

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



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



**World Health  
Organization**

# E

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

REP13/FFV

**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**

**CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

**36<sup>th</sup> Session**

**Rome, Italy, 1 – 5 July 2013**

**REPORT OF THE 17<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE  
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

**Mexico City, Mexico**

**3 – 7 September 2012**

**NOTE:** This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2012/29-FFV.

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of  
the United Nations



World Health  
Organization

E

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

CX 5/95.2

CL 2012/29-FFV  
September 2012

TO: - Codex Contact Points  
- Interested International Organizations

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

SUBJECT: **DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 17<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (REP13/FFV)**

The report of the 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables will be considered by the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Rome, Italy, 1–5 July 2013).

## **PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 36<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

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

1. **Draft Standard for Avocado (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995) at Step 8** (para. 42 and Appendix II).
2. **Draft provisions for uniformity rules and other size-related provisions (sections 5.1 – uniformity and 6.2. – commercial identification) (draft Standard for Avocado) at Step 8** (para. 42 and Appendix II).
3. **Draft Standard for Pomegranate at Step 8** (para. 53 and Appendix III).
4. **Proposed draft provisions for sizing and uniformity rules (sections 3 and 5.1) (draft Standard for Pomegranate) at Step 5/8** (para. 53 and Appendix III).

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above draft and proposed draft standards, should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 3 – Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), **preferably by email**, to the above address **before 15 March 2013**.

### **Proposed draft Standards at Step 5 of the Procedure**

5. **Proposed draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit** (para. 85 and Appendix IV).

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above proposed draft Standard, should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 3 – Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), **preferably by email**, to the above address **before 15 March 2013**.

## **PART B: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND INFORMATION**

6. **Proposals for new work on fresh fruits and vegetables (ALINORM 10/33/35, para. 121)**

Governments wishing to propose new work on Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should do so in writing, in conformity with the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts (Part 2 – Critical Review, Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission), **preferably by e-mail**, to the above address, **before 15 October 2013**.

7. **Proposed Layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables** (para. 150 and Appendix VII)

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above matter, should do so in writing, taking into account the background information provided in the explanatory notes, **preferably by e-mail**, to the above address, **before 15 October 2013**.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables reached the following conclusions:

### **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 34<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

#### **Adoption of draft and proposed draft standards**

The Committee agreed to forward:

- the draft Standard for Avocado (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995) including draft provisions for uniformity rules and other size-related provisions (sections 5.1 – uniformity and 6.2.4 – commercial identification) for adoption at Step 8 (para. 42 and Appendix II);
- the draft Standard for Pomegranate including proposed draft provisions for sizing and uniformity rules (sections 3 and 5.1) for adoption at Step 8 and 5/8 with omission of Step 6/7 respectively (para. 53 and Appendix III); and
- the proposed draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit for adoption at Step 5 (para. 85 and Appendix IV).

#### **Approval of new work**

The Committee agreed to request the Commission approval of new work on Standards for Okra (para. 109 and Appendix V) and Ware Potato (paras. 123-124 and Appendix VI).

#### **Other matters of interest to the Commission**

The Committee:

- noted ongoing work in the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables on explanatory brochures on bananas and pomegranates based on corresponding Codex standards and remained available for further collaboration in this area (para. 20).
- agreed to develop a worldwide standard for durian and to return the text for further elaboration, comments and consideration at its next session (para. 106).
- agreed to consider the possible revision of a number of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables in view of the revision of corresponding UNECE standards based on a paper to be presented by the UNECE Secretariat at the next session of the Committee (paras. 12, 126-127).
- agreed to consider the possible revision of the maturity requirements in the Standard for Table Grapes at its next session upon request of the Organization of Vine and Wine (OIV) (paras. 21, 131).
- agreed to continue to discuss a proposed layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables (para. 150 and Appendix VII).
- agreed to further consider the Terms of Reference of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables at its next session (para. 157).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	page iii
REPORT OF THE 17 <sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.....	page 1
SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK.....	page 14
	<b>Paragraphs</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION.....	2-3
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1).....	4-6
MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 2a)	7
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2b)	
– UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards.....	8-16
– OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables.....	17-20
– International Organization of Vine and Wine (OIV).....	21
UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2c).....	22
DRAFT STANDARD FOR AVOCADO (REVISION OF CODEX STAN 197-1995) (Agenda Item 3a)	
MATURITY REQUIREMENTS: METHODS OF ANALYSIS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF DRY MATTER CONTENT (SECTION 9) (Agenda Item 3b)	
PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY TOLERANCES – ALLOWANCES OF TOLERANCES FOR DECAY AND/OR INTERNAL BREAKDOWN (SECTION 4.1) (Agenda Item 3c)	
DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR UNIFORMITY RULES AND OTHER SIZE-RELATED PROVISIONS – SECTIONS 5.1 (UNIFORMITY) AND 6.2.4 (COMMERCIAL IDENTIFICATION) (Agenda Item 3d).....	23-42
DRAFT STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE (Agenda Item 4a)	43-53
PROPOSED DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR SIZING AND UNIFORMITY RULES (SECTIONS 3 AND 5.1) (Agenda Item 4b).....	54-85
PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR GOLDEN PASSION FRUIT (Agenda Item 5).....	86-106
PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR DURIAN (Agenda Item 6).....	107-132
PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 7).....	133-150
PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 8).....	151-157
REVISION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 9).....	158
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 10).....	159-161
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 9).....	
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>Pages</b>
Appendix I: List of Participants.....	15
Appendix II: Draft Standard for Avocado (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995).....	28
Appendix III: Draft Standard for Pomegranate.....	32
Appendix IV: Proposed Draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit.....	35
Appendix V: Project Document: Proposal for New Work on a Standard for Okra.....	39
Appendix VI: Project Document: Proposal for New Work on a Standard for Ware Potato.....	42
Appendix VII: Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.....	

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CCFFV) held its 17<sup>th</sup> session in Mexico City (Mexico) from 3 to 7 September 2011, at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. The Chairperson of the Committee, Mr Christian Turégano Roldán, Director General of Standards, General Bureau of Standards, Ministry of Economy appointed Ms Andrea Barrios, International Standardization Director, General Bureau of Standards, to chair the Session on his behalf. The Session was attended by 38 Member countries, 1 Member Organization and 1 Observer from 1 international organization. The list of participants is given in Appendix I.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Mr Christian Turégano Roldán welcomed the participants and opened the session on behalf of the Government of Mexico in the presence of Ing. Simón Treviño Alcántara, Director General for Agricultural Promotion, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food; Lic. Jesús Eugenio Huerta Gonzáles, Director for Multilateral Economic Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ing. Eduardo Benitez Paulín, Deputy Representative of FAO in Mexico; and Dr Amalia Ayala, international consultant in family and community health of WHO.

## Division of Competence

3. The Committee noted the division of competence<sup>1</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>2</sup>

4. The Committee established two in-session working groups to discuss several comments received on pending issues in the draft standards for avocado (led by Spain) and pomegranate (led by the United States of America) in order to facilitate the consideration of these issues in plenary as these standards were for finalization by this session. The Committee therefore agreed to discuss Agenda Items 3 (avocado) and 4 (pomegranate) after Agenda Items 5 (golden passion fruit) and 6 (durian).

5. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as amended as the Agenda for the Session.

6. The Committee noted that there would be a presentation on the UNECE Standard and Brochure for Pineapples and Chilli Peppers on the margins of the meeting.

## MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 2a)<sup>3</sup>

7. The Committee noted the final adoption of the draft Standards for Tree Tomatoes and Chilli Peppers with amendments, the adoption of the proposed draft Standard for Pomegranates at Step 5 and the approval of new work on a Standard for Golden Passion Fruit. The Committee further noted that all Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables were available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Spanish on the Codex website: <http://www.codexalimentarius.org> and that they were also being translated into Russian.

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

### UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (UNECE)

8. The Committee noted the information provided by the Representative of the UNECE on the main issues of interest to its work arising from the sessions of the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards and its Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables subsequent to the last session of the Committee as follows:

9. At its November 2011 session, the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards adopted: (a) the revised 2011 Standard Layout for UNECE standards on fresh fruit and vegetables, clarifying the use of terms “varieties” and “trademarks” in the standards; (b) the revised texts of the standards for apples, early and ware potatoes, pears, plums and garlic; (c) the text of the Standard for Fresh Chilli Peppers as a Recommendation for a one-year trial period.

10. At its June 2012 session, the UNECE Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables started work on new standards for persimmon and quince; submitted the text of the new Standard for Lambs Lettuce to the Working Party for approval as a Recommendation for a one-year trial period; and recommended to the Working Party to extend for one more year the trial period for the 2011 Recommendation for Fresh Chilli Peppers. It also reviewed and submitted the revised texts of the standards for the following products to the Working Party for approval: citrus fruit, cultivated mushrooms, leafy vegetables, leeks, lettuces, mangoes, melons, pears, pineapples, plums, tomatoes, watermelons and witloof chicory.

11. The Working Party made good progress on developing UNECE explanatory brochures for the Standards on Fresh Chilli Peppers and Pineapples together with revising the standards. It was expected that both brochures would be adopted in November 2012.

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

<sup>2</sup> CX/FFV 11/16/1; CRD (Mexico).

<sup>3</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/2; CRD 2 (Mexico); and CRD 6 (Senegal).

<sup>4</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/3; CRD 2 (Mexico); and CRD 15 (OIV).

12. The Committee might wish to consider reviewing the Codex standards for fresh chilli peppers, mangoes, pineapples and tomatoes in the light of the work done by UNECE. The Committee agreed to consider this matter under Agenda Item 7 (proposals for new work).

13. In 2011 UNECE promoted agricultural quality standards worldwide by holding regional workshops in Tajikistan for Central Asian countries, in Ghana for African countries, in Moldova for the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), in Croatia for south-east European countries and in Thailand for Asian countries. Reports, recommendations and training material of the workshops were available at [www.unece.org/trade/agr/welcome.htm](http://www.unece.org/trade/agr/welcome.htm) under "Promotion/Capacity-building".

14. At its November 2012 session, the Working Party would consider the issue of periodicity in revising UNECE standards. It would also continue discussion on revising the Geneva Protocol. In this regard, at its 2011 session, the Working Party asked: (a) the UNECE's legal office to clarify the legal status of the current (1985) version of the Geneva Protocol and (b) the UNECE Secretariat to provide in writing the legal opinion of the legal service on that matter to the Working Party. The legal opinion of the legal service had been received by the Secretariat and would be submitted to the forthcoming session of the Working Party for consideration.

15. The 68<sup>th</sup> session of the Working Party would be held from 5 to 7 November 2012 and the 61<sup>st</sup> session of the Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables would be held from 30 April to 3 May 2013. All Member States of the United Nations could participate in the Working Party meetings on an equal footing.

16. The delegation of Mexico requested the UNECE Secretariat to provide for the inclusion of the Hass varieties of avocados in the UNECE Standard for Avocado.

#### **ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)**

17. The Committee noted the information provided in Part II of working document CX/FFV 12/17/3 in relation to the activities of the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables in particular:

18. The Scheme Rules recognized Codex standards as international standards that could be adopted as OECD standards for the development of explanatory brochures to facilitate implementation of the standards and quality inspection between members of the Scheme. Within this framework, the OECD Scheme had adopted the Codex Standard for Banana as an OECD Standard and was in the process of developing the corresponding OECD Brochure in consultation with OECD and Codex members.

19. The OECD Scheme was also closely following the development of the Codex Standard for Pomegranate with a view to developing an OECD Brochure on Pomegranate also in consultation with Codex members. In this regard, the OECD Secretariat had circulated an e-mail to Codex Contact Points inviting Codex members who were not members of the OECD Scheme to participate as observers in the OECD electronic working group on the development of these brochures. The Committee noted that this was an informal request from the OECD to Codex members with a view to examining possible ways of cooperation on the development of explanatory materials.

20. The Committee noted the ongoing work in the OECD on explanatory brochures on bananas and pomegranates based on Codex standards and remained available for further collaboration in this area. The Committee further noted that this would be in line with its Terms of Reference in relation to consultation with other international organizations active in the area of standardization of fresh fruits and vegetables.

#### **INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF VINE AND WINE (OIV)**

21. The Committee noted a summary of the current work undertaken by OIV that might be of interest to the Committee in particular on table grapes and the OIV Resolution on Minimum Maturity Requirements for Table Grapes. The Committee agreed to consider the request of OIV on the opportunity to revise section 2.1 on minimum maturity requirements in the Standard for Table Grapes (CODEX STAN 255-2007) under Agenda Item 7 (proposals for new work).

#### **UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2c)<sup>5</sup>**

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

#### **DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR AVOCADO (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995) (Agenda Item 3a)<sup>6</sup>**

##### **General remarks**

23. The Committee recalled that the Standard for Avocado (CODEX STAN 197-1995) does not cover varieties currently marketed internationally e.g. small-sized Hass and other varieties such as hybrids of Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties and that relevant sections of the Standard needed to be revised to cover these varieties taking into account the revised UNECE Standard for Avocado (FFV-42).

<sup>5</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/4; CRD 2 (Mexico).

<sup>6</sup> REP11/FFV, Appendix II; CX/FFV 12/17/6; CX/FFV 17/17/5 (rev) (Comments of Argentina, Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ghana, Iran, Paraguay and the United States of America); CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 5 (Mali); CRD 8 (Indonesia); CRD 9 (Cuba); CRD 10 (Iran); CRD 11 (Kenya); CRD 12 (Argentina); CRD 13 (Costa Rica); CRD 16 (Thailandia); and CRD 17 (Peru).

24. The Committee noted that the scope of the revision as approved by the Commission was to revise the provisions concerning quality and sizing as well as consequential amendments to other sections of the Standard arising from the inclusion of additional varieties therefore it was not necessary to review the whole Standard.

25. The Committee further noted that, at its last session, it had retained the Standard at Step 7 waiting for the identification of analytical methods for the determination of dry matter content; the consideration of inclusion of tolerances for decay and internal breakdown in the quality tolerances; and the completion of provisions on size uniformity and associated labelling requirements.

#### **MATURITY REQUIREMENTS: Methods of Analysis for the Determination of Dry Matter Content (Agenda Item 3b)**

##### **Methods of Analysis**

26. The Committee thanked the delegation of Mexico for the presentation of a video on the methodology for the determination of dry matter percentage used in Mexico based on the microwave drying technique. The delegation informed the Committee that no ISO, AOAC or IUPAC method was available for the determination of dry matter content of avocados. The delegation also informed the Committee that analytical procedures for the determination of dry matter content of avocados were available in the OECD Guidance on Objective Tests to determine the Quality of Fruit and Vegetables and Dry and Dried Produce<sup>7</sup> which also referred to the microwave drying technique.

27. One delegation expressed the view that the microwave drying technology had its merits due to its speed, simplicity, low cost and repeatability, however it might result in localized drying and give a high variability in drying times dependent on power settings and sample type. The delegation felt that if a method was to be included in the Standard as a reference method for the determination of dry matter content, a laboratory reference method must be used to address rejection or dispute settlement cases. In this regard, another delegation noted that although the method was sensitive to the microwave power and drying time, if it was appropriately calibrated, the results showed accuracy, precision and repeatability but it could not be used as a reference method for the purposes of international trade. In that case, the laboratory method described in the OECD Guidance should apply. These views were supported by a number of delegations.

28. Several delegations shared the view that the information provided in reply to CL 2011/12-FFV was sufficient for the purposes of identification of methods of analysis for the determination of dry matter content and there was no need to identify a Codex reference method for the determination of dry matter content for inclusion in the Standard.

29. The Committee thus agreed not to include a reference method for the determination of dry matter content in the standard and consequently, section 9 on methods of analysis and sampling was removed.

##### **Dry Matter Content**

30. The Committee discussed the need to retain the 19% dry matter content for other non-defined varieties as there was no scientific basis to establish such a limit for varieties that were not defined or described in the Standard or in scientific / technical literature. In this regard, it was noted that the dry matter content for the Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties and their hybrids varied widely and even within the same variety or lot therefore, it would be restrictive to set a limit for these varieties.

31. Some delegations felt that if this percentage was removed the "other varieties" different from the higher dry matter content varieties i.e. Hass, Torres, Fuerte, Pinkerton, Edranol and Reed would not be covered by the Standard. In this regard, it was noted that the 19% was considered a threshold level to address dry matter content for avocado varieties other than the above varieties while the dry matter content of Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties could be lower than 19% which was why an exception for them had been introduced. However, if the 20 and 21% dry matter content were specific to the high dry matter content varieties defined in the Standard and the Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties and their hybrids did not reach the minimum 19%, the absence of such threshold limit would not exclude "other varieties" from the standard but would rather provide for flexibility in the application of the standard while still ensuring fair trade practices. The deletion of this minimum level would also take into account the concern on the dry matter content percentages for "other non-defined varieties" mentioned in the Standard.

32. Based on the above considerations and explanation, the Committee agreed to delete the reference to 19% and "other non-defined varieties" and to generally indicate that other varieties including the Antillean / West Indian / Guatemalan varieties may show a lower dry matter content in relation to the dry matter content specified for certain varieties in this section.

#### **PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY TOLERANCES – Allowances of tolerances for decay and/or internal breakdown (Section 4.1) (Agenda Item 3c)**

33. The Committee recalled that it could not agree on the introduction of tolerances for decay and internal breakdown at its last session and therefore, it agreed to reconsider this issue at its next session based on the technical justification for the inclusion of such tolerances and the associated figures that would be presented by those countries interested in having these provisions included in the Standard.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/agr/fv>

34. Several delegations supported the inclusion of provisions for decay and internal breakdown in the quality tolerances as fresh fruits and vegetables were perishable produce subject to long distance transportation and storage which might result into certain degree of decay and internal breakdown in the produce that should not lead to the rejection of the lot. It was noted that minimum tolerances for decay and internal breakdown were a common industry and trading practice however, the absence of such tolerances in an international standard like Codex would imply “zero” tolerance that could create technical barriers to trade while the objective of Codex standards was to facilitate trade in food.

35. It was noted that the term “decay” would encompass any fruit that would be affected by a progressive deterioration in the time that would make it unfit for consumption. As regards avocado, the “stem end rot” could be considered as an example of deterioration covered under the term “decay”. It was also noted that the term would cover both decay associated with pathogenic and non-pathogenic microbial contamination and internal breakdown associated with physiological spoilage such as senescence, chilling injuries, etc. The origin of the deterioration would not be so relevant as opposed to the effect on the produce edibility.

36. Some delegations did not support the inclusion of such provisions in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as it would imply non-compliance with good agricultural practices. These delegations were especially concerned about the term “decay” covering pathogenic spoilage.

37. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to include tolerances for decay for Class I and Class II. However, the Committee could not reach agreement to include similar tolerances for Extra Class. In this regard, it was noted that Extra Class produce constituted a small segment of the market, i.e. premium quality, and that the incorporation of decay tolerances in this class would have economic implications for the private sector. It was also noted that this was a very special small market where trade operators provided for special transportation (e.g. means, speed, etc.) to deliver the produce at the destination point. It was further noted that if the lot failed to comply with the 5% non-compliance with the requirements for Extra class the lot would not be rejected but downgraded to the subsequent or relevant class. The delegation of the United States of America expressed its reservation for the exclusion of decay tolerances for Extra Class.

38. One delegation noted that quality tolerances for Extra Class specified that 5% by number of weight of produce may not comply with the requirements of the class but met those of Class I which allowed tolerances for decay consequently, some allowance for decay were already allowed in Extra Class. Another delegation noted that allowances for decay in the quality tolerances should be held in the framework of the discussion on general provisions for fresh fruits and vegetables in the proposed Codex layout.

39. Based on the above considerations and in the spirit of compromise, the Committee agreed to include tolerances for decay for Classes I and II only. The Delegation of Colombia and Thailand expressed their reservations to this decision.

#### **DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR UNIFORMITY RULES AND OTHER SIZE-RELATED PROVISIONS – Sections 5.1 (Uniformity) and 6.2.4 (Commercial Identification) (Agenda Item 3d)**

40. The Delegation of Spain, as lead country of the electronic and in-session working groups on avocados, informed the Committee that the recommendations for sections 5.1 and 6.2.4 put forward in working document CX/FFV 12/17/6 were also agreed upon by the in-session working group and were presented to the plenary for consideration.

41. The Committee agreed to incorporate the provisions for uniformity when sizing by count and the related labelling provisions in the Standard. The Committee also agreed that, as uniformity rules referred to size by count, it would be more appropriate to transfer these provisions to section 3(b).

#### **STATUS OF THE DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR AVOCADO**

##### **STATUS OF THE DRAFT SECTION 5.1 – UNIFORMITY AND SECTION 6.2.4 – COMMERCIAL IDENTIFICATION**

42. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Standard and draft provisions for uniformity and other size-related provisions (sections 5.1 and 6.2.4) to the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix II).

#### **DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE (Agenda Item 4a)<sup>8</sup>**

##### **PROPOSED DRAFT PROVISIONS FOR SIZING AND UNIFORMITY RULES (Sections 3 and 5.1) (draft Codex Standard for Pomegranate) (Agenda Item 4b)**

43. The Committee recalled that the proposed draft Standard for Pomegranate without sizing and uniformity provisions had been adopted at Step 5 by the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission and would thus be considered at the present session at Step 7. The Committee also recalled that it had established an Electronic Working Group led by the United States of America to establish sizing and uniformity provisions that would be considered at Step 4.

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

<sup>8</sup> REP11/FFV, Appendix V; CX/FFV 12/17/7 (Comments at Step 6 – Colombia and Iran); CX/FFV 12/17/8; CX/FFV 12/17/8-Add.1 (Comments at Step 3 – Argentina, Australia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Iran); CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 4 (India); CRD 7 (Chile); CRD 11 (Kenya); CRD 14 (Paraguay); CRD 16 (Thailand); CRD 17 (Peru); and CRD 19 (Malaysia).



**General decision**

45. The Committee agreed that the term “arils” was the correct term to describe the edible part of pomegranates and applied this term across the standard where appropriate.

**Section 3 - Sizing**

46. The delegation of the United States of America introduced the report of the in-session working group that had developed sizing provisions, where sizing was optional and if sized, size could be determined by count, diameter or weight, or in accordance with current trading practices in order to take into account different practices in trade. The in-session working group had also established new sizing tables for sizing by diameter and weight.

47. There was some discussion as to whether the size codes in the tables should be mandatory so, if size codes were used, the ones contained in this section should apply. The Committee however agreed that they should only serve as a guide.

**Section 5.1 - Uniformity**

48. The in-session working group had proposed that mixed packages be exempted from the requirement that “the visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents”.

49. Some delegations felt that this could mislead consumers and also lead to different qualities in the same package. It was clarified that section 5.1 contained also the requirement that the fruit contained in mixed packages should be uniform in quality i.e. they should all belong to the same quality class.

50. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that for mixed packages the visible part of the contents of the package must also be representative of the entire contents.

**Section 6.1.1 - Nature of produce****Section 6.2.4 - Commercial identification**

51. There was a discussion as to whether size codes (either for weight or diameter ranges) could be used independently from indicating the actual diameter or weight range in the package. However, as it had been decided in section 3 that the sizing tables were only guides and since there could be different tables in use, the Committee agreed that the weight or diameter range should be indicated together with the size code.

52. One delegation noted that, in its opinion, the indication of “net weight” should be mandatory. However, it was clarified that net weight was usually optional in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

**STATUS OF THE DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE****STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 3 – PROVISION CONCERNING SIZING AND SECTION 5.1 - UNIFORMITY**

53. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Standard to the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 and the proposed draft provisions for sizing (section 3) and uniformity (section 5.1) for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix III).

**PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR GOLDEN PASSION FRUIT (Agenda Item 5)<sup>9</sup>**

54. The delegation of Colombia as lead country of the Electronic Working Group on Golden Passion Fruit introduced working document CX/FFV 12/17/9 containing a summary of the discussion held in the working group and the proposed draft Standard.

55. The Committee considered the standard section by section and made the following comments and amendments:

**General discussion on the scope of the standard**

56. One delegation said that, while golden passion fruit did not play a major role in its market, there were several other edible species of passion fruit marketed in its country and at international level. The delegation felt that the standard should include different species of passion fruits thus become a single standard for passion fruit. The different species and common names could be included in the standard to facilitate its application hence international trade rather than focussing on one particular specie.

57. Other delegations supported this proposal as many other species and hybrids of passion fruit were traded therefore the scope of the standard should be enlarged to cover other species. The single standard could present a clear separation between those provisions common to all species and those provisions specific to the relevant specie. The specific names, i.e. scientific and/or common names of the different species or commercial varieties, could be addressed through labelling.

---

<sup>9</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/9; CX/FFV 12/17/9-Add.1 (Comments of Costa Rica, Ghana, Paraguay and the United States of America); CRD 2 (Mexico), CRD 6 (Senegal); CRD 11 (Kenya); CRD 16 (Thailand); and CRD 19 (Malaysia)

58. The delegation of Colombia noted that there were many species in the *Passifloraceae* family which varied widely as regards their morphological, biological and physico-chemical characteristics e.g. shape, size, skin, total soluble solids, sugar/acid ratio, etc. Golden passion fruit was meant for fresh consumption as opposed to other passion fruits. The stalk was an integral part of the fruit thus, if it was removed, the flesh would be exposed whereas other species could be marketed without the stalk. Skin defects in golden passion fruit related more to cracking / rough skin rather than surface depression / wrinkled skin as in other species of passion fruits. Cultivation areas and growing methods, post harvest handling / treatments, and phytosanitary issues for golden passion fruit were different from other passion fruits. In view of the specific characteristics of passion fruit species, in particular the golden passion fruit specie, it would be very difficult to combine all species in one standard hence, it would be better to keep separate standards like in the case of the single standards for various citrus fruits. The delegation further noted that no data had been provided to the Committee in order to consider the inclusion of other species of passion fruits at this session.

59. Some delegations supported this opinion and noted that the standard should not be expanded at this point as this would delay its completion. A separate standard could then be developed for other passion fruit species that shared more similar characteristics. Alternatively, separate standards for different species of passion fruits could also be developed.

60. Those delegations favouring the development of a general standard noted that this approach would optimize the use of the Committee's resources in the development of worldwide standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, that no more standards than absolutely necessary should be developed within Codex, and that this was in the overall interest of the Commission.

61. The Codex Secretariat recalled that this issue had been raised at the last session of the Committee, that the conclusion had been to request new work on a standard for golden passion fruit which had been approved by the Commission, and that there had been no comments on the scope at that stage. If there was consensus, the Committee could enlarge the scope of the standard and inform the Executive Committee and the Commission accordingly. Another possibility would be to request new work on a standard for other passion fruit species in which case a project document and lead country would need to be identified.

62. The Committee could not reach consensus as to whether to enlarge the scope of the standard to have a single standard covering all species of passion fruits or to request new work on a standard for different species of passion fruits (excluding golden passion fruit).

63. In view of this, the Committee agreed to review the standard section by section while noting which parts were specific to golden passion fruit and to decide on a way forward after completing the review.

#### **Title**

64. One delegation proposed to amend the title to read "*Passiflora ligularis* Juss" as there were many different common names for this product and the name "golden passion fruit" might not be known in other countries. Other delegations were of the opinion that using the botanical name in the title to a commercial standard would not facilitate trade and would be confusing to consumers.

65. As a compromise solution, the Committee decided to amend the title to include a reference to the botanical name of the specie namely "*Passiflora ligularis* Juss". It was noted that this would avoid referencing many names in the footnote to the title which would not comprehensively address all possible names given across countries and regions for golden passion fruit. It was further noted that the inclusion of botanical names in the title of standards already applied to some Codex standards.

#### **Section 1 - Definition of produce**

66. The Committee decided to include the family "*Passifloraceae*" in the definition, which was a common practice in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

#### **Section 2.1 - Minimum requirements**

67. The Committee agreed to split the first indent into three separate indents (whole; fresh in appearance; firm) to align with other standards for fresh fruits and vegetables carrying similar provisions.

68. The Committee also agreed to split the indent related to surface depression and cracking into two indents to better address specific minimum requirements for golden passion fruits and general requirements for passion fruits. In this regard, the Committee noted that the indents related to the stalk/knot and cracking were specific to golden passion fruit.

#### **Section 2.2 - Classification**

69. One delegation noted that the requirement "characteristic of the variety" was contained in both Extra Class and Class I and should thus better be in the minimum requirements. The Committee decided to maintain these requirements unchanged as they were part of the layout used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

#### **Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 - Classes I and II**

70. The Committee rearranged the list of defects for better clarity. It was agreed to include provisions for defects in shape in Class I for consistency with similar provisions in Class II and to separate defects in colouring from skin defects as they were not subject to the 10 or 20% of the surface of the fruit.

71. The Committee noted that defects in shape related to the zone near to the stalk for the particular case of golden passion fruit. The Committee also noted that the term “rough skin” was the correct term for golden passion fruit while the term “wrinkled skin” would be more appropriate for other passion fruits as golden passion fruit did not developed “wrinkled skin”. It was further noted that “rough skin” addressed defects due to accumulation of healed injuries e.g. scars which made the skin was not so smooth as it should be.

### **Section 3 - Sizing**

72. Some delegations proposed to include sizing by weight and count. The delegation of Colombia indicated that sizing by diameter was the method presently used in trade. However, if information on other sizing methods were provided, they could be included in the standard.

73. One delegation said that the sizing table should be corrected as there were gaps in the numbers linking to the subsequent classes e.g. 77-67, 66-56, etc.

74. The Committee decided to maintain the sizing provisions in square brackets until information on other sizing methods had been provided.

### **Section 5.1 - Presentation**

75. One delegation indicated that, in its country, mixed packaging of different colours and sizes was a common marketing practice and that this would be important to consider if the Committee decided to enlarge the scope. The delegation noted that this was already a common practice in international trade of passion fruits. This comment was supported by other delegations.

76. The delegation of Colombia noted that mixing of different species was not a common practice in the uniformity section of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The delegation mentioned that different species had different characteristics in particular shape (size), respiration rates, etc. that might lead to different degree of ripeness or damage to the produce that in turn would affect uniformity (quality) of the produce in the package. The delegation noted that mixing different colours and sizing would be against the concept of uniformity in the quality characteristics of the produce (specie). This view was supported by other delegations.

77. The Committee decided to leave the section unchanged while recognizing that provisions might change if the scope of the standard was enlarged.

### **Section 6 - Marking or labelling**

78. The Committee agreed that for the name of the product the common and the scientific name of the produce (specie) should be used (sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.2).

### **Other sections**

79. The Committee noted that other sections of the standard carried provisions that were common to Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables therefore did not need revision.

### **Conclusion**

80. The Committee discussed how to continue work on the standard. Many delegations were of the opinion that the review had shown that other species could be included in the standard therefore, a single standard for passion fruits should not be so difficult to develop. Other delegations were of the opinion that it would be more appropriate to continue work on a specific standard for golden passion fruit at this time and to eventually start work on standards for different species of passion fruits or on a standard for other species of passion fruits.

81. The Committee considered two options in relation to the further development of the standard: (1) to send the standard back to Step 2 for redrafting by an electronic working group which would consider proposals for enlarging the scope or (2) to advance the standard for adoption at Step 5 while noting that any delegation could submit comments to the Codex Alimentarius Commission in particular as per the inclusion of other species with a view to providing justification for the enlargement of the scope.

82. The Codex Secretariat noted that the deadline for finalization of the standard was 2014 and that completion of the standard within this timeframe could be reached by following either options.

83. The Committee noted splitting views in relation to the above options. In view of this, and taking into consideration the decision of the Commission to approve new work on a standard for golden passion fruit, the Chair of the Committee recommended to forward the standard to the Commission for adoption at Step 5 and to keep the provisions on sizing in square brackets waiting for data on sizing methods in particular by weight and count. The Chairperson noted that delegations could submit comments and information at Step 5 for consideration by the Commission on the economic importance of other species of passion fruits for their countries which could possibly allow the enlargement of the scope by having specific annexes attached to common provisions in the main body of the standard.

84. The Committee agreed to the proposal from the Chairperson and also agreed to re-establish the electronic working group led by Colombia open to all members and observers and working in English and Spanish to discuss any open questions in the standard especially the section on sizing by weight and count.

**STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR GOLDEN PASSION FRUIT**

85. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft Standard to the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix IV).

**PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR DURIAN (AT STEP 4) (Agenda Item 6)<sup>10</sup>**

86. The Committee recalled that the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission had approved new work on a standard for durian and requested the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables to consider this task at its next session. However, if the Committee considered that the development of a worldwide standard for durian was not possible, work could be continued as a regional standard in the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for ASIA (November 2012).

87. In line with this request, the Committee first discussed if it was possible and appropriate to develop an international standard for durian.

88. The delegation of Thailand provided information on the characteristics and trade volume of durian and mentioned that, in addition to the data provided to the Executive Committee, additional data was provided in CRD 16 to support the development of an international standard for durian. Some delegations considered that the produce was not known extensively outside the production zone. Many other delegations however were in favour of establishing an international standard for durian in view of the increasing international trade of this produce. The Committee therefore agreed to establish a worldwide standard for durian.

89. The Committee based its discussion on a proposed draft standard prepared by Thailand. It discussed the standard section by section and made the following comments and amendments:

**Section 1 - Definition of produce**

90. The delegation of Thailand explained that many species of durian were suitable for consumption and for this reason *Durio* spp. (meaning species of the genus *Durio*) had been indicated in the definition of produce.

91. There were around 30 commercial varieties grown in Asia mainly from five species but overall around 27 species were cultivated producing edible fruit therefore the genus as opposed to the individual species had been named in this section.

92. It was proposed to delete the definitions of terms as the standard was meant for experts. The delegation of Thailand clarified that, as the produce was less known outside the Asian region, it might be preferable to retain these definitions. The Committee decided to retain the definitions but to include them in an annex to the standard.

**Section 2.1 - Minimum requirements**

93. The Committee considered whether provisions for “whole” should be separated from the remaining provisions for the peduncle and the stem.

94. A delegation explained that because of the morphology of the fruit, with its intrusive peduncle, the fruit could be damaged if the peduncle was removed and only an intact peduncle showed that the fruit had been properly handled and was of a good quality. In this regard, the delegation of Thailand explained that this was an important criteria for consumers who were prepared to pay quite a high price for good quality durian. The delegation stressed that durian without an intact peduncle was no longer considered whole therefore, the provisions for whole and stalk related to the intactness of the produce should remained.

95. Some delegations requested clarification as to the presence of the stem in addition to the stalk and whether provisions for the stem could be deleted as the way it was written indicated that it was not relevant as a minimum quality requirement. The delegation of Thailand explained that the presence of the stem was an important indicator of the degree of maturity of the produce as being this a climacteric fruit continuing its ripening process after harvesting. In this regard, when the abscission layer between the peduncle and the stem showed the absence of the latter the fruit could be considered ready for consumption. However the reference to the presence of the stem could be removed to clarify the provisions concerning the wholeness of the fruit.

96. The Committee decided to move the indent related to the presence of visible defects affecting the quality of the produce to the quality classes I and II as having this provision in the minimum requirements would be very restrictive and allow only few fruits to be marketed. It was noted that more serious defects were already covered by the first two indents (i.e. whole and sound).

**Section 2.1.1**

97. The Committee noted that provisions in this section referred to (1) the development and ripeness of the fruit and (2) the development and condition during transportation and as such both sections should be kept separated which was in line with the layout of Codex standards of fresh fruits and vegetables. The Committee consider a proposal to amend the first paragraph to better address the ripening process of a climacteric fruit like durian as follows:

“The durians must have reached an appropriate degree of development in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and to the area in which they are grown and to allow the fruit to reach an appropriate degree of ripeness.”

<sup>10</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/10 (Proposed draft Standard for Durian); CX/FFV 12/17/10-Add.1 (Comments of Colombia, Costa Rica and Japan); CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 3 (Philippines); CRD 16 (Thailand); and CRD 19 (Malaysia).

98. The Committee however agreed to retain the entire section unchanged for further development and consideration at its next session.

### **Section 2.2 - Classification**

99. As regards the grading of defects in the quality classes which usually referred to “very slight defects” in Extra Class, “slight defects” in Class I and “defects” in Class II, the delegation of Thailand explained that defects in Extra Class should only be “very slight superficial defects” whereas in Classes I and II they referred to “very slight defects” and “slight defects”.

100. It was noted that provisions for locules and thorns could be moved to section 2.1.1 as they were more related to the development of the fruit. It was also noted that a list of defects could be provided for classes I and II in line with the layout of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

101. The Committee agreed to delete the reference to specific varieties in the quality classes as provisions in these classes should apply to varieties in general.

### **Section 3 - Sizing**

102. It was noted that the language used in the section needed to be harmonized with other Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. It was also noted that the proposed sizing table contained gaps and needed to be re-arranged.

### **Section 4 - Tolerances**

103. The Committee noted that reference to tolerances applying to the “lot” should be clarified as Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables usually apply tolerances to the “package”.

104. The delegation of the United States of America noted that information should be provided as to the presence of decay and internal breakdown due to the particular characteristics of durians.

105. The Committee further noted that the 20% size tolerance should also be clarified as usually a size tolerance of 10% were allowed in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

### **STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR DURIAN**

106. The Committee decided to return the proposed draft Standard to Step 2 for redrafting by an electronic working group taking into account the discussion at the present session, working in English only and coordinated by Thailand.

### **PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 7)<sup>11</sup>**

#### **PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CODEX STANDARD FOR OKRA**

107. The delegation of India introduced its proposal and gave a summary information based on the project document presented in Part I of working document CX/FFV 12/17/11.

108. Following this presentation, several countries indicated that they were interested in developing a Codex Standard for Okra. One delegation mentioned that it was important that the alternative name “lady’s fingers” was indicated in the title of the standard. Other delegations mentioned that the botanical names of the species should also be indicated.

#### **Conclusion**

109. The Committee agreed to request the Commission to approve new work on a Codex standard for Okra and to forward the relevant project document to the Executive Committee for the Critical Review (Appendix V).

110. The Committee also agreed to establish an electronic working group open to all members and observers, coordinated by India and working in English only to prepare a proposed draft standard based on the proposal attached to the project document.

#### **PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CODEX STANDARD FOR WARE POTATO**

111. The delegation of India introduced its proposal and gave a summary information based on the project document presented in Part II of working document CX/FFV 12/17/11.

112. Many delegations supported this proposal as timely because of the high trade volume of this produce and the intention of more countries to trade the product internationally which had in some cases founded difficult. It was therefore necessary for Codex to fulfill its mandate to protect consumers and to promote fair practices in the food trade by establishing a standard for this produce.

113. The delegation of the European Union mentioned that there was no EU standard for the commercial quality of potatoes although the potato industry was among the most important worldwide. While recognizing the importance of international trade in potato, the delegation noted that, as the proposal had been received very late, there had been no time to consult with the national stakeholders in order to take a position on this request. The delegation noted, that developing a standard for a produce that was produced worldwide and traded in high volumes internationally, might be difficult. The delegation also noted also that it should be clear which problems were to be addressed by the standard as in its opinion the main issues in international trade of potato were not related to quality issues but to phyto-sanitary issues which were not within the competence of this Committee.

---

<sup>11</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/3; CX/FFV 12/17/11; CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 6 (Senegal); and CRD 15 (OIV).

114. Other delegations also said that they needed more time to consult with their stakeholders before taking a position.
115. The Representative from UNECE informed the Committee that UNECE had established two standards for potatoes, one for early and ware potatoes and one for seed potatoes. In addition, the Representative mentioned that there was also an OECD explanatory brochure based on the UNECE standard for early and ware potatoes.
116. In this regard, some delegations mentioned that the work already done by the UNECE could serve as a basis for the new Codex standard.
117. One delegation indicated that it also needed more time to consult with its stakeholders. However, it would be very likely that it would not be in the position to support work on a Codex standard for potatoes as in its country all trade was done without having a national standard and it was considered that the industry was capable of addressing the relevant issues themselves. The delegation also reported that discussions in the UNECE on important standardization issues such as quality classes and a unique reference method to determine the cooking type, which was important consumer information, had not been resolved in years of discussion resulting in a UNECE standard without the relevant section on classification.
118. The delegation of Senegal mentioned a specific case where all phyto-sanitary issues concerning export of ware potatoes to the European Union had been solved however, the export had not been possible because of quality requirements in the national standard of one EU member state.
119. In view of the above discussion, the Committee considered two options to moving forward with the development of this standard: Option 1, to recognize that more time was needed to take a decision, to annex the project document prepared by India to the report of this session, and to request all members and observers to consult with their stakeholders and take a decision on a way forward at the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFFV, in this case a decision by the Commission on the approval of new work could be taken at its 37<sup>th</sup> Session in 2014. Option 2, to forward the project document to the Executive Committee and the Commission requesting approval of new work for the establishment of a Codex standard for ware potato, recognizing that this would give countries around 10 month time to consult with their stakeholders and to make any relevant comments at the 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission in 2013.
120. In considering these options, the majority of delegations supported Option 2, as this would allow Codex to move forward in a timely manner to establish a standard for this important produce. Some delegations that had indicated previously that they needed more time to consult with their stakeholders also indicated that they supported this option as 10 months should be sufficient for such consultations.
121. Several other delegations supported Option 1 as time was needed not only to consult with their stakeholders but also to come up with a clear project document identifying the difficulties that might arise with the international standardization of ware potatoes. They were not convinced that the current project document clearly identified whether the produce was amenable to standardization and this was an important criteria for the Executive Committee and the Commission when examining proposals for new work. They were also concerned that, by moving too quickly, a technical discussion that should be held in the Committee would be moved to the Commission level which was not preferable.
122. As there was no consensus on any of the two options, a third option was tabled by the Codex Secretariat namely to inform the Executive Committee and the Commission of the status of discussions and the difficulties in reaching a consensus hence asking for relevant advice. However, the Committee did not support this option.

### **Conclusion**

123. After some discussion the Chairperson presented the following conclusion: The Committee recommends approval of new work on a Codex Standard for Ware Potato, in taking this decision, the Committee acknowledges the views of several delegations that, while not opposing the development of the standard, indicated that more time was needed to consult with their stakeholders as the proposal was received late. However, the Committee noted that the period between this session and the next session of the Executive Committee i.e. 10 months would allow for sufficient time for countries to consult with their stakeholders and bring any concerns to the Commission in relation to the approval of this new work.

124. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Chair. The project document is attached as Appendix VI.

### **POSSIBLE REVISION OF CODEX STANDARDS IN LIGHT OF THE REVISION OF UNECE AND OIV STANDARDS**

#### **UNECE**

125. The Committee recalled that the UNECE had informed the CCFFV that the UNECE was about to finalize the revision of their standards for mangoes, pineapples, tomatoes and fresh chilli peppers and that the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables might wish to consider reviewing the corresponding Codex standards to determine if a revision was appropriate.

126. As the final decision on the revision of the UNECE standards would be taken by the UNECE Working Party meeting later in 2012, the Representative from UNECE offered to prepare a note after the session of the Working Party in November 2012, highlighting to which extent the revised UNECE standards differed from Codex standards and on that basis Codex members could take a decision on the need to revise the relevant Codex standards.

### **Conclusion**

127. The Committee agreed to discuss the issue at its 18<sup>th</sup> Session based on the information provided by the UNECE.

**OIV**

128. The Codex Secretariat explained that within the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV namely point (c): “to consult, as necessary, with other international organizations which are active in the area of standardization of fresh fruits and vegetables”, the OIV had asked the CCFFV to consider the possibility to revise the maturity requirements in the Codex Standard for Table Grapes, to align it with relevant OIV texts. The proposal also contained a comparison between the Codex/UNECE and OIV requirements (see CRD 15).

129. A delegation expressed on the possibility that the review of this provision might lead to a comprehensive revision of the Standard.

130. The Codex Secretariat clarified that no decision was needed at this moment but the Committer might consider how to reply to the question posed by the OIV.

131. The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group open to all members and observers, coordinated by the United States of America and working in English only to evaluate the proposal of the OIV and to report back to the next session of the Committee on the opportunity to revise the maturity requirements in the Codex Standard for Table Grapes.

**STANDARD FOR VANILLA**

132. The delegation of Mexico recalled that, at the 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFFV, it had announced the interest to develop a Codex standard for vanilla. The delegation informed the Committee that, after revising the original proposal, it would consider the possibility to submit the proposal to the Codex Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables.

**PROPOSED CODEX LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 8)<sup>12</sup>**

133. The Committee recalled that, at its last session, there was no time to continue discussing the proposed Codex layout and it was therefore agreed that the Codex and UNECE Secretariats should work together on a draft layout taking into account the 2011 revision of the UNECE layout showing the differences between the standard language used currently in Codex standards and the revised UNECE layout to facilitate the consideration of this matter at its next session.

134. The Codex Secretariat introduced working document CX/FFV 12/17/12 and explained that the proposed Codex layout as contained in Annex I of the working document was to a large extent harmonized with the UNECE layout and that relevant explanation on the history of the combined Codex / UNECE layout used for the establishment of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables including explanation when appropriate on the rationale for the establishment of certain provisions in the proposed Codex layout were given in paragraphs 1-52 of the working document.

135. The Committee noted that the text highlighted in grey corresponds to UNECE text that had been incorporated in the proposed Codex layout for consideration by the Committee.

136. The delegation of Mexico referred to the information provided in CRD 2 related to a glossary of terms used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

137. The Committee agreed to discuss the proposed layout section by section and made the following comments and amendments:

**Introductory notes**

138. The Committee agreed to put the reference to the UNECE into square brackets in view of the on-going discussion on the review of the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV in relation to the consultative process with the UNECE.

**Scope**

139. The Codex Secretariat explained that unlike other Codex commodity standards that followed the Format for Codex Commodity Standards, Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables do not contain a section on scope, which was to a certain extent covered by the provisions under the definition of produce. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that Codex members had on numerous occasions commented on the lack of a section on scope during the consideration of specific standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

140. The Committee agreed that the Codex layout should contain a section on scope to be developed at its next session based on comments received from Codex members on this matter.

141. However, the Committee also agreed that, part of the text given as an example of a section on scope in Annex II of CX/FFV 12/17/12 could be retained for further consideration at its next meeting. In this regard, the Committee noted that Codex commodity committees (like the CCFFV) develop standards that were more related to non-food safety issues although cross references to the relevant horizontal food safety texts were given in the relevant sections on food hygiene, contaminants, etc. Therefore, when referring to the purpose of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables to define quality and “safety” requirements for a given produce it should be seen by reference for food safety issues and not in the sense that the CCFFV would itself develop food safety requirements.

---

<sup>12</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/12; CX/FFV 12/17/12-Add.1 (Comments of Ghana and the United States of America); CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 3 (Philippines); and CRD 16 (Thailand).

### Definition of Produce

142. The Committee agreed to put in square brackets the reference to “commercial varieties (cultivars)” in view of the latest developments in the CCFFV in regard to the standardization of produce covering various / all species like in the case of chilli peppers (i.e. *Capsicum spp.*) or durian (i.e. *Durio spp.*).

### Provisions concerning quality

143. The Committee agreed on the need to have provisions addressing the lack of freshness of the produce due to the perishable nature of fresh fruits and vegetables. The Committee further agreed that the UNECE text could be taken as a basis for discussion but could not decide on the place in the layout where such provisions should be included. In this regard, it was suggested that such provisions would be more appropriate to include in the section on quality tolerances.

### Minimum requirements

144. A delegation commented on the need for objective guidance on the interpretation / measurement of certain qualifiers such as “practically” which might make the interpretation and application of the standard difficult and suggested that such terms be removed from the minimum requirements. The delegation also mentioned that a glossary on the terminology used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables could assist the Committee, Codex members, and users of the standards in the implementation of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

145. The Committee considered the appropriateness to retain the term “whole” or “intact” in the first indent of the minimum requirements. It was noted that depending on the nature of the produce one of the two terms might be appropriate. The Committee therefore agreed to retain both terms. The Committee further noted that depending on the nature of the produce additional provisions to complement the wholeness or intactness of the produce might be added.

146. The Committee agreed to have separate entries for presence of pests and damages caused by pests. It was noted that provisions for damages caused by pest might vary depending on the nature of the produce. The Committee noted that *practically free from damage caused by pests* applies to produce whose skin could not be peeled like berries, leafy vegetables, etc. while *free from damage caused by pests* applied to fruits with thicker skin like citrus fruits, melons, etc. and that this was also linked to the allowance for skin defects in the quality classes. The Committee further agreed to add an explanatory note to clarify the usage of the two indents referring to damage caused by pests.

147. The Committee discussed the opportunity to retain the footnote to the provision on foreign smell and/or taste, which allowed for smell caused by conservation agents. Some delegations requested the removal of the footnote as smell of conservation agents could affect consumer acceptance of the produce. Other delegations did not support this request as the footnote provided for flexibility in the application of this provision. These delegations noted that smells associated with waxes or other preservatives used for the transportation / storage of the produce should be allowed especially at import control stage. The Committee agreed that additional explanatory notes to the footnote should be elaborated to clarify at what point this provision could apply (e.g. import control point, retail sale, etc.).

### Conclusion

148. Due to time constraints, the Committee agreed to suspend discussion on the proposed Codex layout.

149. The Chair of the Committee informed the Committee that the host country Secretariat would look into the possibility to give an extra plenary day to the next session of the Committee and to allocate this time to the consideration of the layout in recognition of the relevance of this matter for future work of the CCFFV in the development of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

150. The proposed Codex layout is attached to this report as Appendix VII for comments and consideration by the next session of the Committee.

### REVISION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 9)<sup>13</sup>

151. The Committee recalled that the 34<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission noted the proposal from the delegation of Colombia to consider the revision of the Terms of Reference of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. Following discussion of this proposal, the Commission had agreed to recommend the CCFFV to consider its Terms of Reference and that the result of its consideration could be forwarded to the Committee on General Principles for review if necessary. The Commission had also tasked the Codex Secretariat to prepare a background document on the history and linkages between the CCFFV and the UNECE in order to assist the Committee to make an informed decision.

<sup>13</sup> CX/FFV 12/17/13, CRD 2 (Mexico); CRD 3 (Philippines); CRD 11 (Kenya); CRD 18 (rev) (Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Cuba, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Dominican Republic); CRD 20 (Argentina); CRD 21 (Brazil); and CRD 22 (Dominica).



152. The Codex Secretariat introduced the background document and said that paragraphs 1-17 of working document CX/FFV 12/17/13 gave an overview of the Terms of Reference and working arrangements of the CCFFV and the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Standards; relevant discussions in the Executive Committee and the Commission; as well as the history of the present proposal to consider a revision of the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV. Paragraphs 18 to 23 had been developed by the Codex Secretariat to draw the attention of the Committee on different matters that the Committee might wish to take into account when considering the opportunity to revise its Terms of Reference vis-à-vis to the consultative process with the UNECE. In this regard, the Codex Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 11 where the UNECE provided some comments on how the UNECE Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables understood the consultation process with the CCFFV.

153. One delegation suggested that no quick decisions should be taken on this matter but rather to establish an electronic working group to thoroughly review the Terms of Reference of the Committee looking not only at the Terms of Reference but also at how the two bodies work or could work together.

154. The delegation of Costa Rica referring to CRD 18(rev) noted that the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV were unique in making consultations and referring draft and proposed draft standards to a working party of another organization. The delegation suggested to align the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV with those of other Codex commodity committees and proposed the Terms of Reference should simply read: "To develop worldwide standards and codes applicable to fresh fruit and vegetables."

155. The delegation of the EU noted that UNECE and Codex had worked together for a long time in accordance with their procedures. In its opinion, the cooperation had benefitted both bodies and not been a hindrance. In referring to paragraph 15 of working document CX/FFV 12/17/13, the delegation noted that it did not feel that Codex and UNECE standards needed to be the identical. However, Codex might make use of existing UNECE standards and amend them as necessary in its own context. Based on these considerations, the delegation did not see the need to amend the Terms of Reference of the Committee however, the delegation supported the establishment of an electronic working group to look further into the issue.

156. One delegation noted that the Commission had given a clear task to the Committee that this matter should be discussed in the Committee and not be given to an electronic working group especially as working groups tended to be in one language only which made difficult participation of all Codex interested countries.

#### **Conclusion**

157. Based on the above considerations, the Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group coordinated by Japan and working in English, French (translation to be provided by France) and Spanish (translation to be provided by Costa Rica) with the mandate to consider the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV and in doing so to take into account paragraphs 18, 20 and 23 of CX/FFV 12/17/13 and the TOR of other commodity committees in order to facilitate the discussion on this matter.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 10)<sup>14</sup>**

158. The Committee noted that there was no other business to consider.

#### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 11)**

159. The Committee noted the kind offer of the delegation of Thailand to host the next session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. The Committee also noted the kind offer of the delegation of South Africa to host a future session of the CCFFV.

160. The Chair of the Committee thanked the delegations of Thailand and South Africa for their interest in the work of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. The Chair expressed the willingness of the host country Secretariat to look into the possibility to co-host the next session of the Committee in Thailand and would be liaising with the relevant authorities of the Government of Thailand on this matter.

161. The Committee was informed that the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was tentatively scheduled to be held in approximately 18 months. The exact time and venue would be determined by the host Government in consultation with the Codex Secretariat.

---

<sup>14</sup> CRD 6 (Senegal).

## SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject Matter	Step	Action by	Document Reference REP13/FFV
Draft Standard for Avocado (revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995)	8	Governments 36 <sup>th</sup> CAC	Para. 42 and Appendix II
Draft provisions for uniformity rules and other size-related provisions (sections 5.1 – uniformity and 6.2.4 – commercial identification) (draft Standard for Avocado)	8		
Draft Standard for Pomegranate	8	Governments 36 <sup>th</sup> CAC	Para. 53 and Appendix III
Proposed draft provisions for sizing and uniformity rules (sections 3 and 5.1) (draft Standard for Pomegranate)	5/8		
Proposed draft Standard for Golden Passion Fruit	5	Governments 36 <sup>th</sup> CAC Governments Electronic Working Group (Colombia) 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Para. 85 and Appendix IV
Proposed draft Standard for Durian	2/3	Electronic Working Group (Thailand) Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Para. 106
Proposed draft Standard for Okra	1/2/3	36 <sup>th</sup> CAC Electronic Working Group (India) Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Para. 109 and Appendix V
Proposed draft Standard for Ware Potato	1/2/3	36 <sup>th</sup> CAC Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Paras. 123-124 and Appendix VI
Proposals for new work on Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables	---	Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	ALINORM 10/33/35, para. 121
Proposed layout for Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables	---	Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Para. 150 and Appendix VII
Revision of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	---	Electronic Working Group (Japan) Governments 18 <sup>th</sup> CCFFV	Para. 157

## APPENDIX I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS  
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

**Chairperson:** Mtro. CRISTIAN TURÉGANO ROLDÁN

**Président:** Director General de Normas

**Presidente:** Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
Estado de México  
C.P. 53950  
Tel: 57 29 91 00 Ext. 43200-43201  
Fax: 55 20 97 15

**Assistant to the Chairperson:** Mtra. ANDREA BARRIOS VILLARREAL.

**Assistante du Président:** Directora de Normalización Internacional

**Asistente del Presidente:** Dirección General de Normas  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
Estado de México  
C.P. 53950  
Tel: 57 29 91 00 Ext. 43216  
Fax: 55 20 97 15  
E-mail: [andrea.barrios@economia.gob.mx](mailto:andrea.barrios@economia.gob.mx)

**ALGERIA  
ALGÉRIE  
ARGELIA**

**AIT Benali Hadda**  
Chef de bureau  
Hey Zerhouni Mokhtar-loolog BEA 15  
No 10-Mohammaolia-ALEER  
Tel. (213) 52 307 106 - 21 73 26 16  
Fax. 21 73 26 16  
Email. [Habdi.hada@yahoo.fr](mailto:Habdi.hada@yahoo.fr)

**AUSTRALIA  
AUSTRALIE**

**O'SULLIVAN Angela**  
Director International Food Standards / Department of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Forestry  
18 Marcus Clarke Street  
CANBERRA City  
Australia 2601  
Tel. (+61) 2 62723871  
Email. [angela.osullivan@daff.gov.au](mailto:angela.osullivan@daff.gov.au)

**BHUTAN  
BHOUTAN  
BUTÁN**

**TSHERING Kinlay**  
Chief Horticulture Officer / Departament Of Agriculture  
Horticulture División, Department of Agriculture, P.O BOX No. 392  
THIMPHU  
BHUTAN  
Tel. (00) 975 2 336946 / 323183 / 323184  
Fax. 00 975 2 325837  
Email. [kinlaytshering@moa.gov.bt](mailto:kinlaytshering@moa.gov.bt); [kinlay\\_rc@yahoo.com](mailto:kinlay_rc@yahoo.com)

**CAMEROON  
CAMEROUN  
CAMERÚN**

**NNAMA Nkili Renee Michele**  
Cadre  
Tel. (+237) 9935 2555  
(+237) 74 717193  
Fax. (+237) 22 22 35 69  
Email. [renee\\_michele@hotmail.fr](mailto:renee_michele@hotmail.fr)

**NKANDI Hermann Henri**  
Ingenieur d'Agriculture, Inspecteur Phytosanitaire. Ministère de  
l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural  
Direction de la réglementation et du contrôle de qualité  
B'p 22082, Yaounde, Cameroun  
Tel. (223) 99 80 87 24/ 75 77 70 18  
Email. [mkandihermann@yahoo.fr](mailto:mkandihermann@yahoo.fr)

**CANADA  
CANADÁ****SMITH Kevin**

National Manager, Processed Products Program  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
1400 MERIVALE RD  
OTTAWA, ON  
CANADA  
Tel. (613) 773-6225  
Fax. (613) 773-6282  
Email. [kevin.smith@inspection.gc.ca](mailto:kevin.smith@inspection.gc.ca)

**CHILE  
CHILI****ESPINOZA Claudia**

AV. Presidente Bulnes N° 140, 5° Piso  
Santiago Chile  
Tel. (52-2) 3451214  
Email. [claudia.espinoza@sag.gob.cl](mailto:claudia.espinoza@sag.gob.cl)

**ESCUDERO M. Paulina**

Cruz del Sur 133 piso 2  
Santiago Chile  
Tel. (56-2) 472 4720  
Email. [pescudero@asoex.cl](mailto:pescudero@asoex.cl)

**PANIAGUA Ramírez Karla**

Asistente del Consejero Agrícola / Consejería Agrícola de la Embajada de Chile  
Del Rio NO. 23, Col. Barrio de Santa Catarina D.F México  
Tel. 56599793  
Fax. 56599803  
Email. [karla.paniagua@consejagri.org](mailto:karla.paniagua@consejagri.org)

**HERNÁNDEZ Rubio Mario**

Gestión de Controversias / Proyectos Especiales / Consejería Agrícola de la Embajada de Chile  
Del Rio 23, Col Barrio de Santana Catarina  
México D.F  
Tel. 56599793  
Fax. 56599803  
Email. [zhaoxiaoyan@nercv.org](mailto:zhaoxiaoyan@nercv.org)

**COLOMBIA  
COLOMBIE****MUÑOZ Ibarra Javier**

Asesor  
Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Turismo  
Calle 28 N° 13 A 15 piso 3, Bogotá Colombia  
Tel. 571-6067676 Ext. 1205  
Fax. 571-6064777  
Email. [jmunoz@mincomercio.gov.co](mailto:jmunoz@mincomercio.gov.co)

**MUNAR León Ricardo Enrique**

Químico / Instituto Colombiano de Normas Técnicas y Certificación ICONTEC  
Carreras 37 No. 52-95  
Bogotá D.C Colombia  
Tel. (571) 607 88 88  
Fax. (571) 315 06 13  
Email. [munar@icontec.org](mailto:munar@icontec.org)

**COSTA RICA****LÓPEZ Marín Ligia Mayela**

Gerente del Programa Nacional de tomate  
Investigadora en Hortalizas y Coordinadora Codex CCFV-Costa Rica / Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
2 cuadras sur de Teletica Canal 7  
San José/Mata Redonda/Sabana Oeste  
San José, Costa Rica  
Tel. (+506) 2231-2344  
(+506) 8350-5452  
(+506) 2236-3185  
Fax. (506) 2232-9863  
Email. [llopez@inta.go.cr](mailto:llopez@inta.go.cr)  
[Lilia.lo@hotmail.com](mailto:Lilia.lo@hotmail.com)

**CUBA****SÁNCHEZ García Cira Margarita**

Jefe área Calidad, Bioseguridad y Medio ambiente  
Presidente Comité Técnico de Normalización sobre Frutas y Vegetales Frescos  
Instituto de investigaciones en Fruticultura Tropical, Ministerio de la Agricultura  
7ma Av. No. 3005 e/30 y 32, Miramar, playa  
La Habana Cuba  
C.P 10600  
Tel. (537) 209-3401/209-3585  
Fax. 203-6794  
Email. [calidad@iift.cu](mailto:calidad@iift.cu)

**CUÉ LADRÓN DE GUEVARA Mariela**

Licenciada Química  
MINCEX Ministerio del Comercio Exterior y La Inversión Extranjera  
Infanta, # 16, esq.23. Vedado, la República de Cuba  
Tel. (53) 7-8631837  
(53) 7-8380364  
(53) 7- 8380454  
Email. [mariela.cue@mincex.cu](mailto:mariela.cue@mincex.cu)

**DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO  
RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO  
REPÚBLICA DEMOCRÁTICA DEL CONGO****BIONGO Ntikala Gilbert**

Chef de Division / Défense des Végétaux  
Rue kutunga n° 36/ C. Masina  
Kinshasa  
République democratique du Congo  
Tel. (+243) 811484250  
Email. [gilbiongo@yahoo.fr](mailto:gilbiongo@yahoo.fr)

**DENMARK  
DANEMARK  
DIMANARCA****ØSTERGAARD Knud**

Head of Division/ Danish Veterinary and Food Administration  
Stationsparken 31-33  
DK-2600 Glostrup  
Denmark  
Tel. (+45 72 27 67 05)  
Email. [koe@fvst.dk](mailto:koe@fvst.dk)

**ATAZ Antonio**

Administrator  
Council of EU, Denmark Delegation  
Rue de la Loi 175  
1048 Brussels  
Tel. +45 72 27 67 05  
Email. [antonio.ataz@consilium.europa.eu](mailto:antonio.ataz@consilium.europa.eu)

**DOMINICA  
DOMINIQUE****ROLAND Royer**

Technical Officer / Dominica Bureau of Standards  
National Centre of testing excellence  
Stockfarm, P.O Box 1015, Roseau  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Tel. 1-(767) 285 3344 and 1-767-448-1685  
Fax. 1-767-4490-9217  
Email. [royer@diminicastandards.org](mailto:royer@diminicastandards.org)  
[Royee22@hotmail.com](mailto:Royee22@hotmail.com)

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC  
RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE  
REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA****MONTES de Oca Ortíz Daniel Antonio**

Encargado División Evaluación y Seguimiento  
Departamento de Inocuidad Agroalimentaria (DIA), en el Ministerio  
de Agricultura  
Av. John F. Kennedy, Km. 6, Urb. Jardines Del Norte, Santo  
Domingo, D. N.  
República Dominicana  
Tel. 809-547-3888, ext. 6024, 6025  
Email. [montesdeoca.master@gmail.com](mailto:montesdeoca.master@gmail.com) [codexsespas@yahoo.com](mailto:codexsespas@yahoo.com)

**EUROPEAN UNION  
UNION EUROPÉENNE  
UNIÓN EUROPEA****ZAMORA ESCRIBANO Eva Maria**

Administrator Responsible for Codex Issues  
Directorate General Health and Consumers  
European Commission, Rue Froissart 101  
1049 Brussels  
Tel. (+32 2) 299 86 82  
Fax. (+32 2) 299 85 66  
Email. [eva-maria.zamora-escribano@ec.europa.eu](mailto:eva-maria.zamora-escribano@ec.europa.eu)

**FRANCE  
FRANCIA****BALLANDRAS Catherine**

Inspectrice  
Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances  
DGCCRF 59 Bd Vincent Auriol 75013  
Paris, France  
Tel. (00 33) 1 44 97 28 54  
Fax. 00 33 1 44 97 05 27  
Email. [Catherine.ballandras@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr](mailto:Catherine.ballandras@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr)

**GERMANY  
ALLEMAGNE  
ALEMANIA****BICKELMANN Ulrike**

Head of Inspection Service /  
Federal Office for Food and Agriculture  
Deichmanns Aue 29  
53179 Bonn  
Tel. (0049)-228-6845-3357  
Fax. (0049)-228-6845-3945  
Email. [ulrike.bickelmaN@ble.de](mailto:ulrike.bickelmaN@ble.de)

**GUINEA  
GUINÉE****CONIE Mamadou**

Directour General du Centre d'Appui aux Formalités d'Exportation  
(CAFEX)  
Ministere du commerce  
RP M25 Conokry  
Conakry,  
Guinee  
Tel. 00 224 63 85 25 33  
Email. [Conole\\_mamadou@yaluo.fr](mailto:Conole_mamadou@yaluo.fr)

**HONDURAS****PAGUADA Rubio Juan Carlos**

Ingeniero Agrónomo  
Secretaria de Agricultura y Ganadería (SAG), Servicio Nacional de  
Sanidad Agropecuaria (SENASA)  
Boulevard Miraflores Ave. La Fao, contiguo Injupem, Tegucigalpa,  
M.D.C., Honduras  
Tel. (504) 9581-5357  
Fax. (504) 2231-0786  
Email. [jcpaguada@senasa-sag.gob.hn](mailto:jcpaguada@senasa-sag.gob.hn)

**INDIA  
INDE****REDDY Lachanna Shivarama**

Officer on Special Duty  
Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India  
Room No.440, Krishi Bhawan, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi,  
India  
Tel. (+91) 112 338 3627  
Fax. +91 112 338 3712  
Email. [shivareddy22@yahoo.co.in](mailto:shivareddy22@yahoo.co.in)

**KHURANA Suresh Chander**

Deputy Agricultural Marketing Adviser  
Direcotrate of Marketing and Inspection, Ministry of  
Agriculture, Government of India  
CGO Complex, NH IV, Faridabad - 121001, Faridabad, India  
Tel. (+91) 0129 241 5316  
Fax. +91 0129 241 6568  
Email. [khurana183@gmail.com](mailto:khurana183@gmail.com)

**PRASAD Devendra**

Assistant General Manager  
APEDA, Mministry of Commerce & Industry Government of India  
APEDA, 3rd Floor, NCUI Building, 3 Siri Institutional Area, Opp.  
Asian Games Village Hauz Khas  
New Delhi 110016, India  
Tel. (+91) 112 653 4175  
Fax. +91 112 651 9259  
Email. [devendraprasad62@gmail.com](mailto:devendraprasad62@gmail.com)  
[aqmqc@apeda.gov.in](mailto:aqmqc@apeda.gov.in)

**KHURANA Suresh Chander**

Deputy Agricultural Marketing Adviser  
Direcotrate of Marketing and Inspection, Ministry of  
Agriculture, Government of India  
CGO Complex, NH IV, Faridabad - 121001, Faridabad, India  
Tel. (+91) 0129 241 5316  
Fax. +91 0129 241 6568  
Email. [khurana183@gmail.com](mailto:khurana183@gmail.com)

**INDONESIA  
INDONÉSIE****BUDI Gardjita**

Director of Quality and Standardization, DG  
Marketing and Processing for Agricultural Products, Ministri of  
Agriculture  
Harsono RM. No 3 Ragunan, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia  
Tel. (+62 21) 781 5881  
Fax. +62 21 781 1468  
Email. [gbudi.jkt@gmail.com](mailto:gbudi.jkt@gmail.com)

**PASARIBU Charles Panahatan**

Embassy's staff  
Julio Verne #27, col. Polanco  
México City  
México  
Tel. 52 55 5280 3449  
Email. [Economics3@hotmail.com](mailto:Economics3@hotmail.com)

**IRAN  
IRÀN****PARICHEHR Seyed Rahmatollah**

Fruits Offer  
Ministry of Jihad-e-agriculture  
No1.Plant production Building.Malekoshoraie Bahar  
street.Taleghani Avenu, Tehran, Iran  
Tel. 009 891 281 13043  
Fax. 009 821 888 61394  
Email. [Fruits\\_agri.jahad@yahoo.com](mailto:Fruits_agri.jahad@yahoo.com)

**ITALY  
ITALIE  
ITALIA****IMPAGNATIELLO Ciro**

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies  
Via XX Settembre, 20. 00187 Rome Italy  
Tel. + 39 06 46 65 60 46  
Fax. + 39 06 48 80 273  
Email. [c.impagnatiello@mpaaf.gov.it](mailto:c.impagnatiello@mpaaf.gov.it)

**SUMMO Oracio**

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies  
Via XX Settembre, 20  
00187 Rome Italy  
Tel. (+39) 0646656147  
Fax. (+39) 0648800273  
Email. [o.summo@mpaaf.gov.it](mailto:o.summo@mpaaf.gov.it)

**JAPAN  
JAPON  
JAPÓN****KONDO Yoshikiyo**

Associate Director (International Affairs)  
Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki  
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100 – 8950  
Japan  
Tel. 81 33 50 28 732  
Fax. 81 3 35 07 42 32  
Email. [yoshikiyo\\_kondo@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:yoshikiyo_kondo@nm.maff.go.jp)

**KENYA  
KENIA****WASILWA Lusike**

Assistant Director, Horticulture and Industrial Crops  
Kenya Agriculture Research Institute  
P.O. Box 57811-00200  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel. (+254) 726-551-561  
(+254) 733-971-245  
Fax. (+254) 20-4183344  
Email. [lwasilwa@gmail.com](mailto:lwasilwa@gmail.com)  
[lwasilwa@kari.org](http://lwasilwa@kari.org)

**ONJOLO Samuel Omolo**

Manager Agriculture  
P.O Box 54 974-00200  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel. + 2547 722 31 51 65  
Fax. (02) 60 40 31  
Email. [onjol@kebes.org](mailto:onjol@kebes.org)  
[onjolos@gmail.com](mailto:onjolos@gmail.com)

**MALAWI****MALIDADI Charles**

Principal Agricultural Scientist  
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Bvumbwe Agricultural  
Research Station  
P O Box 5748, Limbe, Malawi  
Tel. (265) 999 728 882  
Fax. (265) 1 471 323  
Email. [charlesmalidadi@yahoo.com](mailto:charlesmalidadi@yahoo.com)

**MALAYSIA  
MALAISIE  
MALASIA****ABBAS Ishak**

Senior Director Regulatory  
Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority (FAMA)  
Bangunan FAMA Point, Lot 17304  
Jalan Persiaran 1, Bandar Baru Selayang, 68100 Batu Caves,  
Selangor, Malaysia  
Tel. (603) 6126 2020  
Fax. 603 6120 2064  
Email. [ishak@fama.gov.my](mailto:ishak@fama.gov.my)

**JUSOH Alias**

Senior Assistant Director  
Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority (FAMA)  
Bangunan FAMA Point, Lot 17304  
Jalan Persiaran 1, Bandar Baru Selayang, 68100 Batu Caves,  
Selangor, Malaysia  
Tel. (603) 6126 2020  
Fax. 603 6120 2064  
Email. [aliasj@fama.gov.my](mailto:aliasj@fama.gov.my)

**MOROCCO  
MAROC  
MARRUECOS****LAAOUANE Lahbib**

Delegué principal  
Etablissement Autonome de Controle et de Coordination des  
Exportations  
E.A.C.C.E Tassila  
Agadir, Maroc  
Tel. (212) 528834 496  
Fax. (212) 52 8338914  
Email. [laaouanelahbib@gmail.com](mailto:laaouanelahbib@gmail.com)

**MEXICO**  
**MEXIQUE**  
**MÉXICO**

**JIMÉNEZ Rodríguez Gabriela Alejandra**

Subdirectora de Normas  
 Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura  
 Subsecretaría de Agricultura  
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación  
 Municipio Libre 377 Piso 2 Ala B, Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac,  
 Delegación Benito Juárez  
 CP. 03100, Ciudad De México, D.F.  
 Tel. 38 71 10 00 ext. 34056  
 Email. [gjimenez.dgvd@sagarpa.gob.mx](mailto:gjimenez.dgvd@sagarpa.gob.mx)

**ÁLVAREZ Jiménez María Elena**

Jefa de Departamento  
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación  
 Municipio Libre 377 Piso 2 Ala B, Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac,  
 Delegación Benito Juárez, CP 3100  
 Ciudad De México, D.F.  
 Tel. 38 71 10 00 Ext. 34057  
 Email. [malvarez.sa@sagarpa.gob.mx](mailto:malvarez.sa@sagarpa.gob.mx)

**VAZQUEZ Morales Mateo**

Asesor de la Delegación de México  
 Miembro Vitalicio del Subcomité de Frutas y Hortalizas Frescas del CMCAC  
 José Antonio Torres 804 Depto. 8, Col. Viaducto Piedad,  
 Delegación Iztacalco  
 Ciudad De México, D.F.  
 Tel. 52 55 47 53 60 29  
 Email. [mateo36@livecom.mx](mailto:mateo36@livecom.mx)

**LÓPEZ Orduña José Armando**

Director General  
 Asociación De Productores Y Empacadores Exportadores De Aguacate De Michoacán, A.C.  
 Av. Tlaxcala No. 1675, Col. Los Ángeles  
 Uruapan, Michoacán, México  
 Tel. (452) 50 3 30 00 ext. 06  
 Fax. 452 52 8 96 00  
 Email. [direccion@apeamac.com](mailto:direccion@apeamac.com)

**RAMÍREZ Meraz Moisés**

Investigador  
 INIFAP-México  
 Carr. Tampico-Mante Km 55  
 Cuauhtémoc, Tampico, CP 89610  
 México  
 Tel. (836) 2760168  
 Fax. (836) 2760023  
 Email. [ramirez.moises@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:ramirez.moises@inifap.gob.mx)

**OCHOA Ascencio Salvador**

Profesor Investigador Titular  
 Facultad De Agrobiología  
 Universidad Michoacana De San Nicolás de Hidalgo  
 Paseo Lázaro Cárdenas Esquina Berlín, 60090  
 Uruapan, Michoacán, México  
 Tel. 452 52 46 520  
 Email. [sochoa@umich.mx](mailto:sochoa@umich.mx)

**ESTRADA Navarrete Leticia**

Sistema de Gestión de Calidad para Aguacate  
 Unidad de Verificación  
 5 de Febrero N° 68 Int. 9  
 Uruapan, Michoacán, México  
 Tel. (452) 527 2370 / (452) 527 2371  
 Fax. 452 527 2370 ext.106  
 Email. [enleticia@hotmail.com](mailto:enleticia@hotmail.com)

**CORIA Avalos Víctor Manuel**

Doctor en Ciencias  
 Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias  
 Av. Latinoamericana No. 1101  
 Uruapan, Michoacán  
 México  
 Tel. 452 523 7392  
 Email. [coria.victormanuel@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:coria.victormanuel@inifap.gob.mx)

**OSUNA García Jorge Alberto**

Investigador en Post cosecha e Inocuidad de Frutales  
 INIFAP-C.E. Santiago Ixcuintla  
 Km. 6 entronque Carretera Internacional a Santiago Ixcuintla  
 Santiago Ixcuintla, Nayarit, México  
 Tel. (323) 235 2031 Ext. 131  
 Fax. (323) 235 0710  
 Email. [osuna.jorgealberto@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:osuna.jorgealberto@inifap.gob.mx)

**TAPIA Vargas Luis Mario**

Doctor en Ciencias  
 INIFAP  
 Av. Latinoamericana 1101  
 Uruapan, Michoacán, México  
 Tel. (452) 126 1643  
 Fax. 452-524 9434  
 Email. [tapia.luismario@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:tapia.luismario@inifap.gob.mx)

**PÉREZ Domínguez Juan Francisco**

Profesor Investigador  
 INIFAP  
 Kilómetro 8 Carretera Tepatitlán  
 Lagos de Moreno, Col. Rancho las Cruces, Tepatitlán de Morelos,  
 Jalisco  
 México  
 Tel. (378) 78 20 355  
 Email. [perez.juanfrancisco@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:perez.juanfrancisco@inifap.gob.mx)

**OROZCO-SANTOS Mario**

Doctor  
 INIFAP  
 Km. 35 carretera Colima-Manzanillo  
 Tecomán, Colima  
 México  
 Tel. (313) 324 0133 / 324 3082 ext. 126  
 Fax. (313) 324 0133  
 Email. [Orozco.mario@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:Orozco.mario@inifap.gob.mx)

**MONDRAGÓN Jacobo Candelario**

Investigador  
 INIFAP CIR Centro  
 Km. 5.5 Carretera Celaya – San Miguel Allende  
 GUANAJUATO, México  
 Tel. (01) 461 611 53 23 Ext. 22  
 Email. [jacobo77@hotmail.com](mailto:jacobo77@hotmail.com)  
[mondragon.candelario@inifap.gob.mx](mailto:mondragon.candelario@inifap.gob.mx)

**PAZ Vega Sergio**

Vicepresidente  
 Av. Tlaxcala 1675, Col. Los Ángeles  
 Uruapan, Michoacán, México  
 Tel. (452) 50 3 30 00 Ext. 06  
 Email. [spaz@freshdelmonte.com](mailto:spaz@freshdelmonte.com)

**LÓPEZ Rodríguez Salvador**

Av. Prolongación Zaragoza 3303 Trojes de Oriente 1era Sección  
 Aguascalientes, México  
 Tel. (449)9967593  
 Email. [salvadorlopezagro@hotmail.com](mailto:salvadorlopezagro@hotmail.com)

**AGUIRRE Ramírez Adriana**

Av. Prolongación Zaragoza 3303 Trojes de Oriente 1era Sección  
Aguascalientes, México  
Tel. (449) 996 7593  
Email. [conaproch@prodigy.net.mx](mailto:conaproch@prodigy.net.mx)

**SUÁREZ Brito Pamela**

Gerente de Asuntos Internacionales en Inocuidad Alimentaria  
Dirección Ejecutiva de Operación Internacional Comisión Federal  
para la Protección Contra Riesgos Sanitarios (COFEPRIS),  
Secretaría de Salud  
Av. Monterrey No. 33 Piso 1 Colonia Roma  
México D.F.  
Tel. + (52) 50 80 52 00 ext. 1389  
Fax. + (52) 55 5208 2974  
Email. [psuarez@cofepris.gob.mx](mailto:psuarez@cofepris.gob.mx)

**SÁNCHEZ Delgado Irma Rossana**

Verificador Dictaminador Sanitario  
Dirección Ejecutiva de Operación Internacional  
Comisión Federal para la Protección Contra Riesgos Sanitarios  
(COFEPRIS), Secretaría de Salud  
Av. Monterrey No. 33 Piso 1 Colonia Roma  
México D.F.  
Tel. + (52) 50 80 52 00 ext. 1146  
Fax. + (52) 55 5208 2974  
Email. [irsanchez@cofepris.gob.mx](mailto:irsanchez@cofepris.gob.mx)

**RAMÍREZ Ramírez Alexis**

Maestro en Economía  
Secretaría de Economía  
Insurgentes Sur 1940, Segundo Piso Col. Florida, Delegación  
Álvaro Obregón, CP. 01030  
México, D.F.  
Tel. (55) 52 29 61 00 Ext. 34207  
Email. [alexis.ramirez@economia.gob.mx](mailto:alexis.ramirez@economia.gob.mx)

**PONTES Hernández Daniela**

Maestra en Economía  
Secretaría de Economía  
Insurgentes Sur 1940, Segundo Piso Col. Florida, Delegación  
Álvaro Obregón, CP. 01030  
México, D.F.  
Tel. (55) 52 29 61 00 Ext. 34236  
Email. [daniela.pontes@economia.gob.mx](mailto:daniela.pontes@economia.gob.mx)

**NETHERLANDS****PAYS-BAS****PAÍSES BAJOS****HAMMER Leonora**

Asesor de la Embajada de Países Bajos  
Vasco de Quiroga 3000-7  
México D.F.  
Tel. (55) 52589921 Ext. 205  
Fax. 55 52 58 81 39  
Email. [mex-lnv@minbuza.nl](mailto:mex-lnv@minbuza.nl)

**PANAMA****PANAMÁ****JUÁREZ Maure Buenaventura**

Jefe de Inocuidad de Alimento  
Dirección Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal  
Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario  
Rio Tapia, Tocumen  
Panamá, Panamá  
Tel. (507) 6789-2515  
Fax. (507) 266-0472  
Email. [bjarez@mida.gob.pa](mailto:bjarez@mida.gob.pa)

**PARAGUAY****PINTOS Cortessi Carmen Viviana**

Ing. Agr., Jefe de Departamento de Calidad e Inocuidad Vegetal  
SENAVE  
Humaita 145 c/ Nuestra Sra. de la Asunción  
Asunción, Paraguay  
Tel. 0981 310 314  
Fax. 021 441 549  
Email. [vivi-pintos@hotmail.com](mailto:vivi-pintos@hotmail.com)

**PHILIPPINES****FILIPINAS****GUIANG Edna**

CHAIRPERSON, Sub-Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables-  
NCO  
Bureau of Plant Industry  
692 San Andres St., Malate, Manila, Philippines  
Tel. (632) 5240779  
Fax. (632) 5217650  
Email. [edna.guiang@yahoo.com](mailto:edna.guiang@yahoo.com)

**DE LA CRUZ Israel**

Senior Science Research Specialist  
Bureau of Agriculture & Fisheries Product Standards  
BPI Compound, Visayas Avenue  
Diliman, quezon City  
Philippines  
Tel. (+63 2) 455 2858  
Fax. +63 2 455 2858  
Email. [Israel.delacruz@phikappaphi.up.edu.ph](mailto:Israel.delacruz@phikappaphi.up.edu.ph)

**SENEGAL****SÉNÉGAL****HANNE Alhousseynou Moctar**

Chef de Bureau Quarantine des Plantes et Point Focal  
SPS/Senegal  
Ministère de l'Agriculture et Equipement Rural Direction de la  
Protection des Végétaux  
Tel. (221) 776 4075 17  
Fax. (221) 33 8 34 28 54  
Email. [almhanne@yahoo.fr](mailto:almhanne@yahoo.fr)

**SLOVAKIA****SLOVAQUIE****ESLOVAQUIA****DŽANIBEKOVÁ Jana**

Counsellor / Embassy of the Slovak Republic in Mexico  
Julio Verne 35  
11 560 México  
Tel. 0052-55-5280 6669  
Fax. 0052-55-5280 6294  
Email. [emb.mexico@mzv.sk](mailto:emb.mexico@mzv.sk)

**SOUTH AFRICA****AFRIQUE DU SUD****SUDÁFRICA****MOSOME Mooketsi Lucas**

Chief  
Food Safety and Quality Assurance Officer  
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
Private Bag X343  
Pretoria, South Africa  
Tel. +2712 319 7334  
Fax. +2712 319 6055/ 6265  
Email. [MooketsiMo@daff.gov.za](mailto:MooketsiMo@daff.gov.za)



**BOITSHOKO Ntshabele**

Director  
 Food Safety and Quality Assurance  
 Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
 Private Bag X343  
 Pretoria, South Africa  
 Tel. +2712 319 7304  
 Fax. +2712 319 67 64  
 Email. [BoitshokoN@daff.gov.za](mailto:BoitshokoN@daff.gov.za)

**SPAIN****ESPAGNE****ESPAÑA****CAMPS Almiñana Jaime**

Jefe de Área / Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad  
 Paseo de la castellana, 162. Planta 6ª  
 28046 Madrid  
 España  
 Email. [jcampes@comercio.mineco.es](mailto:jcampes@comercio.mineco.es)

**CALDERÓN Moreno Manuel María**

Consejero de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente –  
 Embajada de España en México  
 Hegel 713- Col. Bosque de Chapultepec  
 México D.F.  
 México  
 Email. [coagrimex@prodigy.net.mx](mailto:coagrimex@prodigy.net.mx)

**GUNTIÑAS Rubio Helena**

Jefe de Servicio Técnico  
 Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente  
 C/ Alfonso XII 62- 3er planta  
 Madrid España  
 Tel. (34) 913 476602  
 Fax. (34) 91 34 76 620  
 Email. [hguntinas@magrama.es](mailto:hguntinas@magrama.es)

**SWITZERLAND****SUISSE****SUIZA****BOSS Manuel**

Collaborateur Scientifique  
 Office fédéral de l'agriculture OFAG, Marchés et Affaires  
 Internationales, Produits végétaux  
 Mattenhofstrasse 5  
 CH-3003 Berne  
 Suisse  
 Tel. +41 31 322 25 26  
 Fax. +41 31 322 26 34  
 Email. [manuel.boss@blw.admin.ch](mailto:manuel.boss@blw.admin.ch)

**THAILAND****THAÏLANDE****TAILANDIA****KOSIYACHINDA Suraphong**

Chairman of Subcommittee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables  
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards  
 50 Paholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak  
 Bangkok THAILAND  
 Tel. (662) 561-2277 Ext. 1413  
 Fax. (662) 561-3373

**PHONKLIANG Korwadee**

Standards Officer  
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards  
 50 Paholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak  
 Bangkok THAILAND  
 Tel. (662) 561-2277 Ext. 1413  
 Fax. (662) 561-3373  
 Email. [korwadeep@hotmail.com](mailto:korwadeep@hotmail.com)

**JATUPORN PONG Chutiwan**

Standards Officer  
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards  
 50 Paholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak  
 Bangkok, Thailandia  
 Tel. (662) 561-2277 Ext. 1414  
 Fax. (662) 561-3373  
 Email. [chutiwan@acfs.go.th](mailto:chutiwan@acfs.go.th)

**CHANBUEY Kulpipith**

Standards Officer  
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards  
 50 Paholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak  
 Bangkok THAILANDIA  
 Tel. (662) 561-2277 Ext. 1415  
 Fax. (662) 561-3373  
 Email. [jaae1199@yahoo.com](mailto:jaae1199@yahoo.com)

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

International Standards Coordinator / Office of the Deputy  
 Administrator  
 Stop 0235: 1400 independence ave. SW  
 Washington DC 20205-0235  
 United states of America  
 Tel. (202) 690 4944  
 Fax. (202) 720 0016  
 Email. [dorian.lafond@ams.usda.gov](mailto:dorian.lafond@ams.usda.gov)

**MU Dongmin**

Product Evaluation and Labeling Team  
 Food Labeling and Standards Staff  
 5100 Paint Branch Parkway  
 College Park, MD 20740  
 USA  
 Tel. +1 240 402 1775  
 Fax. + 202 720 3157  
 Email. [Don.Mu@fda.hhs.gov](mailto:Don.Mu@fda.hhs.gov)

**LOWERY Kenneth**

International Issues Analyst / U.S. Codex Office  
 1400 independence Ave SW, room 4861  
 Washington, DC 20250-3700  
 Tel. +1 202 690 4042  
 Fax. +1 202 720 3157  
 Email. [kenneth.lowery@fsis.usda.gov](mailto:kenneth.lowery@fsis.usda.gov)

**YEMEN****YÉMEN****SAEED Nasr**

Specialist  
 Yemen Standardizations Metrology and Quality Control  
 Organization  
 Al –Zubairy st. Sana'a Sana'a  
 Republic of Yemen Sana'a  
 Tel.00967-700171172  
 Email. [codex.yemen@gmail.com](mailto:codex.yemen@gmail.com)

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES  
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES**

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

**MALANITCHEV Serguei**

Chief, Agricultural Standards UNIT / UNECE  
UN Economic Commission of Europe  
Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10  
Switzerland  
Tel. 41 22 91 74 146  
Fax. 41 22 917 06 29  
Email. [serguei.malanitchev@unece.org](mailto:serguei.malanitchev@unece.org)

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

**BRISCO López Gracia Teresa**

Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06 570 52700  
Fax. +39 06 570 54593  
Email. [gracia.brisco@fao.org](mailto:gracia.brisco@fao.org)

**HEILANDT Tom**

Senior Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel. +39 06570 54384  
Fax. +39 06570 54593  
Email. [tom.heilandt@fao.org](mailto:tom.heilandt@fao.org)

**TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT  
SECRETARIAT TECHNIQUE  
SECRETARÍA TÉCNICA**

**Vizueth Chávez Michelle**

Subdirectora para la Atención del Codex Alimentarius y otros  
Organismos  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext. 43218  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex@economia.gob.mx)

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT  
SUPPORT TECHNIQUE  
SOPORTE TÉCNICO**

**Contreras Zubieta Ana Laura**

Jefe de Departamento de Enlace y Logística con Organismos  
Internacionales de Normalización  
Dirección de Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No.6  
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez  
C.P. 53950, Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9100 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [ana.contrerasz@economia.gob.mx](mailto:ana.contrerasz@economia.gob.mx)

**Flores Guerrero Víctor Fabian**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía

Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Garduño Ramírez Lizbeth**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Hernández Serrano Melanie**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Hernández Soto Vanesa**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Montero Herrera Susana Jacqueline**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Romero Ana Luisa**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

**Vázquez Salvador Patricia**

Prestador de Servicio Social  
Dirección De Normalización Internacional  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel. (5255) 5729 9300 Ext.43220  
Fax. 5520 9715  
Email. [codexmex1@economia.gob.mx](mailto:codexmex1@economia.gob.mx)

## APPENDIX II

## DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR AVOCADO

(Revision of CODEX STAN 197-1995)

(At Step 8)

## 1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

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

## 2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

## 2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.1.2 Maturity requirements

The fruit should have a minimum dry matter content<sup>1</sup> at the harvest, according to the variety, to be measured by drying to constant weight:

- 21 % for the variety Hass;
- 20 % for the varieties Torres, Fuerte, Pinkerton, Edranol and Reed.

Other varieties including Antillean/West Indian/Guatemalan may show a lower dry matter content.

## 2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Avocados are classified in three classes defined below:

## 2.2.1 "Extra" Class

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

## 2.2.2 Class I

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

---

<sup>1</sup> This requirement applies to a fruit lot and not to individual fruits.

- slight defects in shape and colouring;
- slight skin defects (corkiness, healed lenticels) and sunburn; the maximum total area should not exceed 4 cm<sup>2</sup>.

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

The stalk, if present, may be slightly damaged.

### 2.2.3 Class II

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

- defects in shape and colouring;
- skin defects (corkiness, healed lenticels) and sunburn; the maximum total area should not exceed 6 cm<sup>2</sup>.

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

The stalk, if present, may be damaged.

### 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Avocados can be sized through one of the following options:

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

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

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

- b) By count: To ensure uniformity in size between produce in the same package when they are sized by count, the weight of the smallest fruit shall be not less than 75% of the weight of the largest fruit in the same package.

#### 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

##### 4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

###### 4.1.1 "Extra" Class

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

###### 4.1.2 Class I

Ten percent by number or weight of avocados not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class. Included therein shall be allowed not more than 1% for avocados affected by decay.

###### 4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of avocados satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exception of avocados affected by decay that should be not more than 2%.

##### 4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

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

#### 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

##### 5.1 UNIFORMITY

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

##### 5.2 PACKAGING

Avocados must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new<sup>2</sup>, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

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

###### 5.2.1 Description of Containers

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

#### 6. MARKING OR LABELLING

##### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

###### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

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

##### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

###### 6.2.1 Identification

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

---

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

<sup>3</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.

### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

### 6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

### 6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size expressed in minimum and maximum weight in grams or by number (by count);
- Net weight (optional).

### 6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

## 7. CONTAMINANTS

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

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

## 8. HYGIENE

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

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

## APPENDIX III

## DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR POMEGRANATE

(At Step 8)

## PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 3: PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING AND SECTION 5.1: UNIFORMITY

(At Step 5/8)

## 1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

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

## 2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

## 2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Pomegranates are classified in three classes as defined below:

## 2.2.1 "Extra" Class

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

## 2.2.2 Class I

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

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

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

## 2.2.3 Class II

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



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

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

### 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Pomegranate may be sized by count, diameter or weight in accordance with existing commercial trading practices. When such is the case, the package must be labeled accordingly.

- A. When sized by count, size is determined by the number of individual fruit per package.
- B. Pomegranate may be sized by diameter (the maximum diameter of the equatorial section of each fruit).

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

Table A Diameter

Size Code		Diameter (mm)
1	A	≥81
2	B	71 – 80
3	C	61 -70
4	D	51 – 60
5	E	40 – 50

- C. Pomegranate may be sized by weight (the individual weight of each fruit).

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

Table B Weight

Size Code		Weight (g)
1	A	≥ 501
2	B	401 - 500
3	C	301 - 400
4	D	201 - 300
5	E	125 - 200

### 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

#### 4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

##### 4.1.1 "Extra" Class

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

##### 4.1.2 Class I

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

##### 4.1.3 Class II

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

#### 4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

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

### 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

#### 5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only pomegranates of the same origin, variety, quality and size (if sized). Sales packages may contain mixtures of varieties of different colors and sizes provided they are uniform in quality and for each variety concerned, its origin.

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

#### 5.2 PACKAGING

Pomegranates must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new<sup>1</sup>, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

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

##### 5.2.1 Description of Containers

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

### 6. MARKING OR LABELLING

#### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

##### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety, class, size (if sized) expressed in accordance with any one of the following methods: count, size code and range, size range.

#### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

##### 6.2.1 Identification

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

##### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

##### 6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

##### 6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (if sized) expressed in accordance with any one of the following methods:
  - Count,
  - Size code and range,
  - Size range.

---

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

<sup>2</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.

- Net weight (optional).

#### 6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

### 7. CONTAMINANTS

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

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

### 8. HYGIENE

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

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

## APPENDIX IV

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR GOLDEN PASSION FRUIT (*Passiflora ligularis* Juss)

(At Step 5)

## 1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of golden passion fruit grown from *Passiflora ligularis* Juss from the Passifloraceae family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer after preparation and packaging. Golden passion fruits for industrial processing are excluded.

## 2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

## 2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

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

2.1.1 The golden passion fruits must have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness<sup>1</sup> in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and to the area in which they are grown.

The development and condition of the golden passion fruits must be such as to enable them:

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

## 2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Golden passion fruits are classified into three classes defined below:

## 2.2.1 "Extra" Class

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

## 2.2.2 Class I

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The maturity of golden passion fruits can be gauged visually from its external colouring and confirmed by examining total soluble solid content, titratable acidity.

### 2.2.3 Class II

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

- defects in shape including an extension in the zone of the stalk;
- defects of the skin such as scratches or rough skin, not exceeding more than 20% of the total surface area of the fruit;
- defects in colouring.

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

## 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

[Golden passion fruit may be sized by diameter, count or weight.] When sized by diameter, size is determined by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section of each fruit, in accordance with the following table:

Size Code	Diameter (mm)
A	≥ 78
B	77 – 67
C	66 – 56

## 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

### 4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

#### 4.1.1 “Extra” Class

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

#### 4.1.2 Class I

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

#### 4.1.3 Class II

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

### 4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

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

## 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

### 5.1 UNIFORMITY

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

### 5.2 PACKAGING

Golden passion fruits must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new<sup>2</sup>, 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.

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

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

### 5.2.1 Description of containers

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

## 6. MARKING OR LABELLING

### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

#### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce, "Golden Passion Fruit (*Passiflora ligularis* Juss)", and may be labelled as to name of the variety.

### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

#### 6.2.1 Identification

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

#### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce, "Golden Passion Fruit (*Passiflora ligularis* Juss)", if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety (optional).

#### 6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

#### 6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (size code);
- Net weight (optional).

#### 6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

## 7. CONTAMINANTS

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

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

## 8. HYGIENE

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

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

---

<sup>3</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.

## APPENDIX V

## PROJECT DOCUMENT: PROPOSAL FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARD FOR FRESH OKRA

**Background**

Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) also known as lady's fingers or gumbo, is a [flowering plant](#) of the [Malvaceae family](#). It is valued for its edible green seed pods. The plant is cultivated in tropical, subtropical and warm temperate regions around the world. Okra is an important vegetable of the tropical countries and popular among consumers in Cameroon, Ghana, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Switzerland, UAE and USA. It is believed to have originated in Africa and is, currently, being grown in most subtropical and tropical regions of the world. India, Pakistan, Iraq etc. are major okra growing countries.

**1. Purpose and the Scope of the Standard**

The scope of the work is to establish a worldwide standard for okra obtained from varieties of *Abelmoschus esculentus* L. Moench of Malvaceae family, which must be supplied fresh to the consumers after proper preparation and packaging. The objective of the standard is to consider the characteristics of okra for fresh consumption within the framework of an international document.

**2. Relevance and timelines**

Due to the growing trend of worldwide okra production and trade, it is necessary to establish a standard covering the safety, quality, hygiene and labeling in order to have a reference that has been internationally agreed by consensus between the main producing and trading countries. More significantly, the present status of okra is not limited to any particular region and hence justifies the elaboration of an international standard commensurate with the okra's true standing as an increasingly valuable worldwide commodity. In addition, the drafting of a Codex Standard for Okra will help to protect consumers' health and to promote fair trade practices in accordance with the different international agreements.

**3. Main aspects to be covered**

The most relevant items which may be considered are related to:

- Establish the minimum requirements of okra, which shall be complied with, independently from the quality class.
- Define the categories to classify okra in accordance with its characteristics.
- Consider the sizing classes to commercialize okra depending on its length.
- Establish the tolerance as regards quality and size that may be permitted in okra contained in a package.
- Include the provisions to be considered relating to the uniformity of the packaged product and the package used.
- Include provisions for the labeling and marking of the product in accordance with the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.
- Include provisions for contaminants with reference to the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods.
- Include provisions for hygiene and handling with reference to the Recommended International Code of Practice for Hygiene - General Principles of Food Hygiene.

**4. Assessment against the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities****General criterion**

Okra comes in different varieties and size. Generally, the size determines the consumption of okra in a recipe. Hence, trading in okra is done according to its quality and size. An international standard for okra to protect the consumers from fraudulent practices and for protection of consumer health will assist in removing obstacles to international trade.

**Criteria applicable to commodities****(a) Volume of production and consumption in individual countries and volume and pattern of trade between countries**

The total production of okra is reported to be 6.48 million MTs during the year 2009. It is grown mainly in India, Nigeria, Sudan, Pakistan, Ghana, Egypt, Benin, Saudi Arabia, Mexico and Cameroon. Largest area and production is in India followed by Nigeria, Sudan and Iraq.

**PRODUCTION OF OKRA**

Qty. (in MTs)

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
Benin	49122	48060	49143
Burkina Faso	27000	22433	17838
Cameroon	40552	41585	40000
Cote d'Ivoire	112537	115913	115000
Egypt	117940	104690	100000
Ghana	108000	89731	71350
Guatemala	6375	6018	6209
India	4070000	4179000	4528000
Iraq	140579	132015	152751
Jordan	-	5550	-
Mexico	35946	35711	28671
Nigeria	1280000	1039000	826170
Oman	-	-	5400
Philippines	27886	29485	29710
Pakistan	103659	114657	116096
Saudi Arabia	55000	52000	56974
Senegal	11835	4700	3200
Sudan	216950	223650	249000
Syrian Arab Republic	15290	20100	13812
Turkey	36992	37543	38432
United States of America	10000	9673	9825
Yemen	20730	21530	22519

Source: As provided by national governments and FAOSTAT.



**Pattern of International Trade in Okra**

Qty. (MTs)

EXPORTING COUNTRY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Egypt	26.00	53.00	110.00	110.00	-	-
Greece	-	-	-	-	0.035	0.180
Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region	-	-	-	2.914	4.132	0.027
India	24317	43513	38098	55311	73161	69963
Japan	-	-	-	1374.76	1352.21	1815.64
Jordan	6.00	14.00	653.00	3.00	11.00	-
Malaysia	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	-	-	-	1987	1875	2100

Source: As provided by national governments.

Qty. (MTs)

IMPORTING COUNTRY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Kuwait	40	9	87	87	-
Malaysia	3	27	10	-	-
Switzerland	150	410	391	401	370
United Arab Emirates	-	5	36	-	-
United States of America	39145	38694	40601	38223	34995

Source: As provided by national governments.

**(b) Diversification of national legislation and apparent resultant or potential impediments to international trade**

As mentioned above, okra is traded according to varieties and size. The size of okra varies largely ranging from baby okra to more than 11 cm long. Currently, US and India have national legislations (quality and grading standards) for okra. ISO and UNECE do not have standard for okra. This new work will provide guidance, which countries will be able to use to develop their own quality and grading standards for okra, and when applied internationally, may assist in providing a harmonized approach.

**(c) International or regional market potential**

The import of okra by most countries is increasing. The trade can be enhanced by developing quality and grading standards for okra.

**(d) Amenability of the commodity to standardization**

The characteristics of okra from its cultivation to harvest, cultivar varieties, composition, quality and packaging all lead to adequate parameters for the standardization of the product.

**(e) Coverage of the main consumer protection and trade issues by existing or proposed general standards**

There is no general commodity standard covering okra. Currently, size is the only criteria taken into the consideration. Therefore, the new work will enhance consumer protection and facilitate okra trade by establishing an internationally agreed quality standard covering minimum requirements, classes, size, color, uniformity, packaging etc.

**(f) Number of commodities, which would need separate standards including whether raw, semi-processed or processed**

A single standard for okra will cover all varieties of okra traded worldwide.

**(g) Work already undertaken by other international organizations in this field and/or suggested by the relevant international intergovernmental body(ies)**

There is no other international organization that has undertaken international standard for okra. Even ISO and UNECE have not undertaken work on okra. Therefore, this new work does not duplicate work undertaken by other international Organizations.

**5. Relevance to the Codex strategic objectives**

The elaboration of a codex standard for okra is in line with the strategic objective to promote the maximum application of codex standards by countries in their national legislation and to facilitate international trade. This proposal is relevant to Activity 1.2 “Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality” of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013. The new work contributes to state the minimum quality requirements for okra for human consumption, different classes based on quality parameters and size with the purpose of protecting the consumer’s health and achieving fair practices in the food trade.

**6. Information on the relation between the proposal and other existing Codex documents**

This is proposed as a new global standard and has no relation to any other existing Codex text on this item, except that the standard will make references to relevant standards and related texts developed by general subject committees. In fact, there is no comparable standard for okra framed by any global body including ISO and UNECE.

The proposal for the elaboration of a Codex Standard for okra is part of the Terms of Reference of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. This new work has been recommended by the CCFFV at its 16<sup>th</sup> session.

**7. Identification of any requirement for and availability of expert scientific advice**

There is no need foreseen for expert scientific advice.

**8. Identification of any need for technical input to the standard from external bodies**

There is no need of technical input from external bodies.

**9. Proposed timeline for completion of the new work**

DATE	PROCEDURES
September, 2012 CCFFV	India: Presentation of the proposal CCFFV: Agreement to start new work on a proposed draft Codex Standard for Okra.
June/July, 2013 CCEXEC/CAC	CCEXEC: Critical Review Process: Recommendation to start new work on a proposed draft Standard for Okra CAC: Approval of New work. Circulation of draft standard for comments at Step 3.
May, 2014	CCFFV: Consideration of the proposed draft Standard at Step 4.
June/July, 2014 CCEXEC/CAC	CCEXEC: Critical Review Process: Recommendation for adoption at Step 5. CAC; Adoption at Step 5. Circulation for comments at Step 6. <u>Effort will be made for adoption of the standard at Step 5/8 in June/July, 2014 depending upon relevant inputs from members.</u>
September, 2015 CCFFV	CCFFV – Consideration of the draft Standard at Step 7.
June/July, 2016 CCEXEC/CAC	CCEXEC – Critical Review Process: Recommendation for adoption at Step 8. CAC – Adoption at Step 8 (Codex Standard for Okra)

## APPENDIX VI

## PROJECT DOCUMENT: PROPOSAL FOR NEW WORK ON CODEX STANDARD FOR FRESH WARE POTATO

**Background**

The Ware potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) is a [starchy, tuberous crop](#) from the [Solanaceae](#) family. Ware potato is a native of the Andes region in South America and said to have been introduced in Europe in the 16th century. Ware potato is a short duration crop capable of producing high yield per unit area per unit time. They bear white, pink, red, blue, or purple flowers with yellow [stamens](#). In general, the tubers of varieties with white flowers have white skins, while those of varieties with colored flowers tend to have pinkish skins. The major species grown worldwide is *Solanum tuberosum* commonly known as potato.

**1. The purpose and the scope of the Standard**

The purpose of this work is to establish a world-wide standard with the aim of protecting the consumer's health and facilitating international trade.

The Scope of the standard is ware potato obtained from commercial varieties of *Solanum tuberosum*, which must be supplied fresh to the consumers after preparation and packaging. Ware Potatoes for industrial processing are excluded.

**2. Relevance and timeliness**

Ware potato is grown in many areas of the world. It is globally traded and is not limited to any particular region and hence justifies the elaboration of an international standard. Therefore, it is necessary to establish standards covering the safety, quality, hygiene and labeling in order to have a reference that has been internationally agreed by consensus between the main trading countries.

**3. Main aspects to be covered**

The most relevant items which may be considered are related to:

- Establish the minimum requirements of ware potato, which shall be complied with, independently from the quality class.
- Define the categories to classify ware potato in accordance with its characteristics.
- Consider the sizing classes to commercialize ware potato depending on its size.
- Establish the tolerance limits as regards quality and size that may be permitted in ware potato contained in a package.
- Include the provisions to be considered relating to the uniformity of the packaged product and the package used.
- Include provisions for the labeling and marking of the product in accordance with the General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods.
- Include provisions for contaminants with reference to the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods.
- Include provisions for hygiene and handling with reference to the Recommended International Code of Practice for Hygiene - General Principles of Food Hygiene.

**4. Assessment against the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities****General criterion**

The elaboration of the standard for ware potato would be beneficial for developing countries in particular, because developing countries are the major producers, exporters and consumers of ware potato. It is necessary that the quality of produce meets consumer needs and minimum requirements of food safety.

**Criteria applicable to commodities****(a) Volume of production and consumption in individual countries and volume and pattern of trade between countries**

According to FAO data, the production and trade at a world-wide level has been variable. For 2010, China was the country with the largest cultivated area and production (74.8 million MT), followed by India, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United States of America, Germany and Poland. The production and trade data for last three years is in Annex I and II respectively. It may be seen from the data that ware potato is produced and traded across the world.

**(b) Diversification of national legislation and apparent resultant or potential impediments to international trade:**

International Standard Organization (ISO) 2165:1974 has developed a basic general guideline standard for storage of ware potato. Work has also been undertaken by other international organizations, such as UNECE. Therefore, these aspects can be taken into consideration while developing Codex standard for ware potato.

Due to lack of international standard for ware potato, international trade has been widely affected. Importers prefer to import vegetables based on a Codex standard. Therefore, the new work would provide internationally recognized specific standards in order to enhance international trade and to accommodate the importer's requirements.

**(c) International or regional market potential**

The import of ware potato by most countries is increasing. Ware potato comes in different varieties, sizes and colour. Generally, size is the only criteria taken into consideration. Therefore, development of quality/grading standards for ware potato will help to enhance trade.

**(d) Amenability of commodity to standardization**

The characteristics of ware potato, from its cultivation to harvest, cultivar varieties, composition, quality and packaging all lead to adequate parameters for the standardization of the product.

**(e) Coverage of the main consumer protection and trade issues by existing or proposed general standards**

There is no general commodity standard covering ware potato. The proposed standard will address issues relating to minimum requirements, classes, size, colour, uniformity, packaging etc.

**(f) Number of commodities which would need separate standards including whether raw, semi-processed or processed**

A single standard for ware potato will cover all varieties of ware potato traded worldwide.

**(g) Work already undertaken by other international organizations in this field and/or suggested by the relevant international intergovernmental body(ies)**

There is no other international organization that has undertaken international standard for ware potato. However, the national standards have been developed by Philippines and India. The existing international standards which may be considered while developing standard for ware potatoes are:

- a. UNECE Standard concerning the marketing and commercial quality control of early and ware potatoes, 2011(FFV-52: Early and Ware Potatoes-2011).
- b. OECD International Standards for fresh Fruits and Vegetables: Early and Ware Potatoes.
- c. ISO 2165:1974 ware potatoes-Guide to storage.

**5. Relevance to the Codex strategic objectives**

The elaboration of a codex standard for ware potato is in line with the strategic objective to promote the maximum application of codex standards by countries in their national legislation and to facilitate international trade. This proposal is relevant to Activity 1.2 "Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality" of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013. The proposal is based on scientific considerations and contributes to state the minimum quality requirements for fresh ware potato for human consumption, with the purpose of protecting the consumer's health and achieving fair practices in the food trade.

**6. Information on the relation between the proposal and other existing Codex documents**

The proposal for elaboration of a Codex Standard for ware potato is part of the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

**7. Identification of any requirement for and availability of expert scientific advice**

There is no need foreseen for expert scientific advice.

**8. Identification of any need for technical input to the standard from external bodies**

The existing UNECE and ISO standards would be considered while developing the standard for ware potatoes.

**9. Proposed timeline for completion of the new work**

DATE	PROCEDURES
Sep, 2012 CCFFV	India-Presentation of the proposal CCFFV- Agreement to start new work on a proposed draft Codex Standard for ware potato
June/July 2013 CCEXEC/CAC	CCEXEC- Critical Review Process: Recommendation to start new work on a proposed draft Standard for ware potato CAC- Approval of New work. Circulation of draft standard for comments at Step 3
May, 2014	CCFFV – Consideration of the proposed draft Standard at Step 4.

DATE	PROCEDURES
<b>June/July 2014</b> <b>CCEXEC/CAC</b>	<b>CCEXEC</b> –Critical Review Process: Recommendation for adoption at Step 5. <b>CAC</b> – Adoption at Step 5. Circulation for comments at Step 6. <u>Effort will be made for adoption of the standard at Step 5/8 in June/July 2014 depending upon relevant inputs from members.</u>
<b>September, 2015</b> <b>CCFFV</b>	<b>CCFFV</b> – Consideration of the draft Standard at Step 7.
<b>June/July 2016</b> <b>CCEXEC/CAC</b>	<b>CCEXEC</b> – Critical Review Process: Recommendation for adoption at Step 8. <b>CAC</b> – Adoption at Step 8 (Codex Standard for ware potato )

## APPENDIX VII

## PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

In the text the following conventions are used:

{text}: For text which explains the use of the Standard Layout. This text does not appear in the standards.

<text>: For optional texts or text for which several alternatives exist, depending on the products.

**Codex Standard for{name of produce }**

**CODEX STAN {number of the Standard} {year of the first adoption}**

**INTRODUCTION**

- This Layout is for use by the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables;
- The Layout is intended to guide the Committee in developing standards to encourage a consistent format, consistent terminology, and where appropriate, consistent provisions;
- [When drafting standards, the Committee should consult this format, as well as UN/ECE standards according to the Committee's Terms of Reference;]
- The Committee may omit or add text from the Layout as appropriate for the produce concerned for Codex purposes.

**SCOPE**

[The purpose of the standard is to define the quality and safety requirements for {name of produce} after preparation and packaging.]

**1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

This Standard applies to {name of produce} [of varieties (cultivars)] grown from {Latin botanical reference *in italics* followed where necessary by the author's name} to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. [{Name of produce} for industrial processing is/are excluded.]

{According to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature the name of taxon whose rank is lower than species (e.g. variety, subspecies, form) should be followed only by the name of author of the lowest rank. Example: *Apium graveolens* L. but *Apium graveolens* var. *dulce* (Mill.) Pers. (without letter L. after *Apium graveolens*.)}

{Additional provisions concerning the definition of the produce may be included under this heading}

**2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY**

[If the Standard applied at stages following packaging, products may show in relation to the requirements of the standard:

- a slight lack of freshness and turgidity;

- <for products graded in classes other than the "Extra" Class,> 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.]

**2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the {name of produce} must be:

- whole/intact {depending on the nature of the produce, a deviation from the provision or additional provisions are allowed};
- sound; produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter {with regard to traces of soil, a deviation from this provision is allowed, depending on the nature of the produce};

- [practically free from pests;

- <free of damage caused by pests affecting the flesh \*>;

- <practically free of damage caused by pests \*\*>.]

{The two options on pest damages may be applied as follows:

\* This provisions is appropriate for produce having a skin that protects the flesh properly such as apples, plums, citrus fruit, etc. In this case, the damages caused by pests affecting the skin only, would be covered by the provisions on skin defects in the section on classification.

\*\* This provisions is appropriate for produce having thin skin allowing pests to affect the flesh easily such as berries, leafy vegetables, etc.}

- free of abnormal external moisture excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- [free of any foreign smell and/or taste<sup>1</sup>.]

{Additional provisions may be made for specific standards, depending on the nature of the produce.}

2.1.1 The {name of produce} must have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the variety <and/or commercial type>, the time of <harvesting/picking/etc.>, and to the area in which they are grown.

<The produce must be sufficiently developed, and display satisfactory ripeness, depending on the nature of the produce.>

The development and condition of the {name of produce} must be such as to enable them:

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

**2.1.2 / 2.2 MATURITY REQUIREMENTS**

{To be drawn up, depending on the produce.}

**2.2 CLASSIFICATION**

{Name of produce} are classified in two or three classes, as defined below:

{For those standards where it does not appear necessary to establish a classification, only the minimum requirements apply.}

**2.2.1 "Extra" Class**

{Name of produce} in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic 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.

<They must be:

.....  
.....  
.....>

{Provisions, depending on the nature of the produce.}

**2.2.2 Class I**

{Name of produce} in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety <and/or commercial type>.

<They must be:

.....  
.....  
.....>

{Provisions, depending on the nature of the produce.}

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;
- slight defects in colouring;
- slight skin defects.

.....  
.....  
.....

{Add additional defects allowed, depending on the nature of the produce.}

<The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/pulp/etc.] of the [fruit; produce, etc.].>

<sup>1</sup> [<sup>1</sup>This provision allows for smell caused by conservation agents used in compliance with relevant Codex texts.> ]

**2.2.3 Class II**

This class includes {name of produce} that do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above.

<They must be:

.....  
 .....  
 .....

{Provisions, depending on the nature of the produce.}

The following defects may be allowed, provided the {name of produce} retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

- defects in shape;
- defects in colouring;
- skin defects.

.....  
 .....  
 .....

{Add additional defects allowed, depending on the nature of the produce.}

<The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/pulp/etc.] of the [fruit; produce, etc.].>

**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING**

{Provisions, depending on the nature of the produce.}

Size is determined by {diameter, length, weight, circumference, depending on the nature of produce} <in accordance with the following table:

Size Code {letter, numbers, etc. depending on the trading practices}	{diameter, length, weight, etc.} {depending on the nature of produce}>

The minimum size shall be ....

<To ensure uniformity in size, the range in size between produce in the same package<sup>2</sup> shall not exceed ....>

<There is no sizing requirement for {name of produce, variety, commercial type or class depending on the nature of produce}.>

{Add provisions on minimum and maximum sizes and size range, depending on the nature of produce, the variety, the commercial type and possibly the individual classes.}

**4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES**

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

<sup>2</sup> {Definitions: For the purposes of this Standard:

The term “packages” covers “sales packages” and “prepackages”.

Packages are individually packaged part of a lot, including contents. The packaging is conceived so as to facilitate handling and transport of a number of sales packages or of products loose or arranged, in order to prevent damage by physical handling and transport. The package may constitute a sales package. Road, rail, ship and air containers are not considered as packages.

Sales packages are individually packaged part of a lot, including contents. The packaging of sales packages is conceived so as to constitute a sales unit to the final user or consumer at the point of purchase.}

In accordance with the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Foods the following definitions apply for:

Container: means any packaging of food for delivery as a single item, whether by completely or partially enclosing the food and includes wrappers. A container may enclose several units or types of packages when such is offered to the consumer.

Lot: means a definitive quantity of a commodity produced essentially under the same conditions.

Prepackaged: means packaged or made up in advance in a container, ready for offer to the consumer, or for catering purposes.



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.

**4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES**

**4.1.1 "Extra" Class**

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

A total tolerance of 5%, by number or weight, of {name of produce} not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class I is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 0.5% in total may consist of produce satisfying the requirements of Class II quality.

{Add possible tolerances for individual defects, depending on the nature of the produce.}

**4.1.2 Class I**

Ten percent, by number or weight, of {name of produce} not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

A total tolerance of 10%, by number or weight, of {name of produce} not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class II is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 1% in total may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class II quality nor the minimum requirements, or of produce affected by decay.

{Add possible tolerances for individual defects, depending on the nature of the produce.}

**4.1.3 Class II**

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

A total tolerance of 10%, by number or weight, of {name of produce} satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 2% in total may consist of produce affected by decay.

{Add possible tolerances for individual defects, depending on the nature of the produce.}

**4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES**

For all classes: 10% by number or weight of {name of produce} corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

For all classes {for individual standards, however, different provisions according to the individual classes may be laid down}: a total tolerance of 10%, by number or weight, of {name of produce} not satisfying the requirements as regards sizing is allowed.

{Possible provisions concerning admissible limits of deviations for sized or unsized produce}.

**5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION**

**5.1 UNIFORMITY**

The contents of each package <(or lot for produce presented in bulk in the transport vehicle)> must be uniform and contain only {name of produce} of the same origin, quality and size <(if sized)>.

{In addition, for individual standards, uniformity concerning variety and/or commercial type may be laid down, depending on the nature of the produce.}

{Other possible provisions, depending on the nature of the produce.}

.....  
.....  
.....

<However, a mixture of {name of produce} of distinctly different <species> <varieties> <commercial types> <colours> may be packed together in a <package> <sales package>, provided they are uniform in quality and, for each <species> <variety> <commercial type> <colour> concerned, in origin.>

{If specific requirements, including net weight limits of sales packages, are needed, they can be added within the context of individual standards.}

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

**5.2 PACKAGING**

{Name of produce} must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly.

The materials used inside the package must be new<sup>3</sup>, 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.>

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

### 5.2.1 Description of Containers

The container shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the {name of produce}.

Packages <(or lots for produce presented in bulk in the transport vehicle)> must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

### 5.3 PRESENTATION

The {name of produce} may be presented under one of the following forms:

.....  
.....

{Specific provisions relating to the presentation of the produce may be included at this point.}

## 6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING

### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

#### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package <(or lot for produce presented in bulk in the transport vehicle)> shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety <and/or commercial type>.

### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package<sup>4</sup> 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 {name of produce} 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.>

#### 6.2.1 Identification

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

Packer and/or dispatcher/shipper:

Name and physical address (e.g. street/city/region/postal code and, if different from the country of origin, the country) or a code mark officially recognized by the national authority<sup>6</sup>.

#### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

- Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside.
- <-name of the variety>

<The name of the variety can be replaced by a synonym. A trade name<sup>7</sup> can only be given in addition to the variety or the synonym>

- <-name of the variety [and/or commercial type] (optional)>

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

<sup>4</sup> These marking provisions do not apply to sales packages presented in packages.

<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, and the code mark should be preceded by the ISO 3166 (alpha) country/area code of the recognizing country, if not the country of origin.

<sup>6</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, and the code mark should be preceded by the ISO 3166 (alpha) country/area code of the recognizing country, if not the country of origin.

<sup>7</sup> A trade name can be a trade mark for which protection has been sought or obtained or any other commercial denomination.

- <name of the variety. In the case of a mixture of {name of produce} of distinctly different varieties <species>, names of the different varieties <species>.>
- <"Mixture of {name of produce}", or equivalent denomination, in the case of a mixture of distinctly different commercial types and/or colours of {name of produce}. If the produce is not visible from the outside, the commercial types and/or colours and the quantity of each in the package must be indicated.>

{Add name of the commercial type, depending on the nature of the produce}.

### 6.2.3 Origin of produce

- Country of origin<sup>8</sup> and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.
- <In the case of a mixture of distinctly different varieties <species> of {name of produce} of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the variety <species> concerned.>
- <In the case of a mixture of distinctly different commercial types and/or colours of {name of produce} of different origins, the indication of each country of origin shall appear next to the name of the commercial type and/or colour concerned.>

### 6.2.4 Commercial specifications

- Class
- Size <(if sized)>

{Add other possible particulars, depending on the nature of the produce}.

### 6.2.5 Official control mark (optional)

## 7. FOOD ADDITIVES

### Untreated fresh fruits and vegetables

This Standard applies to fresh fruits and vegetables as identified in Food Categories 04.1.1.1 Untreated fresh fruits and 04.2.1.1 Untreated fresh vegetables (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes (including soybeans), and aloe vera), seaweeds, and nuts and seeds and therefore, no food additives are allowed in accordance with the provisions of the General Standard for Food Additives (CODEX STAN 192-1995) for these categories.

### Treated fresh fruits and vegetables

Food additives listed in Tables 1 and 2 of the General Standard for Food Additives (CODEX STAN 192-1995) in Food Categories 04.1.1.2 (Surface-treated fresh fruit) and 04.2.1.2 (Surface-treated fresh vegetables, (including mushrooms and fungi, roots and tubers, pulses and legumes, and aloe vera), seaweeds, and nuts and seeds) may be used in foods subject to this Standard.

or

INS No.	Name of the Food Additive	Maximum Level
###	Xxx	Limited by GMP or numerical level ( <i>subject to endorsement by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and inclusion and the General Standard for Food Additives</i> )
###	Xxx	

## 8. CONTAMINANTS

### 8.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

{Name of produce} shall comply with those maximum residue limits established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

### 8.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

{Name of produce} shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

<sup>8</sup> The full or a commonly used name should be indicated.

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

**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 (CAC/GL 21-1997).

**10. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING**  
.....

{Depending on the nature of the produce a list of varieties can be included in the annex.}

**Annex I**

**<Non-Exhaustive><Exhaustive> List of .....Varieties**

Some of the varieties listed in the following may be marketed under names for which trademark protection has been sought or obtained in one or more countries. Names believed by the FAO and WHO to be varietal names are listed in the first column. Other names by which the FAO and WHO believe the variety may be known are listed in the second column. Neither of these two lists are intended to include trademarks. References to known trademarks have been included in the third column for information only. The presence of any trademarks in the third column does not constitute any license or permission to use that trademark – such license must come directly from the trademark owner. In addition, the absence of a trademark in the third column does not constitute any indication that there is no registered/ pending trademark for such a variety. For labelling requirements please refer to section 6 of the standard.<sup>9</sup>

Varieties	Synonyms	Trade marks	{Other information depending on the produce}

<sup>9</sup> **Disclaimer:**

- (1) Some of the varietal names listed in the first column may indicate varieties for which patent protection has been obtained in one or more countries. Such proprietary varieties may only be produced or traded by those authorized by the patent holder to do so under an appropriate license. FAO and WHO take no position as to the validity of any such patent or the rights of any such patent-holder or its licensee regarding the production or trading of any such variety.
- (2) FAO and WHO endeavoured to ensure that no trademark names are listed in columns 1 and 2 of the table. However, it is the responsibility of any trademark owner to notify FAO and WHO promptly if a trademark name has been included in the table and to provide FAO and WHO (see addresses below) with an appropriate varietal, or generic name for the variety as well as adequate evidence ownership of any applicable patent or trademark regarding such variety so that the list can be amended. Provided that no further information is needed from the trademark holder, the Codex Alimentarius Commission will change the list accordingly at the session following receipt of the information. FAO and WHO take no position as to the validity of any such trademarks or the rights of any such trademark owners or their licensees.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome, Italy Telephone: +39 06 5705 1 Fax: +39 06 5705 3152 Telex: 625852/610181 FAO I / Cable address: FOODAGRI ROME Email: <a href="mailto:FAO-HQ@fao.org">FAO-HQ@fao.org</a>	World Health Organization (WHO) Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland Telephone: (+ 41 22) 791 21 11 Facsimile (fax): (+ 41 22) 791 3111 Telex: 415 416 Telegraph: UNISANTE GENEVA
---	--

{In the case of lists of varieties where only very few trademarks appear, the list may be presented as follows (inclusion of references to trade names in footnotes)}

## Annex II

### <Non-Exhaustive><Exhaustive> List of Varieties

Some of the varieties listed in the following may be marketed under names for which trademark protection has been sought or obtained in one or more countries. Names believed by the FAO and WHO to be varietal names are listed in the first column. Other names by which the FAO and WHO believe the variety may be known are listed in the second column. Neither of these two lists are intended to include trademarks. References to known trademarks have been included in footnotes for information only. The absence of a trademark in the footnotes does not constitute any indication that there is no registered/ pending trademark for such a variety.<sup>10</sup>

Varieties	Synonyms	{Other information depending on the produce}
Variety "xyz" <sup>11</sup>		

10

#### Disclaimer:

- (1) Some of the varietal names listed in the first column may indicate varieties for which patent protection has been obtained in one or more countries. Such proprietary varieties may only be produced or traded by those authorized by the patent holder to do so under an appropriate license. FAO and WHO take no position as to the validity of any such patent or the rights of any such patent-holder or its licensee regarding the production or trading of any such variety.
- (2) FAO and WHO endeavoured to ensure that no trademark names are listed in the table. However, it is the responsibility of any trademark owner to notify FAO and WHO promptly if a trademark name has been included in the table and to provide FAO and WHO (see addresses below) with an appropriate varietal, or generic name for the variety as well as adequate evidence ownership of any applicable patent or trademark regarding such variety. Provided that no further information is needed from the trademark holder, the Codex Alimentarius Commission will change the list accordingly at the session following receipt of the information. FAO and WHO take no position as to the validity of any such trademarks or the rights of any such trademark owners or their licensees.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome, Italy Telephone: +39 06 5705 1 Fax: +39 06 5705 3152 Telex: 625852/610181 FAO I / Cable address: FOODAGRI ROME Email: <a href="mailto:FAO-HQ@fao.org">FAO-HQ@fao.org</a>	World Health Organization (WHO) Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland Telephone: (+ 41 22) 791 21 11 Facsimile (fax): (+ 41 22) 791 3111 Telex: 415 416 Telegraph: UNISANTE GENEVA
---	--

<sup>11</sup> The proprietary trademark {include the trade name here followed by the appropriate superscript <sup>TM</sup> or ®} may only be used for the marketing of fruit from this variety with the express authorization of the trademark owner.

## EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE PROPOSED LAYOUT

1. The 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (Mexico, May 2011) noted that that Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables are currently presented in a combination of the UNECE layout and the Format of Codex Commodity Standards. The Committee had *“emphasized that it would continue to adhere to the previous decision of the Commission, where the UNECE format would be respected for quality characteristics elaborated under Codex standards, while the Codex format would be respected for those provisions not dealing exclusively with commercial quality”*<sup>1</sup>
2. The above decision is consistent with the Terms of Reference of the Committee namely: *“(b) To consult with the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards in the elaboration of worldwide standards and codes of practice with particular regard to ensuring that there is no duplication of standards or codes of practice and that they follow the same broad format”*.
3. The 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee agreed that the Codex and UNECE Secretariats would work together on a draft layout taking into account the 2011 revision of the UNECE layout, showing the differences between the standard language used currently in Codex standards and the revised UNECE layout to facilitate the consideration of this matter at its next session.<sup>2</sup>
4. The proposed Codex Layout presented in Annex I has been harmonized with the UNECE Layout to the extent it does not introduce major changes in the standardized provisions currently being applied in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. For those sections where differences between the two layouts are envisaged, and for further consideration by the Committee, the UNECE text is presented in a box. The text from the UNECE layout that has been incorporated into the Codex layout is highlighted in grey. The UNECE layout is available for consultation in working document CX/FFV 12/17/4.
5. It is noted that all UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables have been aligned with the revised UNECE Layout which introduces some differences between Codex and UNECE standards for the corresponding products. How this may impact on trade of relevant products and the convenience to harmonize standardized provisions between Codex and UNECE standards is up to consideration by the Committee.
6. Some explanatory notes are provided below to assist the Committee in the interpretation of the provisions as currently presented in the proposed Codex Layout.

### Introductory Notes

7. The introductory notes provide an explanation of the status of the Codex layout as a guidance document to assist the Committee in the development of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The UNECE Layout does not provide such an explanation however this does not introduce a major deviation as regards the technical common provisions to be taken into account when developing quality standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

### Scope

8. A section on scope was previously considered by the CCFFV in view of the fact that the Format for Codex Commodity Standards<sup>3</sup> differentiates between two sections for the scope and the description of the product. However, this format applies mainly to processed products. The Committee may therefore wish to consider whether this section is necessary when developing standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and whether provisions for scope and description can be combined into a single section i.e. “definition of produce” as currently applied in Codex and UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

### Definition of Produce

9. This section is harmonized with the UNECE layout. The reference to the application of the standard *“after preparation and packaging”* has been incorporated into this section and consistently applies as such in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables while in the UNECE layout this reference appears under the section on provisions concerning quality. However, the different allocation of this provision in Codex and UNECE standards does not introduce a major deviation between the two layouts.

### Provisions concerning quality: *Point of application of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables*

10. The UNECE layout states that UNECE standards apply at the export control stage after preparation and packaging. However, if applied at stages following export, the UNECE layout provides for some degree of flexibility in relation to the requirements of the standard in acknowledgment of the perishable nature of fresh fruits and vegetables.
11. Codex standards, including those for fresh fruits and vegetables, apply at all levels of the production chain i.e. export / import control points and to further distribution/sale. Codex standards applying at all points of the distribution chain are based on the (1947) GATT which required that imported products had “no less favourable treatment” than products of national origin and are consistent with the WTO SPS/TBT Agreements that also refer to *“... sanitary and phytosanitary measures do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate between Members<sup>4</sup> ...”* and that *“... products imported from the territory of any Member shall be accorded treatment no less favourable than that accorded to like products of national origin and to like products originating in any other country<sup>5”</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 93/35, paras. 15 and 19.

<sup>2</sup> REP11/FFV, para. 137.

<sup>3</sup> Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Section II: Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts.

<sup>4</sup> Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Article 2, Basic Rights and Obligations.

<sup>5</sup> Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, Technical Regulations and Standards, Article 2, Preparation, Adoption and Application of Technical Regulations by Central Government Bodies.

12. In order to ensure compatibility between Codex and UNECE standards, the Commission agreed with the recommendation of the Committee on General Principles that there were elements of the standards which would apply equally at export and at import, while there were others which had to take into account a certain deterioration of quality during transport therefore “*governments, when indicating the acceptance of a Codex standard for fresh fruits and vegetables, should notify the Commission which provisions of the standard would be accepted for application at the point of import, and which provisions would be accepted for application at the point of export*”.<sup>6</sup> This provision was consistently applied by the Committee as a footnote to the definition of produce in all Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as the statement that UNECE standard applying to export control stage was not compatible with the nature of Codex standards. Later on the UNECE introduced additional wording to provide for flexibility in the application of the UNECE standards at stages following export which has narrowed the differences between the extent of application of Codex and UNECE standards. In addition general provisions to address perishable nature of (fresh) produce have been included in UNECE standards which are missing in Codex standards. Also the reference to the application “*after preparation and packaging*” in both Codex and UNECE standards provides for further compatibility in this regard.

13. In 2005 the Committee “*agreed to delete the footnote referring to the notification of acceptance to the Codex Alimentarius Commission in view of the abolition of the Codex Acceptance Procedure as it was no longer relevant in the framework of the WTO SPS/TBT Agreements and applied this decision across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables*”<sup>7</sup> and consequential amendments were then introduced in all Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

14. As currently presented, sections 1 and 2 in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables are harmonized with UNECE standards with the exception of the provisions relating to the perishable nature of fresh produce. However some additional provisions may be needed to clarify and balance the point of application of Codex and UNECE standards as several delegations over the years have expressed the need for guidance on how to interpret and apply provisions in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables in particular as regards quality tolerances. In view of the removal of the footnote, and the fact that Codex standards apply at all levels of the distribution chain, there could be some merit in revisiting the provisions of the footnote taking into account the abolition of the Codex Acceptance Procedures as irrelevant in the framework of the WTO Agreement and re-install the footnote (revised) to the definition of the produce. The statement in the UNECE layout related to the perishable nature of fresh fruits and vegetables could also be included in the Codex layout and this will follow the approach taken in the Codex Standard for Apples.

15. In Annex I, the text on point of application and perishable nature of fresh produce is presented as in the UNECE Layout with the exception of the reference to “*export control stage*” for the reasons indicated above. It is noted that the reference to application “*after preparation and packaging*” is part of the definition of produce as oppose to the provisions concerning quality in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and was kept as such in the Codex Layout.

16. However, the two provisions i.e. point of application and perishable nature of fresh produce could be presented as indicated in Annex II which could provide for further harmonization between Codex and UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The Committee may wish to consider the proposal in Annex II and decide on its appropriateness.

## 2.1 Minimum Requirements

17. The Committee may wish to consider whether the term “*intact*” (UNECE standards) as opposed to “*whole*” (Codex standards) better reflects the intent of the provision and align the term with the UNECE layout.

18. The provisions for pest and damage caused by pests in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables currently refer to “*practically free of pests and damage caused by them*”. The corresponding provision in the UNECE layout differentiates between presence of pests and damage caused by pests. In addition provisions for damage caused by pests may be more or less stringent depending on the nature of the produce e.g. *practically free from damage caused by pests* apply to fruits whose skin can be more easily attacked by pests like berries, leafy vegetables, etc. while *free from damage caused by pests* apply to fruits with thicker skin like citrus fruits, melons, etc. The Committee is invited to consider which of the two approaches should be retained in the Codex Layout.

19. The provisions related to presence of abnormal external moisture is complemented with an exception for condensation following removal from cold storage which is missing in the UNECE layout. It is however retained in the Codex layout as the provision as presented in Annex I consistently apply across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and provides for flexibility in the application of the standard.

20. The provision for foreign smell and/or taste includes an additional provision allowing for smell caused by chemicals used especially during post-harvest treatments in accordance with relevant Codex texts e.g. General Standard for Food Additives. This provision is missing in the UNECE layout but is retained in the Codex layout as several Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables carry this footnote in view of the particular treatments they may undergo after harvesting.

---

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 91/35, para. 8, ALINORM 93/35, paras. 19 & 26.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 05/28/35, para. 19.



### Section 2.1.1

21. The first paragraph follows the language used in most of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The corresponding text in the UNECE layout is different in language but similar in purpose. As the language provided for in Annex I cannot strictly be considered a “standardized language” but rather the “common language used in most Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables” it is suggested to leave it as such or to find a simpler formula that can be complemented according to the characteristics of the produce. To this purpose, the UNECE text is provided in the box.

22. The Committee is invited to consider whether to retain the language as presented in Annex I as a guidance text for similar provisions in other standards, to follow the UNECE layout, to develop a combined language using the Codex and UNECE texts or any other recommendation the Committee may come up with.

### Maturity Requirements

23. There is no standardized text for this provision. However maturity requirements are identified in Codex standards either as a minimum requirement (= section 2.1.2) or as a general quality requirement (= section 2.2) this is the reason why the two possible positions are indicated in the title of the section. It may then be advisable to leave possibility dependent on the nature of the produce or eventually align with the UNECE layout which identifies maturity requirements as being part of the quality requirements together with the minimum requirements and the quality classes. The Committee is invited to consider this matter.

### Classification

24. This Section is aligned with the UNECE layout. Some additional text was introduced from the UNECE layout that does not affect the content of the provisions.

25. The sentence by which defects must not in any case affect the flesh / pulp of the fruit / produce is maintained. This does not appear in the UNECE layout but is retained in the Codex layout as it applies to several Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

### Sizing

26. This Section has been aligned with the UNECE layout however the possibility to include a sizing table was retained as most of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables use sizing tables to indicate size code / range as established trade practice for the product in question.

27. It is noted there are no specific provisions for sizing that consistently apply in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The text provided in Annex I is rather a guide on how to build this section taking into account the nature of the produce and trading / industry practices.

### Quality Tolerances

28. The Committee may wish to consider whether tolerances for quality and size should apply to the “lot” as opposed to the “package” as inspection, especially at export / import control stage is carried out on the lot and not on the individual packages.

29. The UNECE layout provides for more clear tolerances for produce not complying with the requirements of the relevant class but falling within the requirements of the subsequent classes. It also provides tolerances for decay in Classes I and II that are not included in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables with the exception of the Codex Standard for Apples.

30. The Committee may wish to consider the opportunity to align the quality tolerances with the UNECE layout and to have a further discussion on the appropriateness to include tolerances for decay vis-à-vis the provisions already available in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables relating to e.g. section 2.1.1 on development and condition for transport, handling and arrival at place of destination, section 6.2 as regards compliance with provisions with the Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables and the possible inclusion of general provisions for point of application and perishable nature of fresh fruits and vegetables under section 2 (see also CL 2012/16-FFV<sup>8</sup> – Request for comments quality tolerances related to the inclusion of allowances for decay and/or internal breakdown and CX/FFV 11/16/10<sup>9</sup> – Background document on point of application of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables including quality tolerances at import/export control points presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee).

31. If the Committee would agree on introducing tolerances for decay and/or internal breakdown, the Committee may wish to consider whether align the language and percentages with the UNECE layout but introducing a note for keeping the percentages flexible depending on the nature of the produce so a threshold tolerance of 0.5% and 1% would be kept in general but these percentages might vary above and/or below depending on the characteristics proper to the produce.

### Sizing Tolerances

32. The Committee may wish to align this provision with the UNECE layout as a more simplified approach. However, the current provisions in the Codex layout do not imply a difference with the corresponding provision in the UNECE layout.

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://ftp.fao.org/codex/Circular\\_Letters/CxCL2012/cl12\\_16e.pdf](http://ftp.fao.org/codex/Circular_Letters/CxCL2012/cl12_16e.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> [http://ftp.fao.org/codex/meetings/ccfv/ccfv16/ff16\\_10e.pdf](http://ftp.fao.org/codex/meetings/ccfv/ccfv16/ff16_10e.pdf)

**Uniformity**

33. Provisions for mixture of species / varieties have been included as this seems to have become a common trade practice for several fresh products.

**Packaging**

34. Provisions for stickers have been included as this is a common trade practice for certain products / regions.

35. The UNECE layout does not have provisions for “new” packages. However this term and the accompanying footnote is retained as this provision applies to all Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and the footnote provides for sufficient flexibility in the application of this provision.

36. Compliance with the Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables is retained as this is integral to the overall quality of the product covered by the standard. Although this provision is not included in the UNECE layout, it does not introduce a deviation but rather complements provisions in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

**Description of Containers**

37. This section is not covered in the UNECE layout but provisions for packaging are identical and are included in the packaging section in the UNECE layout while in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables a sub-section on description of containers has been incorporated to address provisions for packaging (in line with the UNECE layout) and containers. The latter could be considered complementary to the provisions on packaging therefore does not introduce a deviation between Codex and UNECE standards.

**Presentation**

38. This section has been removed from the UNECE layout in order to provide for flexibility in the application of the standards. It was felt that presentation is highly market-driven and changes widely and rapidly according to consumer preferences / trading practices.

39. The Committee may wish to consider the appropriateness to retain this section and if so, whether the language provided is flexible enough to ensure wider application and future innovation.

**Marking or Labelling**

40. This section is aligned with the UNECE layout to the extent possible to acknowledge the provisions of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods. In order to keep the balance between Codex and UNECE provisions for labelling, this section has been divided into two sections namely labelling provisions for (1) retail and (2) non-retail containers / packages.

41. The provisions for retail packages are governed by the provisions of the GSFL while the provisions for non-retail container follows the format and content of the UNECE layout. This introduces a deviation between Codex and UNECE standards that is however unavoidable in order to keep a balance between the Codex and UNECE frameworks as all provisions for labelling in Codex commodity standards follow the general provisions of the GSFL in addition to specific provisions included due to the characteristics proper to the produce.

42. The provisions for labelling of non-retail containers has been updated mainly due to the introduction of provisions for mixture of varieties in the uniformity section and to address the issue of trade marks.

43. The UNECE layout has incorporated definitions for “packages” to assist in the interpretation of the provisions in their standards. These definitions have been included in the Codex layout underlining that they are specific to packages for fresh fruits and vegetables. The GSFL provides a definition for container, lot and pre-packaged (food) that could be included in the Codex layout for the same purpose. The Committee may wish to determine the compatibility of the terms defined in the UNECE Layout and the GSFL and whether the inclusion of such definitions would be useful to facilitate the application of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

44. Based on the above considerations, the Committee is also invited to determine whether footnote 4 is applicable in the context of labelling of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and if so, whether it should apply to packages under section 6.1.1 rather than to section 6.2 or should apply to both sections.

**Food Additives**

45. This section has been included following the recommendation of the Commission that the Codex Format for Commodity Standards should be followed for those provisions not dealing exclusively with quality (e.g. sections on contaminants and hygiene).

46. Provisions for food additives for fresh fruits and vegetables in the General Standard for Food Additives relates mainly to surface-treated fresh fruit (Food Category 04.1.1.2) whereby the surface of certain fresh fruit are coated with glazes or waxes or are treated with other food additives that act as protective coatings to preserve the freshness and quality of the fruit e.g. apples, oranges, dates, etc. The provisions are flexible enough to provide for the use or non-use of food additives depending on the nature of the produce.

47. Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables do not contain provisions for food additives however this may not mean that use of food additives is not allowed vis-à-vis provisions for food additives relevant to fresh fruits and vegetables available in the GSFA. Codex commodity standards that do not allow the use of food additives usually introduce provisions indicating this fact e.g. certain standards for quick frozen fruits and vegetables.

48. The Committee may therefore wish to consider the appropriateness of including provisions related to food additives in the Codex layout as guidance in case such provisions should be used depending on the nature of the produce. The introduction of this section in the Codex layout does not necessarily mean that it should consistently be incorporated in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables but if needed, need guidance is provided in the layout as to how to build this section.

#### **Contaminants / Hygiene**

49. This section is in line with the standardized language provided for in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

#### **Annex on List of Varieties**

50. This annex was included when the Committee considered certain standards that carried list of varieties e.g. table grapes, apples, etc. The Committee however considered that developing and, in particular, maintenance of such lists may be difficult in practice and therefore developed standards in such a way that list of varieties are not necessary to facilitate the interpretation or implementation of the standard. This is also in line with the approach followed in Codex in regard to the development of lists in general.

51. However, the provisions in the Annex, which are in line with those in the UNECE Layout, as some UNECE standards carry lists of varieties, contains legal language that may be advisable to keep in the layout as an example of how to treat list of varieties especially in relation to the use of trademarks although it would not necessarily mean that Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should have a list of varieties.