

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.org

Agenda Item 3

CX/FFV 15/19/5-Add.1 (REV)
September 2015

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

19th Session
Ixtapa Zihuatanejo, Guerrero, Mexico, 5 – 9 October 2015

PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR AUBERGINES

Comments at Step 3 submitted by Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, European Union, Ghana, India, Japan, Kenya, Philippines and Thailand

COLOMBIA

Colombia is pleased to give the following comments to the document **PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR AUBERGINE** at Step 4.

Henceforth we take the document attached to CX/FF 15/19/5, English version, as a reference.

1. Definition of Produce

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of aubergines grown from *Solanum melongena* L. **of the *Solanaceae* family**, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Aubergines for industrial processing are excluded.

According to the wording used in the CODEX Standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, Colombia proposes to include the family to which the considered produce belongs to.

2.1 Minimum (first bullet)

- intact, with calyx and peduncle which may be slightly damaged, **and to have a maximum length of 1cm.**

For homogeneity effects, Colombia considers important to include a minimum length for the peduncle.

b) For sizing by weight the minimum weight shall be

- 10 g for aubergines between 20 – 50 g
- 20 g for aubergines between 50 – 100 g
- 75 g for aubergines between 300 – 500 g
- 250 g for aubergines above 500 g

It is important to have a new wording for this section as its interpretation is not clear.

4.1 Quality Tolerances

4.1.1 Categoría "Extra"

Five percent by number or weight of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of the Extra Class, but meeting those of Class I is allowed. ~~Within this tolerance not more than 1% in total may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class I nor the minimum requirements or of produce affected by decay.~~ **or, exceptionally that they are not exceed the established tolerances for Class I.**

It is not suitable to include crossed out text due to the implications for marketing produce affected by decay. The produce must not be affected by decay, either from the phytosanitary point of view or from any other point of view. If so, this is because of improper post-harvest handling practices.

Regarding minimum requirements, as it is indicated by its name, they are the minimum that can be demanding for the produce and this is the reason for their compliance.

4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of Class I, but meeting those of Class II is allowed. ~~Within this tolerance not more than 1% in total may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class II nor the minimum requirements or of produce affected by decay.~~ **or, exceptionally coming within the tolerances of that Class.**

It is not suitable to include crossed out text due to the implications for marketing produce affected by decay. The produce must not be affected by decay, either from the phytosanitary point of view or from any other point of view. If so, this is because of improper post-harvest handling practices.

Regarding minimum requirements, as it is indicated by its name, they are the minimum that can be demanding for the produce and this is the reason for their compliance.

4.1.3 Categoría II

Ten percent by number or weight of aubergines satisfying neither the requirements of Class II nor the minimum requirements is allowed, ~~Within this tolerance not more than 2% in total may consist of produce affected by decay.~~ **with the exception of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering unfit for consumption.**

It is not suitable to include crossed out text due to the implications for marketing produce affected by decay. The produce must not be affected by decay, either from the phytosanitary point of view or from any other point of view. If so, this is because of improper post-harvest handling practices.

5.2 Packaging

Aubergines shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995 **Rev. 1-1991**).

As in 2004 an amendment to this code was made, it is important to include its whole reference.

6.1 Consumer Packages

In addition to the requirements of the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985 **Rev. 1-1991**), the following specific provisions apply:

Reference to the Codex Standard for Labelling must be updated, therefore it is necessary to include the revision done in 1991.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 ~~It is recommended that~~ **The** produce covered by the provisions of this Standard ~~be prepared and handled~~ **shall be prepared and handled** in accordance with the appropriate sections of the 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.

Because of the incidence and importance of applying proper practices, the provision should be mandatory and not a recommendation.

COSTA RICA

Costa Rica appreciates the work done by India as well as the request for comments. However, we have no comments for the time being.

CUBA

Cuba appreciates the opportunity to provides comments on some documents of the agenda of 19th session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

Cuba agrees with the proposal on the document CX/FFV 15/19/5 Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Aubergines

ECUADOR

Clause No./ Sub-clause No./	Paragraph/ Table/Note	Proposed change	Comments (Justification for changing)
2.1.2	4	,,,,,,,sufficiently developed.	(i) Definition and characteristics of <i>sufficiently developed</i> should be included in the standard for clarification.
3	Título SIZING CLASSIFICATION	(i) Sizing definition should be included in the standard as a footnote for clarification.
3	10	PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING	(ii) Metric units in this section must be clarified as they are in cm and mm.
3	13	b) For sizing by weight the minimum weight shall be:	(i) Clarify the ratio of minimum weight.
6.2.1	25	...Identification code <u>supporting the traceability of the produce.</u>	(ii) Traceability issue should be included,
6.2.4	28	- Size (length in mm or weight in g).	(ii) Review the metric units in this proposed draft standard.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union and its Member States (EUMS) would like to thank all the participants in the electronic working group and in particular India for leading this work and for the good progress made.

The EUMS would like to submit to the Committee the following specific comments:

Proposed text	Reason for the change/inclusion
<p><u>According to their shape a distinction is made between:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>elongated aubergines, and</u> - <u>round aubergines.</u> 	This second paragraph should be added to this section to clarify the types of produce.
2.1 Minimum Requirements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sound with characteristic shape of the variety, produce affected by rotting or deterioration[†] such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded. 	<p>The requirement “with characteristic shape of the variety” should not be part of the minimum requirements. In any case, it should not be linked to the requirement “sound”. This could be related to Class Extra and Class I.</p> <p>The footnote 1 must be deleted as it refers to defects in development (fibrous flesh) which should be covered in the maturity requirements.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - free of damage² caused by low temperature.... 	The footnote 2 is an explanatory note describing the defects. It is not customary to have these explanatory notes in the Standards. The footnote itself should be deleted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sufficiently developed without the flesh being fibrous or woody and without over-development of the seeds. 	This indent should be moved to 2.1.2 Maturity Requirements.

Proposed text	Reason for the change/inclusion
2.1.2 Maturity requirements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – sufficiently developed without the flesh being fibrous or woody and in case of seeds, no hard seeds. 	This indent has been moved from 2.1., drafting amendment since 'hard is more accurate criterion than over-development
2.2.1 Extra Class	
They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type as regards shape, appearance, colouring and development.	The reference to parameters should be deleted. Produce in Extra Class must express all aspects typical for the variety and not only those listed.
2.2.2 Class I	
They must be characteristic of the variety <u>and/or commercial type</u> as regards shape, appearance, colouring and development.	The reference to commercial types is missing. The reference to parameters should be deleted. Produce in Class I must express all aspects typical for the variety and not only those listed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – slight discoloration depending upon the variety but not greenish in case of violet varieties 	<p>The reference to variety is not necessary.</p> <p>The reference to greenish in case of violet varieties is necessary to avoid solanacin in aubergines.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – slight superficial skin defects,...and must not affect the flesh of the fruit. 	<p>In the context of the standard it should read “skin” instead of “superficial”.</p> <p>The reference to the defects not affecting the flesh of the fruit should be deleted. This should hold for all defects listed in Class I and not for skin defects only. Alternatively the general requirement “The flesh must be perfectly sound.” could be included as in Extra Class.</p>
2.2.3 Class II	
The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the tree tomatoes aubergines retain their essential characteristics....	Editorial correction: The term “tree tomatoes” must be replaced by “aubergines”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – discoloration depending upon the variety but in case of violet varieties no greenish 	<p>The reference to variety is not necessary.</p> <p>The reference to greenish in case of violet varieties is necessary to avoid solanacin in aubergines.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – skin defects including slight bruising, and/or slight healed cracks and/or sun-scorch provided they do not cover more than 10% of the total surface area 	The term “skin defects” is missing to cover all defects like bruising, cracks and sun-scorch. If not the standard would allow 10% of each of these defects and not 10% in total for all defects listed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Slight dry superficial defect provided they do not cover more than 10% of the total surface area and must not affect the flesh of the fruit. 	This indent is already covered by “skin defects”. Moreover, in Class II the requirement “not affect the flesh of the fruit” is not acceptable. A general requirement for Class II could read “The flesh must be free from major defects.”

Proposed text	Reason for the change/inclusion
3. Sizing	
<p>Size of the aubergines is determined either based on the maximum diameter of the equatorial (in cm); section on the longitudinal axis or by weight (in g).</p> <p>a) For sizing by diameter the minimum diameter shall be</p> <p>-15 mm for small globus aubergines;</p> <p>-30 mm for elongated aubergines;</p> <p>-70 mm for globus aubergines.</p> <p>To ensure uniformity the difference between the smallest and largest aubergine in the same package must not exceed:-</p> <p>a) For sizing by diameter:</p> <p>- 5 mm for small globus aubergines;</p> <p>- 20 mm for elongated aubergines;</p> <p>- 25 mm for globus aubergines.</p> <p>b) For sizing by weight the minimum weight shall be</p> <p>- 10 g for aubergines between 20-50 g;</p> <p>- 20 g for aubergines between 50-100 g;</p> <p>- 75 g for aubergines between 100-300 g;</p> <p>- 100 g for aubergines between 300-500 g;</p> <p>- 250 g for aubergines above 500 g.</p> <p>– Compliance with the sizing scale is compulsory for Extra class and Class I. In addition, elongated aubergines must have a minimum length, excluding peduncle of 80 mm.</p>	<p>For aubergines, it is not necessary to fix a minimum size – especially as there is no definition of certain types of aubergines. The best option would be to delete this section altogether.</p> <p>There is no definition for “small globus aubergines”. Thus, it is not possible to define a special size range for this type of aubergines.</p> <p>Editorial proposal</p> <p>Correction of a drafting error. Weight ranges are given to ensure uniformity (and not a minimum weight).</p>
5.1 Uniformity	
<p>The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only aubergines of the same origin, variety or commercial type, quality, colour and size (if sized). The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.</p>	<p>Traders should not be prevented to offer mixes of different aubergines to consumers, if appropriately labeled.</p>
<p><u>However, a mixture of aubergines of distinctly different commercial types and/or colours may be packed together in a package, provided they are uniform in quality and, for each commercial type and/or colour concerned, in origin.</u></p>	<p>Proposal to add a new sentence to allow mixture of distinctly different commercial types and colours. This provision could be included as 3rd paragraph.</p>
6.1.1 Nature of Produce	
<p><u>Mixture of aubergines”, or equivalent denomination, in the case of a mixture of distinctly different commercial types and/or colours of aubergines. If the produce is not visible from the outside, the commercial types and/or colours and the quantity of each in the package must be indicated.</u></p>	<p>If mixtures of commercial types and/or colours are included in Section 5.1, the consumer packages should be labelled accordingly.</p>

Proposed text	Reason for the change/inclusion
6.2.3 Origin of Produce	
<u>In the case of a mixture of distinctly different commercial types and/or colours of aubergines of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the commercial type and/or colour concerned.</u>	If mixtures of commercial types and/or colours are included in Section 5.1, the country of origin should be labelled accordingly.
5.2. Packaging	
Aubergines must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new ⁴ , 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. For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.	On the background of resource scarcity and public awareness on this issue, re-using of appropriately cleaned packing material should be allowed.

GHANA**1. Definition of produce**

Ghana proposes that, there should be a separation of the Scope and Definition of the produce.

2.1 Minimum Requirements

We propose the deletion of with characteristic shape of the variety, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded. The inclusion of the statement is contrary to the CCFFV standard format.

New technological applications may lead to new varieties which may not have the traditional characteristic shape.

- sound,

We also propose the rewording of the last bullet as fibrous flesh or woody in over developed produce describes over developed okra not aubergines. We propose the bullet reads;

- **Sufficiently developed without over-development of the seeds.**

- sufficiently developed without over-development of the seeds.

3. Provisions concerning sizing

We propose the addition of size by count to the standard as aubergines are traded in Ghana by size and count. We therefore would propose the paragraph reads:

Aubergine may be sized by diameter, count or weight; or in accordance with pre existing trading practices. When sized in accordance with pre-existing trading practices, the package must be labelled with the size and method used.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES**4.1.1 "Extra" Class**

To avoid the addition of inferior classes to the Extra Class, we propose the following wording for the Extra Class aubergine

ive percent by number or weight of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of the Extra Class, but meeting those of Class I is allowed. **Of this total**, not more than 1% may consist of produce affected by decay.

4.1.2 Class 1

Ten percent by number or weight of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of Class I, but meeting those of Class II is allowed. Of this total, not more than 1% may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class II nor the minimum requirements or of produce affected by decay.

4.1.3 Class II

T Of Class II, not more than 2% in total may consist of produce affected by decay.

We propose the deletion of the first sentence because, all produce must meet the minimum requirements of the standard. The statement is inconsistent

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes (if sized), 10% by number or weight or diameter of aubergines not satisfying the requirements as regards sizing is allowed.

5.1 UNIFORMITY

Ghana supports broadening of the Uniformity Requirements to allow mixture of different color aubergines in the same sales package. We therefore propose an addition the requirement as:

However, a mixture of aubergines of distinctly different varieties may be packed together in a sales package, provided they are uniform in quality and, for each variety concerned, in origin.

To prevent repetition of sections in the standard, we propose the deletion of 6.1.1 as 6.2.2 states the same.

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 and/or commercial type.~~

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce "aubergines"

INDIA

General Comments:

India appreciates the deliberations made by the eWG members on the agenda.

Specific Comments:

1) Para 1 of Section 1 "DEFINITION OF PRODUCE" may be read as:

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of aubergines grown from *Solanum melongena* L., **esculentum, insanum and ovigerum** to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Aubergines for industrial processing are excluded.

Rational: In order to ensure consistency with the other standards, family of the aubergines species to be included i.e. var. **esculentum, insanum and ovigerum**.

2) Para 2 of Section 2.2.2 "Extra" Class may be read as:

Aubergines in this class must be of superior quality. They must be firm and characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type as regards shape, appearance, colouring and development. Stalk must be intact and flesh must be perfectly sound.

They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, ~~provided they do not cover more than 2% of the surface area and~~ **provided they** do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

Rational: The 2% superficial defects for extra class will be too restrictive for trade and also to ensure consistency with the other standards percentage should be deleted.

3) Bullet 3 of Para 2 under Section 2.2.2 “ Class I” may be read as:

- slight superficial defects, slight bruising and/or slight healed cracks provided they do not ~~cover more than 5% of the total surface area and must not~~ affect the flesh of the fruit.

Rational: The 5% superficial defects for class I will be too restrictive for trade and also to ensure consistency with the other standards percentage should be deleted.

4) Bullet 4 under Section 2.2.3 “ Class II” may be read as:

- slight dry skin defect provided they do not ~~cover more than 10% of the total surface area and must not~~ affect the flesh of the fruit.

Rational: The 10% superficial defects for class II will be too restrictive for trade and also to ensure consistency with the other standards percentage should be deleted.

5) Para 1 under Section 3 “Provision Concerning Sizing” may be read as:

Size of the aubergines is determined either based on the maximum diameter of the equatorial (~~in mm~~) (in mm); section on the longitudinal axis or by weight (in g).

Rationale: It's an editorial correction

JAPAN

Japan appreciates the efforts of India for leading the eWG and preparing the proposed draft. We are pleased to provide the following comments on the Proposed Draft Standard for Aubergines at Step 3.

Specific comments

New texts are presented in **underlined/bold font** and deletion in ~~strikethrough font~~.

3. Provisions concerning sizing**a) For sizing by diameter***Proposed text*

-~~25~~ 30 mm for elongated aubergines ;

Rationale

Japan proposes 25mm as the minimum diameter for the elongated aubergines. Small-sized elongated aubergines of 25mm in diameter are produced and distributed in Japan and we are of the view that Codex Commodity standards should be inclusive to encompass the range of varieties sold and exported as aubergines with a view to ensure fair trade practices.

3. Provisions concerning sizing**b) For sizing by weight***Proposed text*

For sizing by weight, **the difference between the smallest and largest aubergine in the same package must not exceed:** ~~the minimum weight shall be~~

Rationale

Japan considers that this provision is for the difference between the smallest and largest aubergines in the same package.

KENYA**GENERAL COMMENT**

Kenya would like to appreciate the work done by Electronic Working group led by India to come up with the working document for Codex members to comment on.

SPECIFIC COMMENT

Kenya would like to propose that ‘**clause 1**’ below be the ‘**SCOPE**’ of the standard for it does not define the product but gives the scope of the product to be covered in the body of the standard. This is in consistent with the format of drafting codex standards as stipulated in the Codex Alimentarius Commission procedural manual Edition 23rd. This also will alter all the clauses in this standard so clause one will be ‘scope’ and clause two will be ‘Description’ ‘definition’ etc

We would like to add another common name of ‘ aubergines’ as” **eggplant**” in the scope as inserted below in the new scope.

Justification: Inclusion of Eggplant and scope is important for clarity.

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE SCOPE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of aubergines (**eggplant**) grown from *Solanum melongena* L., to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Aubergines for industrial processing are excluded.

2. Description

This shall be the mature fruit of the aubergines (eggplant from genus acinidia plant...

Specific comment.

Kenya recommends that aubergines or eggplant be described clearly.

2. 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

23.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

- **Intact**, with calyx and peduncle which may be **slightly damaged**;

Specific comment

Kenya proposes the word "slightly damaged" in the statement of 'intact' above and recommends a footnote to describe the level of "slight damage" to be included.

- **sound**, produce affected by rotting or deterioration¹ such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- NEW- '**COLOUR AND SHAPE**'-- **characteristic of the commercial variety**

Specific comment

Kenya recommends addition of bullets of "colour and shape" should be characteristic of the commercial variety

- 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 damage² caused by low temperature or frost or high temperature;
- firm;
- fresh in appearance;
- free of bruising or extensive healed over-cuts;
- sufficiently developed without the flesh being fibrous or woody and without over-development of the seeds.

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

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

2 3.1.2 Maturity Requirements

The aubergines ~~must~~ **'shall'** be sufficiently developed.

Specific comment

Clause 2.1.2 – maturity requirements is repetitive of last bullet of/on minimum requirements. We propose the word 'must' to be changed to 'shall' to be consistent to codex standards

2.3.2 CLASSIFICATION

COMMENT: Classification to be clause 3.2

2.3.2.1 “Extra”Class

Aubergines in this class ~~must~~ **‘shall’** be of superior quality. They ~~must~~ **‘shall’** be firm and characteristic of the variety and/or commerciality peas regards shape, appearance, colouring and development. Stalk must be intact and flesh must be perfectly sound.

They ~~must~~ **‘shall’** be free of defects with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided they do not cover more than 2% of the surface area and do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

COMMENT: We propose all the words “must’ to be replaced with the word ‘shall’

2.3.2.2 Class I

Aubergines in this class ~~must~~ **‘shall’** be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety as regards shape, appearance, colouring and development.

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:

COMMENT: We propose all the words “must’ to be replaced with the word ‘shall’

2.3.2.3 Class II

COMMENT: to be clause 3.2.3

3- 4.PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size of the aubergines is determined either based on the maximum diameter of the equatorial (in ~~cm~~ **mm**);

Specific comment

Correction in units used to be changed from cm to mm. The clause is also changed to be ‘clause 4’ instead of 3.

b) For sizing by weight the minimum weight shall be

~~Compliance with the sizing scale is compulsory for Extra class and Class I. In addition, elongated aubergines must have a minimum length, excluding peduncle of 80 mm.~~

Justification

Kenya proposes deletion of the above clause and insertion of “uniformity in size in each class shall be adhered to for all classes”.

4 5.1.1 “Extra”Class

Five percent by number or weight of aubergines not satisfying the requirements of the Extra Class, but meeting those of Class I is allowed. ~~Within this tolerance not more than 1% into tal may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class I nor the minimum requirements or of produce affected by decay.~~

Justification

Kenya’s position is to discouraging the progression of decaying products that is not satisfying extra class quality.

56.2 PACKAGING

Aubergines ~~must~~ **shall** 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 labeling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

Aubergines shall be packed in each container in compliance with the *Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP44-1995).

GENERAL COMMENT:

Clause 5.2 to be clause 6.2 should have footnote number 3 –'food grade quality of packaging material used' needs to be defined clearly to differentiate it with other packaging materials.

COMMENT

The following clauses to be changed as indicated below:

5.6.2.1 Description of Containers**~~6.~~ 7. MARKING OR LABELLING****~~6.7.1~~ CONSUMER PACKAGES****~~6.7.1.1~~ Nature of Produce****~~6.7.2~~ NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS****~~6.7.2.1~~ Identification****~~6.7.2.2~~ Nature of Produce****~~6.7.2.3~~ Origin of Produce****~~6.7.2.4~~ Commercial Identification****~~6.7.2.5~~ Official Inspection Mark (optional)****~~7.8.~~ CONTAMINANTS****~~8.9.~~ HYGIENE****PHILIPPINES****2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****2.1 Minimum Requirements**

The Philippines proposes to simplify the minimum requirements of aubergines on the following characteristics:

- Firm, whole and fresh in appearance
- Clean and practically free from any visible foreign matter
- Calyx and peduncle shall not be damaged
- Free from decay or deterioration; and
- Not over mature

2.1.2 Maturity Requirements

The Philippines proposes that the term "sufficiently developed" be replaced by the term "**physiologically matured**".

JUSTIFICATION: Physiological maturity for aubergines in terms of commercial maturity could be measured by:

1) Number of days from sowing to first harvest which ranges from 50-55 days depending on the variety (PNS, 1997)

2) Fruit color which is an indicator for commercial ripeness, (IBPGR, 1990, Descriptor of Eggplant)

Thus, the aubergines must be carefully harvested when **physiologically matured** or have reached an appropriate degree of development in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and/or commercial type and to the area in which they are grown.

3. Provision Concerning Sizing

The Philippines proposes that for sizing by weight, the minimum weight shall be the following: (PNS/BAFPS 52:2007)*

- 20 g for aubergines between 20-50 g;
- 51 g for aubergines between 51-100 g;
- 101 g for aubergines between 101-200 g;
- 201 g for aubergines above 201g

*Philippine National Standard/Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Product Standards (PNS/BAFPS)

THAILAND

Thailand appreciates the work done by working group led by India. We generally agree with the main content of the draft. However, we would like to comment on specific points as follows;

2.1 minimum requirements

2nd indent

To be consistent with the other Codex standards, “sound” and “characteristic shape” should be on different bullets. We would like to proposed text as follows;

~~“- sound, with characteristic shape of the variety, produce affected by rotting or deterioration¹ such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;~~

- having a shape and colour characteristic of the variety”

7th indent

We would like to delete the words “temperature or frost” because this two words have the same meaning as “low temperature”. Thus, there is no need to be repetitive. It is proposed to read as follows;

- free of damage² caused by low ~~temperature or frost~~ or high temperature;

11st indent

We would like to propose the deletion of this indent ~~“-sufficiently developed without the flesh being fibrous or woody and without over-development of the seeds.”~~, since the detail has already been specified in Section 2.1.2. Maturity Requirements.

2.2.1 “Extra” Class

We would like to delete the word “firm” in the first paragraph of Section 2.2.1 because this word is already specified as one of the minimum requirements in section 2.1. Also, we would like to replace the word “stalk” with “peduncle” because this word widely used in vanous. The amended text should be read;

“They must be ~~firm~~ and characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type as regards shape, appearance, colouring and development. ~~Stalk~~ Peduncle must be intact in good condition and flesh must be perfectly sound.

Furthermore, we would like to propose lower level of defects provided in the second paragraph as follows;

“They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided they do not cover more than ~~2-1~~% of the surface area.”

2.2.2 Class I

We would like to have separated items between “slight superficial defect”, “slight bruising” and “slight healed” for improved clarification of defects in this standard. Also, we suggest the slight bruising should be 1 % of total surface area, healed crack should be limited to 2% of total surface area. The text should be read as follows;

~~“- slight superficial defects, slight bruising and/or slight healed cracks provided they do not cover more than 5% of the total surface area and must not affect the flesh of the fruit.”~~

- slight superficial defects;

- slight bruising provided they do not cover more than 1% of the total surface area.

- slightly healed cracks provided they do not cover more than 2% of the total surface area and must not affect the flesh of the fruit.”

2.2.3 Class II

We would like to separated item between “bruising” and “slight healed crack or sun scorched or dry skin defect” for better clarification of the defects in this standard. Also, we would like to suggested the number of surface area affected by slight bruising and slightly healed cracks or sun-scorched or dry skin defect as follows;

~~“- slight bruising and/or slight healed cracks or sun scorched provided they do not cover more than 10% of the total surface area;~~

~~“- slight dry skin defect provided they do not cover more than 10% of the total surface area and must not affect the flesh of the fruit.”~~

"- slight bruising provided they do not cover more than 2% of the total surface area

- slightly healed cracks or sun-scorched or dry skin defect provided they do not cover more than 5% of the total surface area;

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

We would like to propose the use of Table for elaborating of size code in this standard which is in accordance with Codex Standard layout. Also, the table should be rearrange in descending order from the biggest to the smallest sizes.

Furthermore, we prefer the used of sizing by weight specifically for elongated aubergines.

4.1. Quality Tolerances

4.1.1 "Extra" Class, 4.1.2 Class I and 4.1.3 Class II

We do not agree with the used of the word "decay" in "Extra" Class, Class I and Class II since it is not in compliance with the Thai regulation under the Plant Quarantine Act. The word "decay" may be used only in case that the phrase "the decay must be non pathogenic is specified". Furthermore, the detail in this section should be in line with the Codex Standard layout.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

We would like to propose the amendment of the text as follows;

- Size (~~length~~ diameter in mm or weight in g)