

# 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 - E-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

REP20/FFV

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

*43<sup>rd</sup> Session*

*FAO Headquarters, Rome Italy*

*06 – 11 July 2020*

**REPORT OF THE 21<sup>st</sup> SESSION OF THE  
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

**Monterrey, Nuevo León Mexico**

**7 – 11 October 2019**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
SUMMARY AND STATUS OF WORK .....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	iv
REPORT OF THE 21 <sup>ST</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES	1
	<b>Paragraph</b>
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) .....	5 - 7
Matters arising from other international organisations on the standardisation of fresh fruits and vegetables (Agenda Item 2b) .....	8
Draft standard for kiwifruit: tolerance for decay (at Step 7) (Agenda item 3) .....	9 - 23
Draft standard for garlic (at Step 7) (Agenda item 4) .....	24 - 38
Proposed draft standard for ware potatoes (at Step 7) (Agenda item 5).....	39 - 50
Proposed draft standard for fresh dates (at Step 4) (Agenda item 6).....	51 - 62
Proposed draft standard for yam (at Step 4) (Agenda item 7).....	63 - 74
Proposed draft standard for onions and shallots (at Step 4) (Agenda item 8).....	75 - 89
Proposed draft standard for berry fruits (at Step 4) (Agenda item 9).....	90 - 98
Discussion paper on glossary of terms used in the layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables (Agenda item 10).....	99
Other business (Agenda item 11).....	100 - 103
Date and place of the next session (Agenda item 12) .....	104

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Appendix I:</b> List of Participants .....	15
<b>Appendix II:</b> Draft standard for kiwifruit.....	20
<b>Appendix III:</b> Draft standard for garlic.....	28
<b>Appendix IV:</b> Draft standard for ware potatoes.....	30
<b>Appendix V:</b> Proposed draft standard for yam.....	35

<b>SUMMARY AND STATUS OF WORK</b>				
<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Text/Topic</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Para(s)</b>
Members CCEXEC79 CAC43	Adoption	Draft standard for kiwifruit	8	23 and App. II
		Draft standard for garlic	8	38 and App. III
		Draft standard for ware potatoes	8	50 and App. IV
		Proposed draft standard for yam	5/8	74 and App. V
CCFL	Endorsement	Relevant sections of the: (i) Draft standard for kiwifruit (ii) Draft standard for garlic (iii) Draft standard for ware potatoes (iv) Proposed draft standard for yam		23 and App. II 38 and App. III 50 and App. IV 74 and App. V
CCPFV	Information/Action	Note the development of a standard for fresh dates and clarify if the scope of CXS 143-1985 covers all stages of fresh dates (Khalal stage, rutab stage and tamer stage)		62
EWG (India, and Saudi Arabia) CCFFV22	Drafting Discussion	Proposed draft standard for fresh dates	2	60(ii) and (iii)
EWG (Iran and India) CCFFV22	Drafting Discussion	Proposed draft standard for onions and shallots	2	88(ii) and (iii)
EWG (Mexico and Argentina) CCFFV22	Drafting Discussion	Proposed draft standard for berry fruits	2	96
United States of America CCFFV22	Drafting	Discussion paper on glossary of terms used in the layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables-		99 & 101

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT**

AU	African Union
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CCEXEC	Executive Committee
CCFA	Codex Committee on Food Additives
CCFL	Codex Committee for Food Labelling
CCFFV	Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables
CCLAC	FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean
CCPFV	Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables
CCSCH	Codex Committee for Spices and Culinary Herbs
CRD	Conference Room Document
CXS	Codex Standard
EU	European Union
EWG	Electronic Working Group
GSFA	General Standard for Food Additive (Codex Stan 192-1995)
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PWG	Physical Working Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
USA	United States of America
WG	Working group
WTO	World Trade Organisation

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CCFFV) held its Twenty-first Session in Monterrey, Nuevo León Mexico from 7 – 11 October 2019, at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. Mr Alfonso Guati-Rojo Sánchez, Director General, General Bureau of Standards, Ministry of Economy of Mexico, assisted by Mr Cesar Orozco Arce, chaired the session, which was attended by 38 Member countries, one Member organisation and one observer organisation. A list of participants is included in Appendix I.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION<sup>1</sup>

2. The Chairperson welcomed the delegates and addressed the meeting emphasizing the importance of consensus in timely completion of Codex standards and their relevance to protect consumer health and ensure fair practices in food trade. He also expressed the commitment of the government of Mexico towards standards work in supporting economic development.

## Division of Competence

3. The Committee noted the division of competence<sup>2</sup> 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)<sup>3</sup>

4. The Committee adopted the agenda.

## MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 2a)<sup>4</sup>

5. The Committee considered the information provided in document CX/FFV 19/21/2, and noted the matters that were presented for information.
6. The Committee further agreed on the following item referred for action.

## Matters from the 75<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CCEXEC75)

### Work management

7. The Committee agreed that the priority setting criteria for the establishment of work priorities and the decision making criteria for the development of Codex standards and related texts as laid down in the Procedural Manual, was still sufficient to ensure that standards and work areas identified as priorities were progressed in a timely manner by CCFFV.

## MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS ON THE STANDARDISATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2b)<sup>5</sup>

8. The Committee noted the activities of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) relevant to its work.

## DRAFT STANDARD FOR KIWIFRUIT: TOLERANCE FOR DECAY (AT STEP 7) (Agenda item 3)<sup>6</sup>

9. New Zealand, Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and recalled that the item had been considered by the Committee since CCFFV18, and that at CCFFV20, the draft standard was held at Step 7 as there was no agreement on provisions concerning quality tolerances for decay in “Extra Class” and “Class I”. New Zealand further explained the process followed by the EWG noting that three rounds of consultations were held in which the guiding principles were developed; and that these principles were used to define the specific tolerances of 0.5% for “Extra Class” and 1% for “Class I” as well as their point of application in the supply chain. The necessity to progress the draft standard was also underlined.

---

<sup>1</sup> CRD2

<sup>2</sup> CRD1

<sup>3</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/1

<sup>4</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/2; CRD3 (EU), CRD8 (East African Community); CRD11 (AU)

<sup>5</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/3

<sup>6</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/4; CRD3 (EU); CRD4 (Republic of Korea); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD9 (Morocco); CRD12 (Thailand)

**Discussion**

10. The Committee held a general discussion noting the support for the approach used by the EWG, and acknowledged that the Codex standard for kiwifruit should in general take into account the following elements:
- (i) The need to ensure fair trade practices be clearly demonstrated;
  - (ii) All international trade practices irrespective of the distance of supply;
  - (iii) The available trade data and experience to work with tolerances; and
  - (iv) The perishable nature of a commodity in relation to rot and internal decay.
11. The Committee discussed the draft tolerances of 0.5% for “Extra Class” and 1% for “Class I”; and their point application in the supply chain and noted the following views expressed by delegations:

0% tolerance in “Extra” Class

12. Delegations in favour of 0% tolerance in “Extra Class” noted that:
- (i) Decay and rot were serious defects that could affect the quality of kiwifruit. The “Extra Class” should only be for superior produce, and its quality must be better than produce in other Classes in order to justify the high price. Hence, it would not be justified to make allowance for decay, soft rot and internal breakdown in “Extra Class”;
  - (ii) The experience gained over 30 years with the implementation of the UNECE Standard for Kiwifruit with 0% tolerance for decay in “Extra Class” demonstrated no need to depart from the current tolerance requirements, even when kiwifruit is transported over long distances; acceptance of Codex commodity standards depended on whether they reflected existing trade practices. Therefore, the closer the commercial reality is reflected, the more Codex standards would be accepted and applied in trade;
  - (iii) The proposed tolerance of 0.5% for “Extra Class” was not based on available data and experience;
  - (iv) There would be a phytosanitary risk if other tolerances were allowed, consumers would not be protected and thus the need to ensure that there was compliance at both export and import border points; and
  - (v) Firm kiwifruit is normally associated with a 6.5-degree brix, and with this quality characteristic, these would be resistant to decay, and proposed tolerance of 0% was consistent with most of current CCFFV standards.

0.5% tolerance in “Extra” Class

13. Delegations in favour of 0.5% tolerance in “Extra Class” noted that:
- (i) “Extra Class” should be for superior products. Fresh products, in the stages after harvest, naturally experience a decrease in quality and have a tendency to deteriorate for physiological reasons;
  - (ii) This was a long standing issue and the proposed change from 0% to 0.5 % tolerances was a step in the right direction; however there may be no assurance that products would remain eligible for this class on arrival at the destination point; and
  - (iii) Based on the long history of trade exercise (implementing tolerance of 0%), slight decay could exist in “Extra Class”. Allowing tolerance for of 0.5 for “Extra Class” would be realistic and could provide a distinction between “Extra Class” and “Class I”.

1% tolerance in “Extra” Class

14. Delegations in favour of 1 % tolerance in “Extra” Class noted that:
- (i) The proposed tolerance fully justified the codex principle of fair trade, irrespective of the complexity of the supply chain; and the existing trade practices fully justified the proposed value of 1% for this Class;
  - (ii) This tolerance had been implemented for more than 30 years in North America and beyond using national standards, without any reported trade problem for this commodity at the World Trade Organisation (WTO);
  - (iii) Codex had already adopted standards for other commodities with similar tolerance; and there should be consistency among all standards; and
  - (iv) Fresh products, in the stages after harvest, naturally experience a decrease in quality and have a tendency to deteriorate for physiological reasons.

15. The Committee discussed the practical implementation of applying a fraction of tolerance 0.5% and a concern that this may be both logistically and statistically difficult to apply when conformity is done by count (sample size) as it could result in fractions of a fruit (e.g. 0.5% of 100 fruits would result in 0.5 fruits); however, when decay is present in any form the entire fruit is rejected. On the other hand, it was also noted that application of a fractional tolerance was possible and this would depend on the sampling approach applied.
16. On the proposal by one delegation to include the reference to National Plant Protection Organisations as decay and rot was a phytosanitary matter, the Chair of EWG explained that the standard related to quality matters, while phytosanitary matters were already covered in various protocols of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).
17. The Chairperson summarised the discussion noting that despite the divergent views expressed by delegations, there was a general recognition on the need to bridge the gap between the tolerances in "Extra Class" and "Class I"; as well as to further clarify the point of application of such tolerances within the supply chain taking into account the experiences and existing trade practices. It was proposed that the Committee, should continue with ad-hoc working group (WG) discussions in the margins of the meeting, led by the EWG Chair (New Zealand), in order to arrive at consensus on the aforementioned issues.
18. The plenary considered the proposed text for tolerances as revised during the WG discussions and took the following decisions:

#### Section 5.1.1 "Extra Class"

- (i) Deleted the square brackets on the statement on tolerances i.e. "Included therein is 0.5% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown"; and
- (ii) Added a statement on point of application reading: "only applies beyond export control point", in order to signify the superior quality within this Class as well as ensure practicality in trade.

#### Section 5.1.2 "Class I"

- Deleted the draft text on point of application i.e. "tolerance for decay shall not be acceptable at the stages of preparation; packaging and at the export control", to ensure distinction between "Extra Class" and "Class I"; as well as to support the practical implementation of provision in line with the current trade practices.

19. The following delegations, while not opposing the advancement of the draft standard for kiwifruit, expressed their reservations:
  - (i) The European Union (EU) expressed their strong reservation to the provisions allowing a tolerance for decay in "Extra Class". The EU maintains its view that a tolerance for decay in "Extra Class" is not in line with the concept of "Extra Class", which is a special status granted to products of exceptionally high quality. The EU recalls that CAC41 confirmed that provisions for decay in "Extra Class" are optional and, depending on the nature of the produce, may not be applicable or necessary. In the case of kiwifruit, the experience gained over 30 years with the implementation of the UNECE standard FFV-46 for kiwifruit confirms that there is no need to introduce a tolerance for decay in "Extra Class" of kiwifruit, including when transported long distances. Therefore, the EU will continue to apply a zero tolerance for decay in "Extra Class" of kiwifruit as provided in the UNECE standard.
  - (ii) The United States of America (USA) expressed their reservation to the proposed tolerance for decay, soft rot and internal breakdown in the provisions for "Extra Class" noting that: i) the fractional tolerance of 0.5% adopted is both logistically and statistically difficult to apply when conformity is done by count (sample size) as it could result in fractions of a fruit (e.g. 0.5% of 100 fruits would result in 0.5 fruits). When decay is present in any form, the entire fruit is rejected which negates the proposed fractional percentage; ii) the tolerance does not reflect established trade practices in the USA where for 36 years the tolerance for decay, soft rot and internal breakdown has been set at 1.0% in the USA equivalent of "Extra Class"; iii) the adoption of a fractional percentage tolerance in "Extra Class" for Kiwifruit would set an untenable precedent for future adoption of fractional percentages in Codex that the USA considers to be both a practical problem for inspectional activities as well as a deviation from standard usage of whole percentages in "Extra Class". This position was supported by, Costa Rica, Chile and Jamaica.
  - (iii) Colombia expressed their reservation regarding the inclusion of the tolerances for decay in the quality tolerance due to the sanitary and phytosanitary risks associated with the trade of products affected by rot. There was no definition at Codex level of what is generally understood as products affected by rot, and the inclusion of such a provision in a standard intended to promote quality and safety of the products was rather

contradictory. Tolerances for decay were part of the agreements between the customer and the supplier and this was beyond the Codex standard.

20. New Zealand, speaking as the Chair of the EWG, noted that there were diverse national standards being implemented in international trade and that the above proposed tolerances (see para. 18) provided a compromise position that took into account the concerns raised by delegations in particular: “Extra Class” was of superior quality; the practicality of trade; distinction between “Extra Class” and “Class I”; as well as alignment with other Codex Standards. Therefore, the Standard for Kiwifruit would provide support to fair trade and recommended for the adoption of the proposed tolerances.
21. Regarding a concern on the implication of adopting a standard with relatively wide reservations, the Chairperson explained that not all reservations were on the same issue and consensus had been reached but from different perspectives.
22. The Codex Secretariat explained that reservations were recognised in the Procedural Manual and that the way consensus was implemented in Codex allowed the application of tools such as reservations to disagree with decisions while allowing Codex Standards to progress within the Step process.

### **Conclusion**

23. The Committee noted that all the outstanding issues had been addressed and agreed to forward:
  - (i) the draft standard for kiwifruit to CAC43 for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix II); and
  - (ii) the draft Provisions for labelling to the Codex Committee for Food Labelling (CCFL) for endorsement.

### **DRAFT STANDARD FOR GARLIC (Agenda item 4)<sup>7</sup>**

24. Mexico, Chair of the EWG introduced the item and explained that the EWG had discussed the question on whether smoked garlic was classified under fresh produce or not. It was noted that: (i) smoking could change the flavour, colour and taste of the produce, and thus the freshness associated with it; and (ii) there was ongoing work in the Codex Committee on Spices and Culinary Herbs (CCSCH) on the elaboration of a standard for dried and dehydrated garlic as a spice and smoked garlic is excluded. Based on this consideration, the EWG had concluded that smoked garlic was not a fresh product and should be excluded from the scope of the standard for fresh garlic, however it could fall under the purview of the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables (CCPFV).
25. The Chairperson recommended the Committee focus the discussion on those critical issues identified at CCFFV20 (i.e. inclusion of smoked garlic in the standard, the provisions concerning on sizing etc.) as the standard had been fully considered at the previous two sessions.

### **Discussion**

#### Smoked garlic

26. Delegations expressed their support for exclusion of smoked garlic from the standard.
27. One delegation proposed to refer the development of a standard for smoked garlic to CCPFV for their consideration.
28. The Codex Secretariat explained that according to the Procedural Manual, new work proposals should be submitted by members rather than being referred by a Codex subsidiary body.
29. The Committee held a general discussion on the standard, noted the various comments made by the delegations and agreed with the Chairperson’s proposal to request the EWG Chair (Mexico) to lead informal discussions in the margins of the meeting with the purpose of incorporating all the comments received if appropriate.
30. The Committee considered the revised draft standard section by section. In addition to editorial corrections and amendments for clarity, the Committee took the following decisions:

#### Title of the Standard

31. The Committee agreed to insert the word “Fresh” in the title to make a distinction between fresh garlic and dry/dehydrated garlic.

---

<sup>7</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/5; CX/FFV 19/21/5 Add.1 (Algeria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Gambia, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Switzerland, Uruguay); CRD6 (Ghana); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD9 (Morocco); CRD11 (AU); CRD12 (Thailand)



Section 2 - Definition of produce

32. The Committee agreed to:
- (i) Insert the following footnote to provide for the description of the bulb and tooth:
    - **Bulb:** head covered by a wrapper similar to a very thin paper and it confirmed by bulbil, belonging to the genus and species of *Allium Sativum* L;
    - **Tooth:** They are bulbils gathered at their base, forming what is known as bulb each bulbil is wrapped in a white robe, sometimes something reddish, membranous, transparent and very thin;
  - (ii) Retain the use of words “with and without the skin” as it was explained that in some regions garlic without skin is traded; and
  - (iii) Revise the definitions or description for “fresh garlic”, “semi-dry garlic” and “dry garlic” as follows:
    - **Fresh garlic:** produce which preserves its moisture and turgidity in the stem, and with the outer skin of the bulb soft and flexible.
    - **Semi-dry garlic:** produce with the stem and outer skin (foliage and cataphylls) of the bulb not completely dry.
    - **Dry garlic:** produce in which the stem, outer skin of the bulb (foliage and cataphylls) and the skin surrounding each clove are completely dry.

Section 4 - Provisions concerning sizing

33. The Committee agreed to:
- (i) Insert a statement in the introductory paragraph (chapeau) reading that “this table is not applicable to solo garlic”
  - (ii) Amend the range of diameter, in mm, indicating the minimum and maximum cut off point for each diameter; and
  - (iii) Insert a new size code “N” to accommodate garlic varieties with diameters less or equal 15 mm ( $\leq 15$ ) to cater for products with smaller diameter sizes noting that these products were being traded.

Section 5 - Provisions concerning tolerances

34. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that this section had been extensively deliberated.
35. The Committee agreed with the proposed provisions.
36. Colombia reiterated their reservation regarding the inclusion of the tolerances for decay in the quality tolerance (see para 19(iii)).

Section - 7.2.2 Name of Produce

37. The Committee agreed to change “commercial type” to “commercial denomination” and that this amendment should be made to all the standards adopted at this session (**see paras 100 and 101 for further clarification**).

**Conclusion**

38. The Committee noted that all the outstanding issues had been addressed and agreed to forward:
- (i) the draft standard for garlic to CAC43 for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix III); and
  - (ii) the draft Provisions for labelling to CCFL for endorsement.

**PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR WARE POTATOES (AT STEP 7) (Agenda item 5)<sup>8</sup>**

39. India, the Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and highlighted the progress made in preparation of the draft standard, and explained that based on the comments submitted at the session, a revised draft standard had been prepared (CRD10).

---

<sup>8</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/6; CX/FFV 19/21/6 Add.1 (Algeria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, European Union, Gambia, Honduras, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Uruguay, the United States of America); CRD4 (Republic of Korea); CRD6 (Ghana); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD9 (Morocco); CRD10 (India); CRD11 (AU); CRD12 (Thailand)

40. The Committee agreed to discuss the draft standard section by section, taking into account comments submitted, made appropriate editorial corrections, amendments to provide clarity and consistency of the text, and took decisions as outlined in the following paragraphs.

### **Discussion**

41. There was general agreement on the sections on: Definition of Produce (Section 2), Provisions concerning presentation (Section 6), and Food Hygiene (Section 9).

#### Section 1 - Scope

42. The Committee agreed to the deletion of the text on the descriptive characteristics of the potatoes i.e. shape; external skin colour; fresh colour; depth and colour of the eye cavities noting that the standard applies to all commercial varieties of ware potato as indicated in Section 2 - definition of produce.

#### Section 3.1 - Minimum requirements

43. The Committee discussed the various provisions and took the following decisions:

- (i) *Sprouting (bullet 11)* – noted the explanation that sprouting was a natural phenomenon normally associated with ware potatoes during different conditions of storage, and increased the maximum length of the sprout(s), to 3 mm;
- (ii) *Superficial potato common scab* (see bullet 12, Indent 8) – noted that powdery potato scab was a quarantine disease and agreed to insert the following footnote:

*“Provisions for pests and damage caused by pests apply without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules applied by governments in line with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)”*

#### Section 3.2 - Classification

44. The Section was amended to provide for optional classification of ware potatoes.

#### Section 4 - Provisions concerning sizing

45. The Committee noted the explanation that globally there were many variations in sizes/shapes for ware potatoes and that size codes were used to describe such variations, and agreed to further clarify this section as follows:

- (i) Amended the paragraph describing the sizing methods for ware potatoes (i.e. sized by diameter, count or weight or in accordance with trading practices) to indicate that the different sizing methods were optional;
- (ii) Changed the sizing codes from numerical values (1, 2, 3, 4) to alphabetical letters (A, B, C, D) and assigned a descriptor to each code indicating the physical characteristics (size/shape) for potatoes so as bring clarity to the codes i.e. A (large); B (Round); C (long); D (small).

#### Section 5.1 - Quality Tolerances

46. The Committee discussed the Table for quality tolerances and took the following decisions:

- (i) Noted that the presence of soil in fresh agricultural produce was highly regulated due to phytosanitary risks associated with it, and agreed to separate the quality tolerance for soil from extraneous matter; and assigned soil a value of 0.25% for all classes;
- (ii) Agreed to assign values to extraneous matter of 0.25% for “Extra Class”, 0.50% for both classes I and II;
- (iii) Clarified the provisions for: Sprouts (i.e. less than 3mm); and that Green coloration should not exceed 2mm in depth;
- (iv) Deleted the defects on bites to align it with section 3.1 (Minimum requirement)
- (v) Deleted the defects on “brown stains” and “internal defects including late blight, bacterial wilt, ring rot and or internal breakdown” as this was already covered under provision 1 (i) a “Frozen, decay, soft and 1 (i) d “defects Grey, blue or black sub-epidermal stains”.
- (vi) Inserted the following notes/footnote:
  - a note to restrict the total sum of the percentages of defective produce arising from a) Frozen, decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown; b) Extraneous matter; c) Soil; and d) defects not to exceed the total tolerances for ware potatoes, in each class;

- a note to clarify that if the product is not classified, the tolerances for Class II apply.
- a footnote to make reference to IPPC (see para43 (ii); Section 3.1 - Minimum requirements)

47. The Committee noted the following reservations related to quality tolerances:

- Thailand expressed their reservation about the proposed values for quality tolerances for “Extra Class”.
- Costa Rica and Paraguay expressed their reservation on the proposed percentage of tolerance for soil.
- Colombia reiterated their reservation regarding the inclusion of the tolerances for decay in the quality tolerance (see para. 19(iii)).

#### Section 7.2 - Non-Retail Containers

48. The Committee agreed to the proposal to align the text in this section with the current technological advances on electronic solutions that were being used in trade. As a consequence, the section was amended to read as follows:

“Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, either printed on the package itself or on a label secured to the fastening (if the labels are placed inside the packages (string bag), this should be done in such a way that the indications concerning marking are readable from the outside). For produce transported in bulk these particulars should appear on a document accompanying the good, and attached in a visible position in the transport vehicle, unless the document is replaced by an electronic solution in that case the identification should be machine readable and easily accessible.”

#### Section 8 - Contaminants

49. The Committee aligned the paragraph on requirements for maximum pesticide residue limits to the requirements of the Procedural Manual.

#### **Conclusion**

50. The Committee noted that all the outstanding issues had been addressed and agreed to forward:

- the draft standard for ware potatoes to CAC43 for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix IV); and
- the draft Provisions for labelling to CCFL for endorsement.

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR FRESH DATES (AT STEP 4) (Agenda item 6)<sup>9</sup>**

51. India, Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and informed the Committee that, in response to the comments submitted, a revised version of the standard had been prepared for consideration.. India also presented the comparison between the *Standard for Dates* (CXS 143-1985) and proposed draft standard, and concluded that there was no overlap and contradiction between products covered by the two standards.

52. Saudi Arabia, co-Chair of the EWG made a short presentation and explained the developmental stages of fresh dates and elaborated that the proposed standard was intended for fresh dates, which might be early harvested in partially ripened stage ( i.e. khalal or baser and rutab), or late harvested in fully ripened stage (tamer stage). It was further explained that tamer stage could be separated into tamer soft stage and tamer dry stage and the proposed standard would only cover tamer soft stage.

#### **Discussion**

53. The Committee held a general discussion focusing on how to best differentiate products to be covered by the proposed draft with those already covered by CXS 143-1985; and how to ensure that there would be no overlap between the two standards.

<sup>9</sup>CX/FFV 19/21/7; CX/FFV 19/21/7 Add.1 (Algeria, Columbia, Cuba, European Union, Gambia, India, Iraq, Mexico, Peru, Somalia, Switzerland, the United States of America); CRD5 (Philippines); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD9 (Morocco); CRD11 (AU); CRD12 (Thailand); CRD14 (CCFFV22 revised version)

54. Some delegations were of the view that: (i) the language used in CXS 143-1985, to define the product (i.e. dates “may” be dried or hydrated to adjust moisture content) could imply that unprocessed dates with low moisture were also covered under this standard; and that there was no clear distinction between fresh date and dried date; (ii) the moisture content of 10-25% at tamer stage as proposed in the draft standard was lower than moisture content for cane sugar varieties of dates (26%, maximum) as stated in CXS 143-1985; thus the fresh dates at tamer stage could fall within the scope of CXS 143-1985; (iii) in some national requirements, dates at tamer stage were categorised as dried dates; (iv) based on different climate situation and harvesting time, characteristics of each cultivar of fresh dates could vary significantly. This situation, however, had not been reflected in the proposed scope.
55. Other delegations pointed out that: (i) CXS 143-1985 covered processed dates in pitted or un-pitted styles and permits optional ingredients such as glucose syrups, sugar flour, vegetable oils, while the proposed standard could cover fresh dates without any treatment and in un-pitted style; and (ii) the fact that dates were classified as either fresh dates and/or dried dates was well supported by scientific studies; and that fresh dates and dried dates could be easily distinguished using scientific methods e.g. moisture determination, brix determination, etc.
56. India further explained that as per the existing standard CXS 143-1985, dates with a high moisture content were considered raw materials for further adjustment to the desired moisture level, and they were intended for the development of various products through processing, such as dehydration, treatment with ingredients and additives.
57. It was also proposed, that a definition for what is generally known as fresh dates could be developed, and such a definition would characterize the different stages of maturity indices (characteristics) and the cut-off point for the dried product. The use of efficiently scientific methods to support this definition was also emphasized.
58. Delegations indicated that there were remarkable trade volumes of fresh date in the international market and emphasized the necessity to speed up the development of a standard for this produce. They also expressed the need to replace the terms used in the proposed standard with simple and understandable terms such as colour, ripeness/sweetness; etc.
59. In view of divergent views on this subject, it was proposed to request CCPFV clarify the scope of CXS 143-1985.

### **Conclusion**

60. The Committee:
- (i) noted that the scope of the standard needed clarifying and the proposed draft standard was not ready for advancement in the Step process;
  - (ii) agreed to return the proposed draft Standard (CRD14) to Step 2; and
  - (iii) agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Saudi Arabia, working in English, to consider the comments received and the discussions at CCFFV21 and to revise the proposed draft Standard for further consideration by CCFFV22.
61. The report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFFV22.
62. The Committee further agreed to inform CCPFV, that it was in the process of the developing a standard for fresh dates; and to request CCPFV to provide clarification on whether CXS 143-1985 had covered all stages of fresh dates with different level of moisture content i.e. for khalal stage not exceeding 85%, rutab stage not exceeding 45% and tamer stage not exceeding 25%, which dates were freshly harvested and consumed without any processing, addition of ingredients and food additives.

### **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR YAM (AT STEP 4) (Agenda item 7)<sup>10</sup>**

63. Costa Rica, Chair of the EWG, introduced this item and informed the Committee that, in response to the comments submitted, a revised proposed draft standard had been prepared for consideration by the Committee.

---

<sup>10</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/8; CX/FFV 19/21/8 Add.1 (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, European Union, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America); CRD5 (Philippines); CRD6 (Ghana); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD11 (AU); CRD12 (Thailand)

**Discussion**

64. The Committee agreed, to discuss the draft standard, section by section, taking into account comments submitted, made appropriate editorial corrections, amendments to provide clarity and consistency of the text, and took decisions as outlined in the following paragraphs.
65. There was general agreement to the sections on: Scope (Section 1), Contaminants (Section 8); and Food Hygiene (Section 9).

**Section 2 – Definition of produce**

66. The Committee agreed to introduce a new paragraph to provide for the colour description for skin, and flesh of yam; and also punctuated the term "*Dioscorea*" after the first time; and inserted footnote to make reference to IPPC (see para. 42(ii))

**Section 3.1 - Minimum requirements**

67. The Committee discussed the various provisions under minimum requirements as follows: i) amended and aligned the terminology (i.e. "whole or transversely cut pieces") to be consistent with the trade practices for yam (bullet one); ii) deleted the quality characteristic "fresh in appearance"; iii) merged footnote "excluding coconut fibre, saw dust and other materials used as protective" with the provision on "clean and practically free of any visible foreign matter" (bullet five) to exclude these materials from being classified as from foreign matter; iv) inserted a new quality characteristic to cover damages from pests i.e. "practically free from damages caused by pests" (bullet 6).

**Section 3.2.1 "Extra Class"**

68. The Committee agreed to include the following permitted slight defects under this provision:
- (i) Non-transversal cuts or surfaces and/or scars, as long as they do not exceed 5% of the surface of the product; and
  - (ii) Very slight defects in shape.

**Section 4 - Provisions concerning sizing**

69. The Committee, noted the explanation that globally, there were many variations in sizes/shapes for yam and that the table under this section was intended to be inclusive of all species, irrespective of their shape and size, and endorsed the provision.

**Section 5 - Provisions concerning tolerances**

70. The Committee discussed the tolerance for decay, and decided to retain a 1% tolerance in "Extra Class" and modified the tolerance for decay in Class I to 2% so as to create a distinction between the two classes. The Committee also agreed with the inclusion of 1% dirt and impurities quality tolerance for all the three classes noting that due to their nature, yams were not normally cleaned (washed) under the similar conditions like other fresh fruits and vegetables.
71. The Committee noted the following reservations related to quality tolerances:
- (i) Colombia, and the European Union and its Member states reiterated their reservation for the same reasons advanced under paras 19(i) and (iii). Thailand expressed their reservation on the provision allowing a tolerance for decay in "Extra Class".
  - (ii) Costa Rica expressed their reservation on the inclusion of the 1% of dirt and impurities in the three classes due to phytosanitary reasons related to their national legislation.

**Section 7.2.2 - Name of Produce**

72. The Committee agreed to include "name of the produce" and "name of variety and/or commercial type" under this section in the English version.

**Section 7.2.4 - Commercial Specifications**

73. The Committee agreed on the proposal to include "cooking type (optional)" and to delete "net weight" from this section.

**Conclusion**

74. The Committee noted that all the outstanding issues had been addressed and agreed to forward:

- (i) the proposed draft standard for yam to CAC43 for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix V); and
- (ii) the draft provisions for labelling to CCFL for endorsement.

### **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR ONIONS AND SHALLOTS (Agenda item 8)<sup>11</sup>**

75. Iran, Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and informed the Committee that, in response to the comments submitted, a revised version of the proposed draft standard had been prepared by Chair and co-Chair for consideration by the Committee.

#### **Discussion**

##### General consideration

76. The Committee deliberated on whether it would be more appropriate to have two distinct standards, covering onions and shallots or a single covering both commodities.
77. Delegations in support of having two separate standards highlighted the challenges in having adequate characteristics for both products in the same text, and in having clear differences for onions and shallots expressed in the standard. They indicated that it would be easier to elaborate the requirements for separate individual commodities; and that stand-alone standards were easier to implement during inspection; and this was in-line with the Codex strategic plan objective related to recognition and use of Codex standards. It was also mentioned that trade related aspects should be taken into account - shallots fetch a premium price on the international market when compared to onions, and that the requirements for different products should not be mixed in the same standard.
78. Delegations in favour of maintaining one standard for both commodities recalled that the decision was made due to a number of factors including: similar botanical classification; limited available data on shallot; efficient utilisation of the committee resources; the existence of a number of Codex texts covering several products under the same standard. It was also noted that while onions and shallots belonged to the same genus, they have different requirements in some aspects, and these could be addressed by differentiating the provisions in the standard. Separation of these commodities could have an implication with other standards.
79. After extensive discussions, the Committee agreed to retain onions and shallots in the same standard and to include separate provisions when necessary.
80. The Committee agreed to consider the revised proposed draft standard section by section, taking into account comments submitted, and made appropriate editorial corrections, amendments to provide clarity and consistency of the text, and took decisions as outlined in the following paragraphs.

##### Section 2 – Definition of produce

81. The Committee agreed to make the following changes:
- (i) Added *Allium fistulosum* L. in the list of onion bulbs varieties;
  - (ii) inserted the following descriptive characteristics of onions and shallots, i.e.:
    - Onions or shallots may be distinguished by the following shapes: round, elongated, long or demi-long.
    - Onions and shallots may be of the following skin colours: white, purple, pink, red, grey or yellow, and brown.

##### Section 3.1 - Minimum requirements

82. The Committee discussed the various provisions for minimum requirements, noted the comments on the different aspects of minimum quality requirements and agreed to:
- (i) Replace the term “intact” with “whole”;
  - (ii) Delete “free from mould and yeast” as these were covered under pests;

---

<sup>11</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/9; CX/FFV 19/21/9 Add.1 (Algeria, Colombia, Cuba, Costa Rica, European Union, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Switzerland, the United States of America); CRD4 (Republic of Korea); CRD5 (Philippines); CRD6 (Ghana); CRD7 (Indonesia); East African Community (CRD8); Morocco (CRD9); African Union (CRD11); Thailand (CRD12); CRD15 (CCFFV21 revised version)

- (iii) Insert a new quality requirement i.e. “free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature” to take into account extreme temperature induced defects; and
- (iv) Insert a new section “3.1.1 Sufficiently developed -Onions and shallots must be sufficiently developed. They must be firm, and present dry outer skins that are dry and papery”.

### Section 3.2 - Classification

83. The Committee agreed to introduce “Extra Class” with the following descriptor:

#### 3.2.1 Extra Class

*“Onions and shallots in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial denomination. They must be free from 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 the presentation of the package.*

*The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided that they do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:*

- *a very slight defect in shape;*
- *very slight defects in colouring;*
- *very light staining, provided it does not cover more than one fifth of the bulb’s surface; and*
- *for onions, bulbs should be free from doubles and/or double centers;*

#### Section 3.2.2 – Class I

84. The Committee introduced the following two new allowable defects i.e.
- (i) For onions, slight glassiness not exceeding the outer fleshy ring; and
  - (ii) For onions, bulbs should be free from doubles and/or double centres.

#### Section 3.2.3 – Class II

85. The following changes were made:

- (i) introduced a new allowable defects under this class i.e. “For onions, slight glassiness not exceeding the outer fleshy ring”; and
- (ii) Amended the value related to stains in bullet seven to read “25%”.

### Section 4 – Provisions concerning sizing

86. Under paragraph 4.1, the following changes were made:

- (i) Introduced a statement in Paragraph 1, - “when sized in accordance with existing trade practices”- to clarify that declaration of labelling requirements for size and method used; and
- (ii) Clarified the minimum diameters that were applicable to Onions and shallots

### Section 5 – Provisions concerning tolerances

87. The following changes were introduced:

- a) Inserted Section 5.1.1 “Extra Class” and its related tolerances with the following descriptor;
 

*“Five per cent, (5.0%) by number or weight, of onions and shallots not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 1 per cent in total may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class II quality nor the minimum requirements, or of produce affected by decay.”*
- b) In Section 5.1.2 Class I inserted a statement reading - “In addition, 4.0%, by weight, of bulbs may present externally visible shoot growth not exceeding 1cm”; and
- c) In Section 5.1.3 Class II inserted a statement reading - “In addition, 10.0%, by weight, of bulbs may present externally visible shoot growth not exceeding 1cm”.

**Conclusion**

88. The Committee:
- (i) noted that the proposed draft standard for onions and shallots still required further review and was therefore not ready for advancement in the Step process;
  - (ii) returned the draft standard at Step 2 (CRD15) for redrafting; and
  - (iii) established an EWG chaired by Iran and co-chaired by India, working in English only, to revise the standard based on the written comments submitted and the discussions in plenary for further consideration by CCFFV22.
89. The report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFFV22.

**PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR BERRY FRUITS (Agenda item 9)<sup>12</sup>**

90. Mexico, Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and outlined the process used by the EWG to prepare the draft standard. She informed the Committee that the co-Chairs of the EWG had reviewed the Comments submitted at Step 3, and prepared a revised version of the proposed draft standard (CRD13). It was highlighted that in some comments, it was proposed to develop a separate standard for each of the berry fruits, while in others, proposals were for the inclusion of new commercial varieties in the draft standard. These issues were outside the scope of the approved project document.
91. The Committee held a general discussion focusing on broad issues that may need due consideration during the elaboration of the standard. The following views were expressed by delegations on this topic:
- (i) To ensure inclusivity in such a broad horizontal standard, CCFFV should take into consideration the broader definition for berries as stated in the Classification of Food and Feeds (CXA 4-1989) developed by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR). A similar approach was used by the Codex Committee for Food Hygiene (CCFH) to complete the work on Annex V for Berries under the Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetable (CXC 53-2003);
  - (ii) The title of the standard be changed to “Berry fruits and other small fruits”; and the Scope of the Standard need careful consideration to ensure that at the time of completion and implementation of the standard international trade is not disrupted;
  - (iii) The scope of the Standard, should be limited to only berry fruits or berries as laid down in the project document, as not all small fruits were berries;
  - (iv) The varieties to be listed in the standard should be commercially feasible or viable; and to ensure a concise list, where necessary, some of the listed commercial varieties should be grouped together (e.g. all blue berries);
  - (v) Any proposed new addition(s) to the list of commercial varieties may require assessment before being added to the list, as some of the berries were already covered by other existing codex standards; and
  - (vi) When proposing a new commercial variety name for inclusion in the standard, an indication on special requirements, if any, should be indicated.
92. The Chair of the EWG explained that list of commercial varieties in the proposed draft standard was based on the original list in the approved Project Document, and that changing the title to include small fruits would require changing the scope. It was explained that to ensure integrity to the already identified commercial varieties in the project document, proposed new additions would need evaluation for inclusion in the standard.
93. Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that any amendments to the scope of approved work in the project document, would require CCFFV to inform the Commission.

---

<sup>12</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/9; CX/FFV 19/21/9 Add.1 (Algeria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, European Union, India, Iraq, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Somalia, Switzerland, the United States of America); CRD4 (Republic of Korea); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD9 (Morocco); CRD11 (AU); CRD12 (Thailand); CRD13 (Mexico and Argentina); CRD16 (CCFFV21 revised version)



94. The Committee further considered the revised version of the proposed draft standard (CRD13), noted concerns on the following provisions that still needed to be addressed:
- (i) **Title of the Standard** – whether to change it to reflect draft standard to berries and other small fruits;
  - (ii) **Section 1: Scope** – examine the necessity of the second paragraph under the scope (either to retain it or to delete it);
  - (iii) **Section 2: Definition of produce** – The list on commercial varieties of berries be reviewed to: remove duplication, ensure rationalisation and include missing commercial varieties;
  - (iv) **Section 3: Provisions concerning quality requirements** – for all provisions under this section- ensure consistency with the standard layout and other FFV standards; examine the necessity for inclusion of additional or deletion of some quality attributes (e.g. intact, firm etc.); review the classification for completeness and where appropriate create clarity or exceptions around some parameters (e.g. red and white currant panicles must be completely filled);
  - (v) **Section 5: Provisions concerning Tolerances** – Review the proposed tolerances for “Extra Class”;
  - (vi) **Section 6: Provisions concerning presentations** – Review the provisions for uniformity (6.1);
  - (vii) **Section 7: Provisions concerning Marking or Labelling** – Review the different provisions to ensure consistency and alignment with existing practices.

### Conclusion

95. The Committee noted there were some fundamental concerns in several provisions of the proposed draft standard and these concerns required further review and therefore the standard was not ready for advancement in the Step process.
96. The Committee agreed to:
- (i) return the proposed draft standard (CRD16) to Step 2, for redrafting; and
  - (ii) establish an EWG, chaired by Mexico and co-chaired by Argentina and working in English and Spanish to consider the critical issues identified by the Committee and prepare a revised proposed draft Standard for further consideration by CCFFV22.
97. The report of the EWG should be made available to the Codex Secretariat at least three months before CCFFV22.
98. Colombia expressed their concern that various CCFFV draft standards provide for mixing different species and/or varieties during packing, as each variety has different maturity rates and storage conditions, which may cause damage to the whole lot of packed products.

### DISCUSSION PAPER ON GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 10)<sup>13</sup>

99. The Committee agreed:
- (i) to the proposal of the USA to consider the Item at its next session, as this would enable the review of all comments received at this session; and
  - (ii) that the USA would continue with the development of the discussion paper taking into account all comments received at the session.

### OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 11)

#### Use of “commercial type”

100. Brazil expressed a concern on the possible erroneous use of the wording “commercial type” in various standards developed by CCFFV, in particular in Spanish version, as the word “type” may be correlated with classification and not denomination.

<sup>13</sup> CX/FFV 19/21/11; CRD3 (EU); CRD8 (East African Community); CRD11 (AU)

101. The Committee agreed to: (i) defer the implementation of the previous decision on change “commercial type” to “commercial denomination”; and (ii) further discuss the issue under the agenda item for glossary of terms at its next session.

**Late availability of comments (addendum documents)**

102. A concern was expressed on the late availability of comments submitted in response to the circular letters for this session, and that delegations had inadequate time to conduct internal consultations. It was further proposed that the comments (addendum documents) should be available at least three weeks before the meeting.
103. The Committee noted this comment.

**DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda item 12)**

104. The Committee was informed that the exact time and venue of CCFFV22 would be determined by the Host Government in consultation with the Codex Secretariat.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS****LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES****CHAIRPERSON- PRÉSIDENT - PRESIDENTE:**

Mr Alfonso Guati Rojo Sánchez  
 Director General de Normas  
 Secretaría de Economía  
 CDMX

**CHAIR'S ASSISTANT - ASSISTANT DU PRÉSIDENT - ASISTENTE DEL PRESIDENTE:**

Mr Cesar Osvaldo Orozco Arce  
 Director de Normalización Internacional  
 Secretaría de Economía  
 CDMX

**ALGERIA - ALGÉRIE - ARGELIA**

Dr Hanane Bedjaoui  
 Enseignante-chercheur  
 Université de Biskra  
 Biskra

**BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL**

Mr Andre Bispo Oliveira  
 Inspector  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply -  
 MAPA  
 Brasília

**CAMEROON - CAMEROUN - CAMERÚN**

Mr Fru Jonathan  
 Président du Comité National du Codex; Secrétaire  
 Général MINMIDT  
 Ministère des Mines, de l'industrie et du  
 Développement Technologique.

Mr Yannick Herve Etabi Bikie  
 Secrétaire Technique CNCOSAC/ Chef de la Cellule  
 des Stratégie de Normalisation  
 Ministère des Mines de l'Industrie et du  
 Développement Technologique  
 Yaoundé

Mr Temfack Edouard  
 Chef de service  
 Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement  
 Technologique  
 Yaoundé

**CANADA - CANADÁ**

Mr Kevin Smith  
 National Manager  
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
 Ottawa

Mr Luc Mougeot  
 Vice-President  
 Fruit and Vegetable Dispute Resolution Corporation  
 Ottawa, Ontario

**CHILE - CHILI**

Ms Claudia Andrea Espinoza Cayulen  
 Profesional  
 Departamento de Negociaciones Internacionales  
 Servicio Agrícola, ganadero – SAG

**COLOMBIA - COLOMBIE**

Eng Johana Arabella Molano Agudelo  
 Profesional Universitario  
 Instituto Nacional de Vigilancia de Medicamentos y  
 Alimentos – INVIMA  
 Dirección de Alimentos y Bebidas

**COSTA RICA**

Mrs Maricruz Ramírez Sánchez,  
 Docente Investigadora  
 Universidad de Costa Rica  
 San Pedro. Montes de Oca

**CUBA**

Mrs Zita María Acosta Porta  
 Especialista del instituto de investigaciones de  
 fruticultura tropical presidenta del comité nacional de  
 normalización de frutas y hortalizas frescas  
 Ministerio de la agricultura. minag  
 La Habana

Mrs Yolisveydi Díaz Cruz  
 Especialista de calidad empresa cítricos caribe  
 Ministerio de la agricultura. minag  
 La Habana

Mrs Lazara Rosa Mateo Matienzo  
Especialista de calidad  
Ministerio de la agricultura. minag  
La Habana

Mrs Marlen Rodríguez Padrón  
Especialista de Calidad del Instituto de  
Investigaciones Hortícolas Liliana Dimitrova  
Instituto de investigaciones Hortícolas Liliana  
Dimitrova

Mrs Susy Vicente Riquelme  
Especialista del registro sanitario  
Ministerio de salud pública min sap  
La Habana

#### **ECUADOR - ÉQUATEUR**

Mr Marcelo Pazos  
Embajada de Ecuador

#### **EUROPEAN UNION - UNION EUROPÉENNE - UNIÓN EUROPEA**

Mr Risto Holma  
Administrator  
European Commission  
Brussels

#### **FIJI - FIDJI**

Mr Nilesh Ami Chand  
Chief Plant Protection Officer  
Biosecurity of Fiji  
Suva

#### **FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA**

Ms Roxana Gradinariu  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Representation of Romania to the  
European Union

#### **FRANCE - FRANCIA**

Mrs Malika El Krayass  
DGCCRF  
Paris

#### **GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA**

Mrs Kerstin Funke  
Administrator  
Federal Office for Agriculture and Food  
Bonn

#### **GHANA**

Dr Joris Gerald Niilante Amissah  
Lecturer  
University of Ghana, Legon  
Accra, Ghana

Mrs Faustina Adjoa-Mansah Atupra  
Principal Regulatory Officer  
Food and Drugs Authority  
Accra, Ghana

Mr John Laryea Odai-Tettey  
Principal Regulatory Officer  
Food Drugs Authority  
Accra, Ghana

#### **INDIA - INDE**

Ms Pushpinder Jeet Kaur  
Assistant Director  
Food Safety and Standards Authority of India  
New Delhi

Mr Suresh Chandra Khurana  
Consultant  
Food Safety and Standards Authority of India  
New Delhi

Mr Devendra Prasad  
Deputy General Manager  
Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Government of  
India  
New Delhi

Dr. Suresh K. Malhotra  
Agriculture Commissioner  
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare  
Krishi Bhawan  
New Delhi-110001 India

#### **IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) - IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D') - IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)**

Mr Changiz Esfandyari  
Ministry of agriculture

#### **ITALY - ITALIE - ITALIA**

Mr Ciro Impagnatiello  
Senior Officer  
Ministry of Agricultural Food and Forestry Policies  
Rome

Ms Silvia Nicoli  
Senior Officer  
Ministry of Agricultural Food and Forestry  
Rome

#### **JAMAICA - JAMAÏQUE**

Mr Damian Rowe  
Senior Plant Quarantine/SPS Enquiry Point Officer  
Ministry of Industry Commerce Agriculture and  
Fisheries

#### **KENYA**

Mr Ondanje Bernard Geoffrey  
Director  
AFA  
Nairobi

#### **MEXICO - MEXIQUE - MÉXICO**

Mrs Gabriela Alejandra Jiménez Rodríguez  
Subdirectora de Normas  
Secretaría de agricultura y desarrollo rural  
Ciudad de México

Mrs María Elena Álvarez Jiménez  
Jefe de Departamento de Cultivos Tropicales  
Secretaría de agricultura y desarrollo rural

Mr Christian Camacho Rodríguez  
Inspector de Inocuidad  
Aneberries, A.C.  
Zapopan

Mr Nohel Ernesto Guzmán Niebla  
Inspector de Inocuidad  
Aneberries, A.C.  
Zapopan

Mrs Yazmin Arileidy Hernandez De Lucio  
Gerente de Alimentos  
Asociación de Normalización y Certificación A.C.  
CDMX

Mrs Eztephany Magdalena Mauricio Ruvalcaba  
stand ajo  
Sistema producto ajo/ los rancheros  
Mexico

Mr Sergio Narváez Ávila  
Presidente y Representante no Gubernamental SP  
ajo  
sistema producto ajo

Mr Manuel Reveles Hernández  
Cargo: Investigador Titular C Campo Experimental  
Zacatecas  
Instituto nacional de investigaciones, forestales,  
agrícolas y pecuarias  
Zacatecas

Mrs Ana Cecilia Ríos Vivar  
Gerente de la CONPAPA  
Confederación nacional de productores de papa de la  
República Mexicana  
CDMX

Mr Hostilio Torres Robles  
Asesor  
Sistema producto ajo

Dr Lizbeth Ixchel Díaz Trejo  
Supervisora Médica en Área Normativa  
Secretaría de Salud

#### **MOROCCO - MAROC - MARRUECOS**

Mr Mounir Assime  
Head of technical control  
The Food Exports Control and Coordination  
Organization (EACCE)  
Casablanca

Mr Asbbane Mohamed  
Executive at the Plant and Plant Products Control  
Department  
National Office of Food Safety (ONSSA)  
Rabat

#### **NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES BAJOS**

Ms Desirée Hoefnagel  
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality  
The Hague

#### **NEW ZEALAND - NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE - NUEVA ZELANDIA**

Ms Jacqueline Neave  
Adviser  
Ministry for Primary Industries  
Wellington

Mr Shane Olsen  
Manager Plant Exports  
Ministry for Primary Industries

#### **NIGERIA - NIGÉRIA**

Dr Adeboyega Moses Adewumi  
Assistant Director  
Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service  
Abuja

Dr Vincent Ikape Isegbe  
Director General  
Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service  
Abuja

#### **PARAGUAY**

Eng Leticia Soria Cáceres  
Coordinadora del Comité de Frutas y Hortalizas  
Frescas  
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de  
Semilla - SENAVE  
Asunción

#### **PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS**

Ms Edna Guiang  
Bureau of Plant Industry

#### **REPUBLIC OF KOREA - RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA DE COREA**

Dr Jae-eun Mun  
Senior Scientific Officer  
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety  
Chungcheongbuk-do

Dr Won Jo Choe  
Scientific Officer  
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety  
Chungcheongbuk-do

Mrs Eun-sil Lee  
Codex Researcher  
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety  
Chungcheongbuk-do

Mr Sang Sin Lee  
Action Officer(AO)  
National Agricultural Products Quality Management  
Service  
Gimcheon-si

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION –  
FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE –  
FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA**

Ms. Olga Barannikova  
General Director Consumer Market Participants Union  
Moscow

Ms Tatiana Zavistyeva  
Institute of nutrition  
Russia

**RWANDA**

Mr Shukuru Bizimungu  
Lecturer  
Mount Kenya University, Kigali Campus  
Kigali

**SAUDI ARABIA - ARABIE SAOUDITE - ARABIA  
SAUDITA**

Mr Khalid Alatafi  
Deputy Manager of Organic Production Department  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture

Mr Mohammed Alkhamis  
Director of Registration Support & Food Products  
Evaluation  
Saudi Food and Drug Authority  
Riyadh

Mr Suliman Alkhateeb  
General Director Plant Resources Administration  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Agriculture

Mr Abdulaziz Alrabeah  
Senior Food Specialist  
Saudi Food and Drug Authority  
Riyadh

**SENEGAL - SÉNÉGAL**

Dr Marieme Mbaye Sene  
Chef d'Unité Pharmacovigilance  
Ministère Sante et Action Sociale  
Dakar

**SLOVAKIA - SLOVAQUIE - ESLOVAQUIA**

Dr Viera Baricicova  
Senior expert  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the  
Slovak Republic  
Bratislava

**SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA**

Ms Hélène Gonnet  
Scientific Officer  
Federal Office for Agriculture (FOAG)  
Bern

**THAILAND - THAÏLANDE - TAILANDIA**

Dr Suraphong Kosiyachinda  
Chairman of Subcommittee on Fresh Fruits and  
Vegetables  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food  
Standards  
Bangkok

Ms Korwadee Phonkliang  
Standards Officer  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food  
Standards  
Bangkok

**UGANDA - OUGANDA**

Dr Moses Matovu  
Senior Research Officer  
National Agricultural Research Organization  
Kampala

**UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI - REINO  
UNIDO**

Mr Ian Hewett  
Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs  
Southall, London

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA - RÉPUBLIQUE-  
UNIE DE TANZANIE - REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE  
TANZANÍA**

Mr Stephen Paul Rwabunywenge  
Senior standards officer  
Tanzania bureau of standards  
Dar Es Salaam

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

Mr Dorian Lafond  
International Standards Coordinator  
AMS Specialty Crops Program, AMS Specialty Crops  
Program  
Washington DC

Dr David Ingram  
Consumer Safety Officer  
OFS, CFSAN, FDA  
College Park, MD

**ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)**

Dr José Brambila-macías  
Programme Manager  
Trade and Agriculture Directorate, Codes and  
Schemes  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and  
Development

**HOST GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT –  
SECRÉTARIAT DU GOUVERNEMENT HÔTE -  
SECRETARÍA DEL GOBIERNO ANFITRIÓN**

Ms Tania Daniela Fosado Soriano  
Punto de contacto de Codex  
Secretaría de economía  
CDMX

Ms Sofia Pacheco Niño De Rivera  
Directora de Normalización para Industrias Diversas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Ciudad de México

Ms Cielo Angelica Beltrán Zapata  
Dirección General de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Ciudad de México

**CODEX SECRETARIAT**

Ms Lingping Zhang  
Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN  
Rome

Mr Patrick Sekitoleko  
Food Standards Officer  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United  
Nations (FAO)  
Rome

Mr Giuseppe Di Chiera  
Programme Specialist Consultant  
FAO/WHO  
Rome

Mr Peter Di Tommaso  
Documents Clerk  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN  
Rome

**DRAFT STANDARD FOR KIWIFRUIT****(at step 8)****1. SCOPE**

The purpose of the Standard is to define the quality requirements for kiwifruit after preparation and packaging. When applied at stages following packaging, products may show in relation to the requirements of the Standard:

- a slight lack of freshness and turgidity;
- slight deterioration due to their development and their tendency to perish.

The holder/seller of products may not display such products or offer them for sale, or deliver or market them in any manner other than in conformity with this standard. The holder/seller shall be responsible for observing such conformity.

**2. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

This Standard applies to kiwifruit (also known as actinidia) of varieties (cultivars) derived from *Actinidia chinensis* Planch and *A. deliciosa* (A. Chev.) C.F. Liang & A.R. Ferguson and hybrids derived from at least one of them, from the *Actinidiaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer. Kiwifruit for industrial processing are excluded.

**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

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

- intact (but free of peduncle);
- sound; produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- adequately firm; not soft, shrivelled or water-soaked;
- well formed; double/multiple fruit being excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter;
- practically free of pests<sup>1</sup>;
- practically free of damage caused by pests<sup>1</sup>;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;
- fresh in appearance;

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

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

**3.1.1 Minimum Maturity Requirements**

The kiwifruit must have reached an appropriate degree of maturity, in accordance with characteristics of the variety, to allow for development of satisfactory organoleptic characteristics.

The fruit must have attained a degree of maturity of at least 6.2° Brix or an average dry matter content of 15%<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The provisions for pests applies without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules applied by governments in line with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

<sup>2</sup> This should ensure that fruit reach a minimum degree of ripeness of 9.5° Brix when entering the distribution chain.



## 3.2 CLASSIFICATION

Kiwifruit are classified into three classes, as defined below:

### 3.2.1 “Extra” Class

Kiwifruit in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety (cultivar). The flesh must be sound. Fruit must be round or oval in cross section (not flattened), and the ratio of the minimum equatorial diameter to the maximum equatorial diameter of the fruit must be 0.8 or greater.

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.

### 3.2.2 Class I

Kiwifruit in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety (cultivar). The flesh must be sound. Fruit must be round or oval in cross section (not flattened), and the ratio of the minimum equatorial diameter to the maximum equatorial diameter of the fruit must be 0.7 or greater.

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:

- a slight defect in shape (but free of swelling or malformations);
- slight defects in colouring;
- slight, superficial skin defects, provided the total area affected does not exceed 1 cm<sup>2</sup>;
- small “Hayward marks” (longitudinal lines) without protuberance.

### 3.2.3 Class II

This class includes kiwifruit which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 3.1 above. The flesh should not show any serious defects. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the kiwifruit retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape including flattened fruit;
- defects in colouring;
- skin defects provided that the total area affected does not exceed 2 cm<sup>2</sup>;
- several more-pronounced “Hayward marks” with a slight protuberance;
- slight bruising.

## 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Kiwifruit may be sized by weight or count, or in accordance with existing trading practices, and labelled accordingly. When sized in accordance with existing trade practices, the package must be labelled with the size and method used.

(A) For fruit sized by weight:

For *A. chinensis* and *A. deliciosa* and hybrids between these species, the minimum weight for “Extra” Class is 90g, for Class I is 70g and for Class II is 65g.

To ensure uniformity in size, the range in size between produce in the same package that is sized by weight shall not exceed:

- 10 g for fruit less than or equal to 85 g;
- 15 g for fruit weighing greater than 85 g and up to 120 g;
- 20 g for fruit weighing greater than 120 g and up to 150 g;
- 40 g for fruit weighing greater than 150 g.

## **5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES**

### **5.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES**

Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each lot for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated. Produce that fails conformity assessment, may be allowed to be re-sorted and brought into conformity in accordance with the relevant provisions in the *Guidelines for Food Import Control Systems* (CXG 47-2003).

#### **5.1.1 “Extra” Class**

Five percent, by number or weight, of kiwifruit not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class I. Included therein is 0.5% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown which only applies beyond the export control point.

#### **5.1.2 Class I**

Ten percent, by number or weight, of kiwifruit not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class II. Included therein is 1% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.

#### **5.1.3 Class II**

Ten percent by number or weight of kiwifruit satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements. Included therein not be more than 2% of in total may consist of produce affected by decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.

### **5.2 SIZE TOLERANCES**

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

## **6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION**

### **6.1 Uniformity**

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only kiwifruit of the same origin, variety (cultivar), quality and size. However, a mixture of kiwifruit of distinctly different varieties may be packed together in a package provided they are uniform in quality and, for each variety concerned, uniform in origin.

The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

### **6.2 Packaging**

Kiwifruit must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be of food grade quality, 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.

Stickers individually affixed to the produce shall be such that, when removed, they neither leave visible traces of glue nor lead to skin defects.

Kiwifruit 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).

#### **6.2.1 Description of Containers**

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the kiwifruit.

Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

## **7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING**

### **7.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES**

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

### 7.1.1 Name of Produce

Each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and optionally the name of the variety(ies) or cultivar(s) or the predominant flesh colour.

### 7.1.2 Origin of Produce

Country of origin<sup>3</sup> and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

## 7.2 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.

For kiwifruit transported in bulk (direct loading into a transport vehicle) these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods, and attached in a visible position inside the transport vehicle unless the document is replaced by an electronic solution. In that case the identification must be machine readable and easily accessible.

### 7.2.1 Identification

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

### 7.2.2 Name of Produce

Name of the produce and optionally the name of the variety(ies) or cultivar(s) or the predominant flesh colour

The name of the variety can be replaced by a synonym. A trade name<sup>5</sup> can only be given in addition to the variety or the synonym.

### 7.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin<sup>3</sup> and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

### 7.2.4 Commercial specifications

- class;
- size (if sized), expressed
  - by the minimum and maximum weight of the fruit; or
  - by number of fruit and the net fruit weight; or
  - by the size and method used.

### 7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

## 8. CONTAMINANTS

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

8.2 The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995).

## 9. HYGIENE

9.1 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 General Principles of Food Hygiene (CXC 1-1969), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CXC 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as codes of hygienic practice and codes of practice.

---

<sup>3</sup> The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> A trade name can be a trade mark for which protection has been sought or obtained or any other commercial type.

- 9.2** The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria related to Foods* (CXG 21-1997).

**DRAFT STANDARD FOR FRESH GARLIC****(at Step 8)****1. SCOPE**

The purpose of the standard is to define the quality requirements for garlic after preparation and packaging. However, if applied at stages following packaging, products may show in relation to the requirements of the standard:

- a slight lack of freshness and turgidity;
- a slight deterioration due to their development and their tendency to perish.

For the purposes of this standard the holder/seller of products may not display such products or offer them for sale, or deliver or market them in any manner other than in conformity with this standard. The holder/seller shall be responsible for observing such conformity.

**2. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

**2.1** This Standard applies to bulbs<sup>1</sup> of commercial varieties of fresh garlic grown from *Allium sativum L.*, of the *Alliaceae* family, with or without the skin. When presented with skin, a certain degree of external dryness can be observed without clove or cloves freshness detriment, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging.

**2.2** Fresh garlic constituted of several cloves and the garlic known as Solo garlic, constituted of a single clove are included. Green garlic with full leaves, undeveloped cloves and garlic for industrial processing are excluded. The following degrees of dryness of outer skin for fresh garlic are covered by the Standard:

- Fresh garlic: produce which preserves its moisture and turgidity in the stem, and with the outer skin of the bulb soft and flexible.
- Semi-dry garlic: produce with the stem and outer skin (foliage and cataphylls) of the bulb not completely dry.
- Dry garlic: produce in which the stem, outer skin of the bulb (foliage and cataphylls) and the skin surrounding each clove are completely dry.

**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

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

- intact; covered with outer skin, where applicable;
- 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<sup>2</sup> 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;
- free of visible shoots;

---

<sup>1</sup> Bulb: head covered by a wrapper similar to a very thin paper and it confirmed by bulbil, belonging to the genus and species of *Allium Sativum L.*

Tooth: They are bulbils gathered at their base, forming what is known as bulb each bulbil is wrapped in a white robe, sometimes something reddish, membranous, transparent and very thin.

<sup>2</sup> The provisions for pests applies without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules applied by governments in line with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

- practically free of roots.
- For dry garlic, the roots must be trimmed close to the base of the bulb. if presented with cut stems the length should not exceed 3 cm. There shall be no length requirement for stems of braided garlic.

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

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

### **3.1.1 Minimum maturity requirements**

The garlic must 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.

## **3.2 CLASSIFICATION**

Garlic is classified into three classes defined below:

### **3.2.1 “Extra” Class**

Garlic in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. 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. The bulbs must be of regular shape and [properly cleaned]. The cloves must be compact.

### **3.2.2 Class I**

Garlic in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. The cloves must be reasonably compact. However, slight defects 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 tears in the outer skin of the bulb; and
- a slight defect in shape.

### **3.2.3 Class II**

This class includes garlic, which does not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 3.1 above.

The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the garlic retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- slight tears on the external skin or missing parts of the outer skin of the bulb not exceeding the half of the surface;
- slight staining on the outer skin not exceeding more than half of the bulb surface;
- no more than two damaged cloves;
- healed injuries;
- slight bruises;
- defects in shape;
- no more than three cloves, or one fifth of the total number of cloves in a bulb may be missing, whichever is lower.

## **4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING**

Garlic may be sized by diameter (minimum diameter or diameter range) or in accordance with existing trading practices. When sized in accordance with existing trade practices, the package must be labelled with size and the method used. The following methods are guides and may be used on an optional basis. This table is not applicable to solo garlic:

<b>Table 1. Sizing specifications</b>	
<b>Size Code</b>	<b>Range of diameter in mm</b>
A	75
B	>70-75
C	>65-70
D	>60-65
E	>55-60
F	>50-55
G	>45-50
H	>40-45
I	>35-40
J	>30-35
K	>25-30
L	>20-25
M	>15-20
N	≤15

## 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

### 5.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

At all marketing stages, tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each lot for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated. Produce that fail conformity assessment, may be allowed to be resorted and brought into conformity in accordance with the relevant provisions in the *Guidelines for Food Import Control System (CXG 47-2003)*.

#### 5.1.1 Extra" Class

Five percent by number or weight of bulbs not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I. Within this tolerance not more than 1% in total may consist of produce satisfying the requirements of Class II.

#### 5.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of bulbs not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II. 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.

In addition, not more than 1% by weight of bulbs may have cloves with externally visible sprouts.

#### 5.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of bulbs satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements. Within this tolerance not more than 2% in total may consist of produce affected by decay.

In addition, not more than 5% by weight of bulbs may have cloves with externally visible sprouts

### 5.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, ten percent by number or weight of bulbs not corresponding to the size indicated on the package

## 6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

### 6.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only garlic of the same origin, variety or

commercial type, quality and size. The visible part of the contents of the package or lot for produce presented in bulk must be representative of the entire contents.

## 6.2 PACKAGING

The garlic must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be clean and of food grade 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.

The garlic shall be packed in each container in compliance with the *Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CXC 44-1995).

### 6.2.1 Description of Containers

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

## 7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING

### 7.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

#### 7.1.1 Name of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce ("garlic" and/or "fresh garlic", "semi-dry garlic", "dry garlic") and the name of the variety.

#### 7.1.2 Origin of Produce

Country of origin<sup>3</sup> and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

### 7.2 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, and attached in a visible position inside the transport vehicle, Unless the document is replaced by an electronic solution. In that case the identification must be machine readable and easily accessible.

#### 7.2.1 Identification

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

#### 7.2.2 Name of Produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside, such as "garlic", "fresh garlic", "semi-dry garlic", "dry garlic" or "solo garlic", where appropriate;

Name of the variety or commercial type (optional).

#### 7.2.3 Origin of Produce

Country of origin<sup>4</sup> and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

#### 7.2.4 Commercial Identification

- class;
- size expressed as minimum and maximum diameters of the bulb or size code;
- net weight (optional).

#### 7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

---

<sup>3</sup> The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.

<sup>4</sup> 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. CONTAMINANTS**

- 8.1** The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission
- 8.2** The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995).

**9. HYGIENE**

- 9.1** 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 *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CXC 1-1969), *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CXC 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as codes of hygienic practice and codes of practice.
- 9.2** The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria related to Foods* (CXG 21-1997).

**DRAFT STANDARD FOR WARE POTATOES****(at Step 8)****1. SCOPE**

The purpose of the standard is to define the quality requirements for ware potatoes after preparation (e.g. brushing and/or washing) and packaging. When applied at stages following packaging, ware potatoes may show in relation to the requirements of the standard:

- a slight lack of freshness and turgidity;
- a slight deterioration due to their development and their tendency to perish.

The holder/seller of products may not display such products or offer them for sale, or deliver or market them in any manner other than in conformity with this standard. The holder/seller shall be responsible for observing such conformity.

**2. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of ware potato grown from *Solanum tuberosum* L., of the *Solanaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Ware potatoes for industrial processing and early potatoes<sup>1</sup> are excluded.

**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****3.1 Minimum Requirements**

Subject to the tolerances allowed, the ware potatoes must be:

- intact;
- sound; produce affected by rotting or deterioration, which makes it unfit for consumption is excluded
- fresh in appearance and firm;
- clean and practically free of any visible foreign matter<sup>2</sup>;
- practically free from pests<sup>3</sup>;
- practically free from damage caused by pests;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell;
- free of damage caused by low or high temperature;
- free from sprouting; i.e. sprouts may not be longer than 3mm in length
- free of defects affecting the appearance, keeping quality and presentation in the package, such as:
  - Green colouration; pale green flush exceeding one eighth of the surface area;
  - brown stains;
  - cracks cuts, , bruises or roughness exceeding 4 mm in depth;
  - serious deformities;
  - grey, blue or black sub-epidermal stains; exceeding 5 mm in depth;
  - hollow or black hearts and other internal defects;
  - deep common potato scab and powdery potato scab<sup>3</sup>, of a depth of 2 mm or more
  - superficial common potato scab, i.e. scab spots in all must not extend over more than a quarter of the surface of the tuber.

---

<sup>1</sup> Early potatoes means potatoes harvested before they are completely mature, marketed immediately but could not be stored and whose skin is not completely cured so can be easily removed without peeling

<sup>2</sup> Visible foreign matter excludes visual indicators of treatment with sprout inhibitors

<sup>3</sup> Provisions for pests and damage caused by pests apply without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules applied by governments in line with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)

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

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

### 3.1.1 Minimum Maturity Requirements

Ware potatoes must be sufficiently developed with cured skin, with account being taken of the characteristics of the variety and/or commercial type and the area in which they are grown.

### 3.2 Classification

Classification of ware potatoes is optional. When classified, the classification is done in accordance with Section 5 – Provisions concerning Tolerances, ware potatoes are classified into the following classes.

- “Extra” Class, Class I and Class II.

## 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

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

When size is determined by the equatorial diameter (means the maximum distance taken from the right angle on the largest axis of the tuber) of the ware potato (in mm) in accordance with the following table that can be used as a guide in an optional way:

Size Code	Equatorial Diameter in mm
A(Large)	more than 80
B(Round)	35-80
C(Long)	25-75
D(Small)	18-24

However, uniformity in size in sales packages up to 5 kg net weight may be restricted to a maximum of 30 mm between the smallest and the largest tuber.

## 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

At all marketing stages, tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each lot for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated. Produce that fail conformity assessment, may be allowed to be resorted and brought into conformity in accordance with the relevant provisions in the *Guidelines for Food Import Control Systems* (CXG 47-2003).

### 5.1 Quality Tolerances<sup>3</sup>

S.No.	Quality Tolerances	Percentage of defective produce, by number or weight		
		Extra Class	Class I	Class II
1	(i) Total Tolerances for ware potatoes not satisfying the minimum requirements including defects (d), of which no more than:	5	10	10
	(a) Frozen, decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.	1	1	2
	(b) Extraneous matter	0.25	0.50	0.50
	(c) Soil	0.25	0.25	0.25
	(d) Defects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cuts</li> <li>• bruises or roughness</li> <li>• Grey, blue or black sub-epidermal stains; &gt; 5 mm deep</li> <li>• Deep common potato scab and powdery potato scab, &gt; 2 mm deep.</li> <li>• superficial common potato scab &gt; 25% of surface</li> <li>• Sprouts &gt;3mm</li> <li>• Green coloration &gt;1/8 of the surface area or not exceeding 2mm in depth;</li> </ul>			
2	<b>Additional tolerances</b>			
	(a) Produce belonging to other varieties than marked	2	2	2
	(b) Size Tolerances-off size from what is indicated/marketed	10	10	10

Note: The total of (a), (b), (c) and (d) shall not exceed the limit given in (i). Where the product is not classified the tolerances for Class II apply.

## 6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

### 6.1 Uniformity

The contents of each package (or lot for produce presented in the bulk transport vehicle) must be uniform and contain only ware potatoes of the same origin, variety or commercial type, quality, size (if sized) and optionally, cooking type (if indicated).

The visible part of the contents of the package (or lot for produce presented in the bulk transport vehicle) must be representative of the entire contents.

However, a mixture of distinctly different ware potatoes of different skin colours (except green) may be packed together in a sales package, provided they are uniform in quality and, for each variety concerned, in origin.

### 6.2 Packaging

Ware potatoes must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be of food grade quality, 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.

Ware potatoes shall be packed in each package in compliance with the appropriate sections of the *Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CXC 44-1995)*.

#### 6.2.1 Description of Containers

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

## **7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING**

### **7.1 Consumer Packages**

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

#### **7.1.1 Nature of Produce**

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce "Ware Potato" and should be labelled as to name of the variety and/or commercial type.

#### **7.1.2 Origin of Produce**

Country of origin<sup>4</sup> and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

In case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties of ware potatoes of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety concerned.

### **7.2 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, either printed on the package itself or on a label secured to the fastening (if the labels are placed inside the packages (string bag), this should be done in such a way that the indications concerning marking are readable from the outside). For produce transported in bulk these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the good, and attached in a visible position in the transport vehicle, unless the document is replaced by an electronic solution in that case the identification should be machine readable and easily accessible.

#### **7.2.1 Identification**

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)<sup>5</sup>.

#### **7.2.2 Nature of Produce**

Each shall be labeled as to the name of the produce and may be labeled as to name of the variety and/or commercial type. The shape of the tuber may be marked (optional) on the label such as oval, round and long.

#### **7.2.3 Origin of Produce**

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

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties of ware potatoes of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety concerned.

#### **7.2.4 Commercial Identification**

- Class (if classified)
- Size (if sized)
- cooking type, flesh colour, shape of tuber (optional)

#### **7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)**

## **8 CONTAMINANTS**

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

**8.2** The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the contaminants and toxins in accordance with the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995).

## **9. HYGIENE**

**9.1** 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 *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CXC 1-1969), *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CXC 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

---

<sup>4</sup>The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.

<sup>5</sup>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.

---

**9.2** The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the *Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods* (CXG 21-1997)

**PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR YAM****(at Step 5/8)****1. SCOPE**

The purpose of the standard is to define the quality requirements for yam after preparation and packaging. When applied at stages following packaging, products may show in relation to the requirements of the standard:

- a slight lack of freshness and turgidity;
- a slight deterioration due to their development and their tendency to perish.

The holder/seller of the product may not display such product or offer it for sale or deliver or market it in any manner other than in conformity with this standard. The holder/seller shall be responsible for observing such conformity.

**2. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

This standard applies to tubers from commercial varieties of yam of the Dioscoreaceae family obtained from the species *Dioscorea rotundata*, *D. cayenensis*, *D. alata*, *D. esculenta* and *D. trifida*, to be supplied fresh to the consumer. Yams intended for industrial processing are excluded.

The skin colour of yams ranges from off-white to brown and dark brown. The flesh colour of yams can be off-white, yellow, pink or purple. Some large yam tubers are also known to vary in colour between the head and the tail.

**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY****3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

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

- Whole or transversely cut pieces provided that the cut surface is sufficiently cured;
- sound; produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption should be excluded;
- firm;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter, excluding coconut fiber, saw dust and other materials used for protective packaging;
- practically free from pests<sup>1</sup>;
- practically free from damages caused by pests;
- free from abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free from any foreign smell and/or taste;
- free from damage caused by low or high temperature;
- practically free from sprouting;

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

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

**3.1.1 Minimum Maturity Requirements**

The yams must have reached an appropriate degree of development and/or maturity in accordance with the characteristics of the species, the time of harvesting/picking, and the area in which they are grown.

**3.2 CLASSIFICATION**

The yams are classified into three classes defined below:

---

<sup>1</sup> The provisions for pests apply without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules applied by governments in line with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

### 3.2.1 "Extra" Class

Yams in this class must be of superior quality and with the characteristics of the variety and/or commercial type. They must be free from 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.

- Non-transversal cuts or surfaces and/or scars, as long as they do not exceed 5% of the surface of the product;
- Very slight defects in shape.

### 3.2.2 Class I

Yams in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety and/or commercial type. 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:

- Non-transversal cuts or surfaces and/or scars, as long as they do not exceed 10% of the surface of the product;
- A slight defect in shape.

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

### 3.2.3 Class II

This class includes yams that do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in section 3.1 above.

The following defects may be allowed provided that the yam retains its essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- Non-transversal cuts or surfaces and/or scars, as long as they do not exceed 15% of the surface of the product;
- defects in shape.

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

## 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Yam may be sized by weight or in accordance with existing trade practices. When sized in accordance with existing trade practices, the package must be labelled with the size and method used.

When sized by weight, size is based on the individual weight of each tuber or a weight range per package.

The following table is a guide and may be used on an optional basis:

Size Code	Weight (range in Kg)
A	>6
B	>4-6
C	>2.5-4
D	>1.5-2.5
E	>1.0-1.5
F	>0.75-1
G	>0.5-0.75
H	>0.25-0.5
I	>0.1-0.25
J	0.05-0.1



## **5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES**

### **5.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES**

At all marketing stages, tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each lot for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated. Produce that fail conformity assessment, may be allowed to be re-sorted and brought into conformity in accordance with the relevant provisions in the *Guidelines for Food Import Control Systems* (CXG 47-2003).

#### **5.1.1 Extra class**

Five per cent, by number or weight, of yams not satisfying the requirements of this class but meeting the requirements of Class I. Included therein, is 1% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown. And 1% of dirt and impurities.

#### **5.1.2 Class I**

Ten percent by number or weight of yams not satisfying the requirements of this class, but meeting those of class II. Included therein, is 2% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown. And 1% of dirt and impurities.

#### **5.1.3 Class II**

Ten per cent by number or weight, of yams not satisfying the requirements of this class. Included therein, is 2% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown. And 1% of dirt and impurities.

### **5.2 SIZE TOLERANCES**

For all classes, if sized, 10.0% by number or weight of yams not satisfying the requirements with regard to the size indicated.

## **6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION**

### **6.1 UNIFORMITY**

The contents of each package shall be uniform and contain only yams of the same origin, variety or commercial type, quality and size.

However, a mixture of yam of distinctly different colours may be packed together in a package, provided they are uniform in quality and for each colour concerned in origin.

The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

### **6.2 PACKAGING**

Yams must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce. The materials used inside the package must be of food-grade quality, 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.

Yams shall be packed in each package in compliance with the *Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CXC 44-1995).

#### **6.2.1 Description of Containers**

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics necessary to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the yams.

Packages must be free of any foreign matter and smell.

## **7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING**

### **7.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES**

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

#### **7.1.1 Name of Produce**

Each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce "yam" and may be labelled as to the name of the variety(ies), and/or commercial type.

### 7.1.2 Origin of Produce

Country of origin<sup>2</sup> and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties of yams of different origins, the indication of the country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety.

## 7.2 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.

For yams transported in bulk (direct loading into a transport vehicle) these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods, and attached in a visible position inside the transport vehicle unless the document is replaced by an electronic solution. In that case the identification must be machine readable and easily accessible.

### 7.2.1 Identification

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

### 7.2.2 Name of Produce

Name of the produce.

Name of variety and/or commercial type.

### 7.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties or species of yams of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety or species concerned.

### 7.2.4 Commercial Specifications

- Class;
- Size expressed as
  - size range in Kg or,
  - size code in accordance with the table in Section 4 or,
  - in accordance with the method used;
- Cooking type (optional)

### 7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

## 8. CONTAMINANTS

**8.1** The produce covered by this standard shall comply with the maximum residue limits for pesticides established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

**8.2** The produce covered by this Standard shall comply with the maximum levels of the *General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (CXS 193-1995).

## 9. HYGIENE

**9.1** 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 *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CXC 1-1969), *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CXC 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as codes of hygienic practice and codes of practice.

**9.2** The produce should comply with any microbiological criteria established in accordance with the *Principles and Guidelines for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria related to Foods* (CXG 21-1997).

---

<sup>2</sup> The full or commonly used name should be indicated.

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