section or by weight of each apple.

Whenever size is determined by diameter, the minimum diameter required for each class shall be:

	Extra	I	II
Large fruited varieties	65mm	60mm	60mm
Other varieties	60mm	55mm	50mm

Whenever size is determined by weight, the minimum weight required for each class shall be:

	Extra	I	II
Large fruited varieties	110g	90g	90g
Other varieties	90g	80g	70g

We acknowledge that the working group’s proposal concerning a sole minimum size (60mm) for every class and variety has the benefit of bringing a potential solution for the marketing of small sized apples fulfilling the stated maturity requirements. Should the Committee choose to proceed along these lines, the provision of a minimum level of 11Brix° for apples of sizes ranging between 50mm and 60mm would be appropriate.

4.1.3 Size tolerances / Class II

We believe that the Committee lacks the competence to differentiate between pests submitted to quarantine and others which are not. The Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables apply subject to dispositions concerning phytosanitary measures. We therefore support the proposed wording.

5.1 Uniformity

We support proposal (3) with the following amendments (for purposes of simplification and matching the current terminology):

Proposal (3) (amended):

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, size and degree of maturity. For “Extra” class, color should be uniform as possible. The packages destined to the final consumer sales packages (of a net weight not exceeding 5kg) may contain mixtures of varieties provided they are uniform in quality, and for each variety concerned, in origin. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents except for mixed sizes and varieties.

The difference in diameter or weight between fruit in the same package shall be limited to:

~~–under a diameter of 60 mm (90 gr): 5 mm / 20 gr.~~

~~–from a diameter of 60 mm (90 gr) to 90 mm (290 gr): 10 mm / 40 gr.~~

~~–over a diameter of 90 mm (290 gr): 15 mm / 75 gr.~~

The difference in blush collared surface between the apples in a package must not exceed:

~~–10% for “Extra” Class.~~

~~–15% for Class I.~~

6.2.1 Identification

We support maintaining footnote 5.

Annexes I and II

Colour and russetting of skin are varietal characteristics based on genetic factors evident according to the conditions, essentially climatic and meteorological, of production. The draft Appendix I showing the color classification for apples lacks regulatory power for not setting up groups based on the names of the varieties comprised by those groups, which makes it ineffectual. In the understanding that updating the varieties lists might pose problems, we propose that the Committee limit the list to those varieties most relevant for world scale marketing.

Annex II identifies russetting as a defect, while in some apple varieties russetting is a characteristic of the variety, and for others a quality defect.

Proposal: We propose replacing Annexes I and II by an appendix to the standard which would:

- define the color groups (in principle, 4 color groups, as proposed by the working group),
- classify the varieties most relevant for world scale marketing in the given groups (we believe that some 30 varieties, plus their respective clones, should be mentioned);
- indicate those varieties for which russetting is a varietal characteristic, and for the remaining varieties, the tolerated limits of smooth solid and net-lime russetting .