

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



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

Agenda Item 4(a)

CX/FFV 02/9
April 2002

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

*10th Session,
Mexico City, Mexico, 10-14 June 2002*

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES

Governments and interested international organizations wishing to submit comments on the attached ***Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples*** (AT STEP 3) are invited to do so **no later than 10 May 2002** to Mr. Miguel Aguilar Romo, Director General de Normas, Av. Puente de Tecamachalco 6, segundo piso, Lomas de Tecamachalco Sección Fuentes, C.P. 53950 Naucalpan de Juárez, Estado de México, Tel: (52) (55) (5) 7 29 93 00, Ext. 4144, 4108 Directo: (52) (55) (5) 7299480. Fax: (52) (55) (5) 7299484 E-mail: codexmex@economia.gob.mx, with a copy to the Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Foods Standards Programme, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy (Fax No. 39.06.5705.4593 or E-Mail codex@fao.org).

BACKGROUND

1. The 23rd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission approved the elaboration of a Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples as proposed by the 8th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.¹ In doing so, the Commission recommended that this task should be done in close collaboration with the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE).²
2. The 9th Session of the CCFFV decided to return the Proposed Draft to Step 2 for redrafting by the United States, with the assistance of Chile, India, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and the European Community, for circulation, additional comments and further consideration at its next session. In taking this decision, the Committee reaffirmed the decision of the 43rd Session of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission that *"In regard to cooperation between the UN/ECE and Codex in the elaboration of fresh fruit and vegetable standards, the need for close cooperation in order to avoid duplication of effort was reiterated and the suggestion was made that UN/ECE standards should be used as a starting point for draft Codex standards where appropriate"*.³
3. The Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples is attached to this document as Appendix I. Comments submitted at the 9th session of the CCFFV are indicated under each relevant Section of the text. In addition, the Codex Secretariat has made a comparison between the Proposed Draft and the UN/ECE Standard for Apples in order to facilitate discussion at the next Committee's session (Appendix II).
4. Governments and interested international organizations are invited to comment at Step 3 on the attached ***Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples*** as directed above.

¹ ALINORM 99/35A, paras. 186 & 188.

² ALINORM 99/37, para. 206

³ ALINORM 01/35, paras. 98 & 99

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES
(AT STEP 3)

NEW ZEALAND

General comments

New Zealand notes that an international standard for apples and pears already exists, promulgated by UN/ECE (standard number FFV-01). This standard is used as the point of reference by the major world traders in apples. A revision of the standard was finalised at the fifty-sixth session of the Working Party on Standardisation of Perishable Produce and Quality Development in May 2000. Annexes to this standard are currently being revised. OECD is currently revising its explanatory brochure in line with the revised UN/ECE standard.

With this in mind, we consider that Codex should not develop a standard for apples. The possibility of more than one international standard for the same commodity gives us serious concern at the duplication of effort. Furthermore the likelihood of confusion between standards in the trade would defeat the Codex objective of facilitating trade in food.

If however a Codex standard is developed, it should be a basic standard, avoiding the detailed grade descriptions, and should be fully compatible with the UN/ECE standard. It is essential that the two standards are the same. If there are two standards then the purpose of international standards - to provide a common standard and facilitate international trade - is gone!

This approach will minimise the duplication and confusion between the standards, and will be consistent with the approach that CAC decided should be taken when revising standards or developing new ones. We recall that in 1991 CAC endorsed the general recommendations of the FAO/WHO Conference on Food Standards, Chemicals in Food and Food Trade (ALINORM 91/40, para. 63 and Appendix 4) concerning restructuring of standards to remove excessive detail. Although the Conference recognised the importance of provisions such as those relating to styles, types of pack, sizes, defects, etc. it agreed that the elaboration of such provisions should be limited to very special circumstances, since they might be capable of creating barriers to trade.

Specific comments

There is an overall concern at the inconsistency of wording between the existing UN/ECE standard and the proposed Codex standard, leading to different meaning throughout the document. While many of the wording differences appear subtle, the overall effect is to create two different standards. In effect there is no harmonisation between the two.

The cases documented below are examples of the inconsistencies found throughout the standards. They are not a complete list. Where such differences exist in the standard there will be a greater difference in interpretation and application.

URUGUAY

General Comment:

Uruguay welcomes the opportunity to participate in the elaboration of the draft standard for Apples.

According to the last version in circulation, DX/FFV 00/14, April 2000, we wish to inform that an omission has been produced in the presentation of the standard.

According to what was approved in the 8th Reunion of the Working Party of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables Codex, that took place in Mexico City between March 1st and 5th of 1999, Uruguay was to be responsible for the preparation of the same, with collaboration from Argentina and the United States.

Argentina actively participated in the elaboration of the standard, but does not appear in the document.

THE UNITED KINGDOM

General

The UK is aware of all the discussions surrounding the relationship between the CCFFV and the UN/ECE Working Group of Experts on Fresh Fruit and Vegetables. We would therefore urge CCFFV to use UN/ECE Standards as the starting point for Codex Standards and avoid a situation where there could be confusion in international trade.

APPLES (CX/FFV 00/14)

We note that the UN/ECE standard for apples is being reviewed. We hope that any changes to the UN/ECE Standard will be fed into the development of the Codex Standard.

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties (cultivars) of apples grown from *Malus domestica* Borkh. to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Apples for industrial processing are excluded.¹

GERMANY

*This standard applies to commercial varieties (cultivars) of apples grown from *Malus domestica* Borkh. of the *Rosaceae* family to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Apples for industrial processing are excluded.¹*

remark: in line with other Codex standards

SPAIN***TO SECTION 1. PRODUCT DEFINITION***

It should be specified what portion of the fruit is to be standardized, therefore it is proposed that in the first line the phrase: "This standard applies to the commercial varieties..." be substituted by: "This standard applies to the fruits of the commercial varieties..."

¹ Governments, when indicating the acceptance of the Codex Standard for Apples, 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.

¹ Governments, when indicating the acceptance of the Codex Standard for Apples, 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.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

- whole;
- 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 affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- practically free of damage caused by pests;
- practically free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature during storage;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste.

GERMANY

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards.

~~*practically free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature during storage;*~~

remark: covered by sound; in line with revised UN/ECE standard

NEW ZEALAND

2.1 Minimum Requirements

Codex: practically free of pests affecting the general appearance of the fruit.

UN/ECE: practically free from pests.

Does this mean that pests that don't affect the appearance are acceptable?

THE UNITED KINGDOM

Minimum Requirements

Although the UN/ECE standard appears to have been used as the basis for this standard there are some differences. We believe it is important that a standard layout should be followed so that the same terms can be used in all standards and they can be interpreted as a whole rather than on an individual basis. e.g.

2.1 4th. indent - The addition of the phrase "affecting the general appearance of the produce" after practically free of pests.

THE UNITED STATES

To help with uniform application of these requirements, a definition section in the standards should be developed.

EUROPEAN UNION

Paragraph 2.1: Minimum requirements:

The proposed draft Codex standard for apples sets out, in item 2.1.1., that apples have to have reached an appropriate degree of development and of maturity, in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and the areas in which they are grown.

Apples continue their maturing process after harvest. The important thing is not therefore that apples present an appropriate degree of maturity, but rather that they reached a development stage enabling them to continue their maturing process and then reach the required degree of maturity.

In addition, if it is true that the sought development stage depends on the characteristics of the variety concerned, the European Community is not convinced that this development stage depends, for a given variety, of the region where it is cultivated.

Lastly, it is advisable to limit the scope of the footnote to the Fuji variety, which is, to the knowledge of the European Community, the only variety truly concerned.

2.1.1 The apples must have been carefully picked and have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and to the area in which they are grown.²

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

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

GERMANY

to continue their maturing process and to reach the degree of maturity required in relation to the varietal characteristics²

remark: this special requirement is not reflected by the 1st paragraph of Section 2.1.1; in line with revised UN/ECE standard

remark referring to footnote 2: : allowance should only be given to the Fuji variety, in case this would be necessary for other varieties too, these should be mentioned specifically.

JAMAICA

2.1.1 "criteria proper to the variety...", "proper to" could be replaced by "characteristics of".

THE UNITED STATES

2.1.1 Due to the varietal characteristics of certain varieties such as Fuji concerning maturity at harvest, radial watercore is permitted in some countries provided this is contained within the vascular bundles of each fruit.

EUROPEAN UNION

Paragraph 2.1: Minimum requirements:

The proposed draft Codex standard for apples sets out, in item 2.1.1., that apples have to have reached an appropriate degree of development and of maturity, in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and the areas in which they are grown.

Apples continue their maturing process after harvest. The important thing is not therefore that apples present an appropriate degree of maturity, but rather that they reached a development stage enabling them to continue their maturing process and then reach the required degree of maturity.

In addition, if it is true that the sought development stage depends on the characteristics of the variety concerned, the European Community is not convinced that this development stage depends, for a given variety, of the region where it is cultivated.

Lastly, it is advisable to limit the scope of the footnote to the Fuji variety, which is, to the knowledge of the European Community, the only variety truly concerned.

Accordingly, the European Community proposes writing paragraph 2.1.1. in the following way:

² Due to the varietal characteristics of certain varieties such as Fuji concerning maturity at harvest, radial watercore is permitted provided this is contained within the vascular bundles of each fruit.

² *Due to the varietal characteristics of ~~certain varieties such as the Fuji variety~~ concerning maturity at harvest, radial water-core is permitted provided this is contained within the vascular bundles of each fruit.*

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Apples are classified in three classes defined below:

GERMANY**2.2 Classification**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

EUROPEAN UNION

The fact that apples have to be characteristic of the variety, in particular with regard to colouring, is mentioned several times in paragraphs 2.2.1., 2.2.2. and 2.2.3.

Apples are traditionally classified in categories of colour (red colouring varieties, mixed-red colouring varieties, slightly-red and striped varieties) and, additionally, there is a list of the varieties for which russetting is not a defect (for example, the variety "Reinette du Canada"). These provisions, which appear in the existing international standards for apples like those of the UN/ECE or those of the OECD, take part in the harmonisation at the international level of the concept "characteristic of the variety". They contribute therefore to better transparency of the conditions of international trade.

The European Community wishes therefore a classification grid of the varieties of apples according to their colouring (including criteria concerning russetting) to be added to the proposed draft Codex standard for apples. This classification grid should be referred by means of a footnote whenever the proposed draft Codex standard for apples mentions the aspect "characteristic of the variety" of the apples. This footnote would read as follows:

"3 : The colouring and russetting criteria are given in the Annex 1 of this standard. "

The comments of the European Community regarding Annex 1 (colouring) of the proposed draft Codex standard for apples appear hereunder.

2.2.1 “Extra” Class

Apples in this class must be of superior quality.

Their shape, size and colouring must be characteristic of the variety and the stalk must be intact.

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

GERMANY**2.2.1 “Extra” Class**

Apples in this class must be of superior quality. In shape, size and colouring they must be characteristic of the variety⁴ and the stalk must be intact.

The flesh must be perfectly sound.

They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects ~~of the skin~~, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

remark: in line with revised UN/ECE standard

THE UNITED STATES

2.2.1 Extra Class Superior quality and the other defects listed in Class II are not defined. Further clarification is needed in all these areas.

In addition, the defined defect areas are very restrictive and do not reflect current practices in international trade.

The UNECE has formed a working group to discuss bruising and uniform scoring methods. The United States suggests the Committee work with this group on bruising, as well as other defects for all grade classifications.

EUROPEAN UNION

In paragraph 2.2.1 (Extra Class), the proposed draft Codex standard for apples speaks about "very slight superficial defects of the skin,". In order to avoid a pleonasm, the Community proposes speaking only about "very slight superficial defects,".

⁴ The criteria for colouring and russetting are given in the Annex of this standard.

2.2.2 Class I

Apples in this class must be of good quality.

They must be characteristic of the variety.

The stalk may be missing provided there is no skin damage.

Slight defects in shape, development, colouring and from scarring, however, may be allowed, as is handling and physiogenetic damage, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

Slight skin defects must not extend beyond the following limits:

- 2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape;
- 1 cm² total surface area for other defects, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not have a cumulative area of more than 0.25 cm²;
- slight bruising not exceeding 1 cm² in area and no discolouring.

The stalk may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged.

GERMANY**2.2.2 Class I**

Apples in this class must be of good quality. In shape, size and colouring they must be characteristic of the variety

The flesh must be perfectly sound.

~~The stalk may be missing provided there is no skin damage. The following slight defects in shape, development, colouring and from scarring, however, may be allowed, on individual fruit as is handling and physiogenetic damage, 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
- a slight defect in development
- a slight defect in colouring
- slight skin defects which must not extend over more than:
 - 2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape;
 - 1 cm² of total surface area for other defects, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not extend over more than 0.25 cm² cumulative in area;
 - slight bruising not exceeding 1 cm² in area and not discoloured.

remark: please take note that the 3 last indents are sub-indent to the above "slight skin defects ..."; in line with revised UN/ECE standard

The stalk may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged.

INDIA

Clause 2.2.2 Instead of mentioning the defects in dimensions it would be appropriate to indicate in terms of percentage like "5 per cent of the total surface area for other defects Cumulative are of more than 2 percent.

JAMAICA**2.2.2 Class I - Line 10**

"Slight bruising": not comfortable with this phrase as due to the nature of the fruit, such will lead to physical deterioration and affect the keeping quality of the fruit.

NEW ZEALAND**2.2.2 Class I**

This reads very differently from the UN/ECE standard. Codex allows minor handling damage; UN/ECE does not allow damage.

The term physiogenetic is not commonly used in apple standards and will not be widely understood by apple practitioners.

SPAIN**PARAGRAPH 2.2.2 CLASS I**

The modifications introduced into this class in relationship to the CEPE standard suppose the inclusion in the same of defects admissible in the second class and improper in the first class, in consequence, the following substitution is proposed for this section:

“The apples classified in this class shall be of good quality and shall show the characteristics of the variety. The peduncle can not be missing. The flesh must be free of any damage. However, slight defects in shape, development, coloring and handling damage can be permitted provided they do not affect the general appearance of the produce, its quality, its keeping quality and presentation in the package.

The peduncle may be slightly damaged.

The slight epidermis defects cannot extend beyond the following limits:

- 2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape;
- 1 cm² of the total surface for other defects with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not extend over more than 0.25 cm².

THAILAND

Section 2.2.2 Class I should not allow to have skin defects according to scab (*venturia inaequalis*). As the mold is a kind of pest, so it may cause a problem for apple growers of importing countries, more over this allowance will be against those minimum requirements which specified that the apple must be practically free of pests affecting the general appearance of the produce and practically free of damage caused by pests.

THE UNITED KINGDOM

2.2.2 where the phrase “and from scarring, however, may be allowed, as is handling and physiogenetic damage” has been added to the 2 nd sentence in the first paragraph. This is not required, as the skin defects allowed are clearly defined.

THE UNITED STATES

2.2.2 Class I Good quality and other defects listed are not defined. Further clarification is needed in all these areas.

In addition, the defined defect areas are very restrictive and do not reflect current practices in international trade. The UNECE has formed a working group to discuss bruising and uniform scoring methods. The United States suggests the Committee work with this group on bruising, as well as other defects for all grade classifications.

EUROPEAN UNION

In paragraph 2.2.2. (Class I), the proposed draft Codex standard draws up the list of the slight defects that one can admit in Class I. Among the accepted defects appear defects from scarring, which seem to affect the flesh of the fruit.

The European Community considers however that such defects are acceptable only in Category II, on condition of being very light. These defects from scarring have therefore to be limited in Class I to the defects of the skin, excluding defects affecting the flesh.

It is accordingly useful to specify clearly that the flesh has to be perfectly sound, both in Class I and in Extra Class.

The proposed draft also mentions damages due to handling or of physiogenetic origin as also being allowed. The European Community considers that the origin of the defects does not have to be considered to choose those that one accepts or not in each Class. The Community proposes therefore suppressing any reference at the origin of the defects. The description of their characteristics (form, colour, colouring, skin defects) seems in any case sufficient to cover all the types of acceptable defects in this Class, whatever their origin is.

The proposed draft says that several defects of each type can be accepted in Class I. The European Community considers that in this Class, it is difficult to accept products which present numerous form, development and colouring defects (even if this involves only slight form, development and colouring defects). The question does not arise for skin defects, since the provisions in the second subparagraph of paragraph 2.2.2 limit their size. The European Community proposes therefore limiting the defects of form, of development and of colouring to a slight defect of each type.

Lastly, it is mentioned twice that the stalk can be damaged under certain conditions. The European Community proposes suppressing the third sentence of the first subparagraph and keeping the last subparagraph of this paragraph of the preliminary draft.

These considerations lead the European Community to propose the following drafting for paragraph 2.2.2.:

“Apples in this Class must be of good quality. In shape, size and colouring, they must be characteristic of the variety³.

The flesh must be perfectly sound.

The following slight defects, however, may be allowed on individual fruit, 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,*
 - *a slight defect in development,*
 - *a slight defect in colouring,*
 - *slight skin defects which must not extend over more than :*
 - *2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape,*
 - *1 cm² of total surface area for other defects, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*) which must not extent over more 0.25 cm² cumulative in area,*
 - *slight bruising not exceeding 1 cm² in area and not discoloured.*
- The stalk may be missing provided that the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged. "*

2.2.3 Class II

This class includes apples which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above.

Defects in shape, development, colouring and from scarring may be allowed, as is handling and physiogenetic damage, provided the apples retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation.

Skin defects must not extend beyond the following limits:

- 4 cm in length for defects of elongated shape;
- 2.5 cm² total surface area for other defects, including slight bruising, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not have a cumulative area of more than 1 cm².

GERMANY**2.2.3 Class II**

*This class includes apples which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above.*⁴

The flesh must be free from major defects.

remark: in line with revised UN/ECE standard

~~The following defects are in shape, development, colouring and from scarring may be allowed, as is handling and physiogenetic damage,~~ provided the fruit retain its essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation.

- defects in shape
- defects in development
- defects in colouring
- skin defects which must not extend over more than:
 - 4 cm in length for defects of elongated shape;
 - 2.5 cm² total surface area for other defects, including slightly discoloured bruising, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not extend over more than 1 cm² cumulative in area.

remark: in line with revised UN/ECE standard

INDIA

Clause 2.2.3 10 per cent total surface are for other defects not more than 2 per cent.

SPAIN**PARAGRAPH 2.2.3 CLASS II**

It is proposed to add after the 2nd paragraph, the following:

“The peduncle may be missing provided the cut is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged”

The following expression must be substituted “slight defects of the skin cannot...” with the following “slight defects of the epidermis cannot...” and in the second bullet of this section the expression “of scabies” with “of scab”.

THAILAND

Section 2.2.3 Class II should not allow to have skin defects according to scab (*venturia inaequalis*). As the mold is a kind of pest, so it may cause a problem for apple growers of importing countries, more over this allowance will be against those minimum requirements which specified that the apple must be practically free of pests affecting the general appearance of the produce and practically free of damage caused by pests.

THE UNITED KINGDOM

2.2.3 where the phrase “and from scarring, however, may be allowed, as is handling and physiogenetic damage” has been added to the 2nd sentence in the first paragraph. This is not required, as the skin defects allowed are clearly defined.

THE UNITED STATES

2.2.3 Class II The defects listed in Class II are not defined. Further clarification is needed in all these areas.

In addition, the defined defect areas are very restrictive and do not reflect current practices in international trade. The UNECE has formed a working group to discuss bruising and uniform scoring methods. The United States suggests the Committee work with this group on bruising, as well as other defects for all grade classifications.

EUROPEAN UNION

In paragraph 2.2.3. (Class II), the comments made on paragraph 2.2.2 largely apply, in particular those concerning the origin of the defects and the defects from scarring. With regard to these last defects, the European Community considers that defects affecting pulp can be present in Class II, provided that the latter are limited. The European Community proposes therefore replacing the second and third subparagraphs of paragraph 2.2.3. by the following text:

"The flesh must be free from major defects.

The following defects are allowed provided that fruit retains its essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation :

- defects in shape,*
- defects in development,*
- defects in colouring,*
- skin defects which must not extend over more than:
 - 4 cm in length for defects of elongated shape,*
 - 2.5 cm² total surface area for other defects, including slightly discoloured bruising, with the exception of scab (*Venturia inaequalis*), which must not extend over more than 1 cm² cumulative area.**

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

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

However, when sizing by weight, the minimum weight must be ensured for all fruit, as appropriate, according to the minimum diameters for all categories determined below.

The minimum diameter for all categories is 50 mm.

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

- 5 mm for fruit packed in rows and layers;
- 10 mm for fruit packed in bulk or in pre-packaging.

GERMANY**3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING**

Size is determined by maximum diameter of the equatorial section or by weight. However, when sizing by weight, the minimum weight must be ensured for all fruit, as appropriate, meet the minimum diameter sizes listed below.

~~The minimum diameter for all categories is 50 mm.~~

remark: not in line with revised UN/ECE standard

A minimum size by diameter is required for all classes as follows:

	<u>Extra Class</u>	<u>Class I</u>	<u>Class II</u>
<u>Large-fruited varieties⁵</u>	<u>65 mm</u>	<u>60 mm</u>	<u>60 mm</u>
<u>Other varieties</u>	<u>60 mm</u>	<u>55 mm</u>	<u>50 mm</u>

remark: during the last decades it has been helpful in international trade to differentiate between large-fruited varieties and other varieties of medium or small fruit size, different minimum sizes for the relevant groups of varieties made it rather easy to exclude underdeveloped fruits; moreover, different minimum sizes for the relevant classes improved quality; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

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

- 5 mm for “Extra” Class fruit and for Class I and II fruit packed in rows and layers;
However, for apples of the varieties Bramley’s Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger, the difference in diameter may amount to 10 mm.
- 10 mm for Class I fruit packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages;
However, for apples of the varieties Bramley’s Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger, the difference in diameter may amount to 20 mm.
remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard; it is important to ensure, that “Extra” Class fruit is not packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages; therefore, at least the 2nd indent should be harmonised with the UN/ECE standard.

There is no sizing uniformity limit for Class II fruit packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages.

remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

INDIA

Clause 3 para 3 :

10 per cent for fruits packed in rows and layers;

15 per cent for fruits in bulk or in pre-packaging

NEW ZEALAND**3 Provisions Concerning Sizing**

There are major differences between the standards concerning sizing.

i) Codex has one minimum size for all apples and all classes of 50 mm diameter.

UN/ECE categorises apples into two size groups with varying minimum sizes by group and class, e.g.

Large apples, extra class, have minimum of 65 mm diameter

Small apples, class 2, have minimum of 50 mm diameter.

The Codex standard is so low there is no effective minimum size.

⁵ The non exhaustive list of large-fruited varieties is given in the Annex of this standard

- ii) Codex requires all fruit to be uniformly sized - maximum 5 mm range in diameter when packed in rows, maximum 10 mm when bulk or pre -packed.
UN/ECE has no limit on size uniformity for class 2 in bulk or pre-pack.

SOUTH AFRICA

Change the 5mm for fruit packed in rows and layers to 8mm.

SPAIN

SECTION 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE CLASSIFICATION BY SIZES

IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE SECTION BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE FOLLOWING:

“3. Provisions Concerning Sizing.

A minimum size by diameter shall be required for all categories according to the following table:

	<i>Extra</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>
<i>Large Fruited varieties</i>	70 mm	65 mm	65 mm
<i>Other varieties</i>	60 mm	55 mm	55 mm

The difference in diameter between the fruits in a same package shall be limited to 5 mm for the Extra class, and for class II and I packed in rows and layers.

The difference in diameter can be of up to 10 mm for Class I fruits packed in bulk in the package. No limit is established for Class II fruits packed in bulk in the package.

A minimum 50-mm diameter is not admissible for all classes, because this may mean the acceptance of fruits that have not acquired a normal development in many varieties.

THAILAND

This provision refers to size determination by diameter or by weight, whereas the text specified sizing by diameter only. In this connection, sizing by weight should be done in this section.

Sizing by diameter should cover crab or miniature apples which have small size as this variety exists in international trade.

THE UNITED KINGDOM

Provisions Concerning Sizing

The UK considers a 50mm minimum size is too small, and certainly not suitable for all apple varieties. Indeed some of the large fruited varieties may not be sufficiently developed to mature properly at this size. If allowed they could introduce an inferior product onto the market that would be difficult to police. At the beginning of each season growers try to get their fruit on the market as early as possible to get the higher prices, in many cases the fruit size is the only thing preventing them. The use of one minimum size is also a little simplistic given the wide range of sizes of apples. It would seem more appropriate to link minimum size with class. The uniformity of size should also be re-examined to permit a wider uniformity band for certain culinary apples, which are large fruit and need an extra allowance.

THE UNITED STATES

This is another section that should be reviewed by a working group on size classification. This is another issue that is currently under review in the UNECE.

EUROPEAN UNION

The first subparagraph of this paragraph of the proposed draft Codex standard for apples stipulates that, in case of sizing by weight, apples have to respect a minimum weight, "as appropriate, according to the minimum diameters...", what one understands as a minimum weight deduced from the minimum diameter. The European Community considers that this provision is too complicated and is likely to involve multiple differences of interpretation according to the varieties concerned.

The European Community proposes therefore of sticking to a simple minimum diameter whatever the method of calibration of the fruit is (weight or diameter). The second sentence of the first subparagraph of paragraph 3 would be read therefore as follows:

"However, when sizing by weight, the minimum weight must ensure all fruit, as appropriate, meet the minimum diameter sizes listed below".

In paragraph 2.2, it is said that apples have to be characteristic of the variety, in particular as regards shape, size and colouring. Indeed, the traditional size of apples is not the same according to the varieties, and certain apples reach a sufficient development stage with smaller sizes than other varieties. Traditionally, to avoid too much complication, the varieties with large fruit (such as, for example, the varieties Golden Delicious, Jonagold or Granny Smith) are distinguished of the varieties with small fruit like (for example, the varieties Cox Orange Pippin, Gala or Elstar).

The European Community wishes therefore the minimum size of apples not to be the same for large-fruited varieties as for small-fruited varieties. Otherwise, there are high risks that the provisions fixing a minimum size do not make it possible to draw aside the apples not having reached a sufficient development stage, which is nevertheless the raison d'être of such provisions.

In addition, the proposed draft Codex standard for apples intends to set the same minimum size for apples of all quality classes (extra, I and II).

The aim by fixing a minimum size is to draw aside the fruit which did not reach a sufficient development stage. One knows indeed that, the smaller the fruit, the less it is likely to have reached the development stage in question. The fact of lowering the minimum diameter amounts therefore to accepting a greater risk of presence of fruit not having reached the sufficient development stage. It seems logical to accept that a risk of this type is greater in Class II than in the Extra Class. The European Community wishes therefore different minimum diameters to be adopted according to the quality classes.

With regard to the figure for the minimum diameter, the European Community considers that below 55 mm in diameter (65 mm for the large-fruited varieties), fruit are unlikely to present a sufficient development stage. Accordingly, the minimum diameter for apples shall be fixed at this level for classes I and II.

In addition, below 60 mm (70 mm for the varieties with large fruit), there are substantial risks of presence of insufficiently developed fruit. Accordingly, the minimum diameter for Extra class has to be fixed at this level.

The proposed draft Codex standard for apples envisages size uniformity criteria which are identical whatever the quality classes are. The European Community considers however that the uniformity of size of the fruit has to be more important for higher quality classes. It proposes therefore making the size uniformity criteria more flexible for class II and strengthening them for the Extra class.

In addition, the varieties "Bramley's seedling" and "Horneburger" being characterised by diameters which can be very important and these varieties are of a typical but rather irregular shape, the European Community wishes size uniformity criteria more adapted to the characteristics of these varieties to be adopted.

The third subparagraph of paragraph 3 could be replaced by the following text:

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

- 5 mm for Extra class fruit and for Class I and II fruit packed in rows and layers ⁴,*
- 10 mm for Class I fruit packed in bulk in the package or in prepackages ⁵.*

There is no uniformity limit for Class II fruit packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages.

⁴ : *However, for apples of the varieties Bramley's Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger, the difference in diameter may amount to 10 mm.*

⁵ : *However, for apples of the varieties Bramley's Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger, the difference in diameter may amount to 10 mm. "*

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

GERMANY**4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES**

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

remark: apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

THE UNITED STATES

The United States suggests reviewing the grade tolerances and their application for uniformity around the world. Many countries would like to ship superior quality apples, but does the tolerance of 5% create a trade issue when some countries have a 20 - 30 day shipping period. Also, does this tolerance hurt the grower? Also, how countries apply the tolerances needs to be reviewed. For example, some countries have total tolerances, plus an individual container tolerance within the total tolerance.

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES**GERMANY****4.1 Quality tolerances**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

NEW ZEALAND**4.1 Tolerances**

Codex has a tolerance of 2% in class I and 5 % in class II for bitter pit, water core, slight damage or slight rots. UN/ECE has nil tolerance for class I and 2 % for class 2.

THAILAND

Section 4.1 Quality Tolerances for Class I and Class II should not allow to have defects such as slight traces of rotting and unhealed broken skin for the following reasons:

- rotting is unfit for consumption,*
- unhealed broken skin will originate infection from microorganisms, it will cause deterioration and finally unsuitable for consumption,*
- the allowance of these defects will produce inconsistency whit the minimum requirement in section 2.1*

4.1.1 “Extra” Class

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

4.1.2 Class I

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

This tolerance includes 2% of apples that have unhealed light superficial damage, slight traces of rotting or damage to the flesh.

GERMANY*4.1.2 Class I*

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

~~*This tolerance includes 2% of apples that have unhealed light superficial damage, slight traces of rotting or damage to the flesh.*~~

remark: the defects mentioned above are covered by minimum requirements (whole, sound) and should only be allowed within the tolerance of Class II; in line with revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN*PARAGRAPH 4.1.2 CLASS I*

It is proposed to add the following paragraph:

“25% by number or weight of apples not presenting peduncle provided the epidermis of the peduncle cavity is not deteriorated: notwithstanding, for the variety Granny Smith fruit that lacks peduncle shall be admitted with no limitation provided the epidermis of the peduncle cavity is not deteriorated.”

The suppression of the 2nd paragraph is proposed, in order to harmonize with the new draft proposal for section 2.2.2

It is not acceptable to permit in Class I, fruits with non-healed damages and least of all with traces of rotting or damage of the flesh.

THE UNITED KINGDOM*Provisions Concerning Tolerances**Class I*

4.1.2 We believe there should be zero tolerance for any fruit which could rot or break down further while in transit thereby affecting the overall quality of fruit available to the consumer. We therefore suggest the deletion of the final sentence “ This tolerance includes 2% of apples that have unhealed light superficial damage, slight traces of rotting or damage to the flesh.”

We note that the Codex standard avoids listing apple varieties, which we feel, helps to identify the varieties that fit into each colour or size group. In addition we note there is no provision for russeting in the standard and in particular for varieties such as Egremont Russet. CCFV will wish to note that UN/ECE are currently working on a list of apple varieties.

EUROPEAN UNION

Paragraph 4.1.2. sets out a tolerance of 2% for unhealed light superficial damages, slight traces of rot and damages to the flesh, inside the tolerance of 10% applicable to Class I. With the changes that the European Community proposes to paragraph 2.2 (in particular the acceptance of minor defects of the flesh), the majority of the defects aimed by this paragraph are allowed within Class II or, if necessary, by the tolerances of this class (see below). The European Community proposes therefore suppressing the second subparagraph of paragraph 4.1.2.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten per cent by number or weight of apples 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.

Within this tolerance, a maximum of 5% by number or weight of fruit may show the following defects:

- serious corklike blemishing (bitter pit) or watercore;
- slight damage or unhealed broken skin;
- very slight traces of rotting.

GERMANY**4.1.3 Class II**

Ten per cent by number or weight of apples 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.

Within this tolerance, a maximum of 2 per cent by number or weight of fruit is allowed which shows the following defects:

- serious attacks of cork (bitter pit) or water-core;
- slight damage or unhealed cracks;
- very slight traces of rot
- presence of internal feeding pests and/or damage to the flesh caused by pests.
remark: in line with revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN**PARAGRAPH 4.1.3 CLASS II**

It is proposed that the bullet “-important attacks of cork-like stains (bitter pit, etc.) or water-core(water core, vitreous pulp)” be substituted by “-serious attacks of cork-like (bitter pit) or glazed”.

It is proposed that in the third indent the expression “very slight symptoms of rotting” be substituted by “slight signs of rotting”.

EUROPEAN UNION

Paragraph 4.1.3 provides for Class II, within the tolerance of 10%, a narrower tolerance of 5% for certain defects : serious cork-like blemishes or water-core, slight damages or unhealed cracks, very slight traces of rot. The European Community also considers that one has to restrict this kind of defects to a lesser extent than 10%. However, the majority of these defects make the fruit unfit for consumption and it is advisable to set the tolerance of such defects at the lowest level possible. The European Community proposes 2%, in line with the UN/ECE and OECD standards. In addition, other serious defects could be added to this list of the defects entering the tolerance of 5%: presence of living pests and/or deterioration of the flesh due to pests. Accordingly, the second subparagraph of paragraph 4.1.3 could read as follows:

"Within this tolerance, a maximum of 2 per cent by number or weight of fruit is allowed which shows the following defects:

- serious attacks of cork (bitter pit) or water-core,
- slight damage or unhealed cracks,
- very slight traces of rot,
- presence of internal feeding pest and/or damage to the flesh caused by pests."

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10 per cent by number or weight of apples corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed, a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum.

GERMANY**4.2 *Size tolerances***

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

~~*For all classes, 10 per cent by number or weight of apples corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed, a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum.*~~

remark: not in line with revised UN/ECE standard

For all classes:

- *for fruit which is subject to the rules of uniformity, 10 per cent by number or weight of fruit corresponding to the size immediately above or below that marked on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum;*
- *for fruit which is not subject to the rules of uniformity, 10 per cent by number or weight of fruit below the minimum size laid down, with a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum size.*

remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN***Section 4.2 Size tolerances:***

It is proposed that the content of this section be substituted by the following paragraph:

“For fruit that falls under the standards of uniformity, a 10% by number or weight of fruit corresponding to the size immediately above or below that marked in the package, with a maximum variation of 5 mm under the minimum for the fruits classified in the lowest permitted size”.

EUROPEAN UNION

- *Following the proposal not to require size uniformity criteria for Class II fruits presented in bulk in the package or in prepackages, it is necessary to re-examine paragraph 4.2. in order to envisage both cases: fruit subject to size uniformity criteria, fruit non subject to size uniformity criteria. Paragraph 4.2 could thus read as follows:*

“For all the classes :

- a) For fruit which is subject to the rules of uniformity, 10% by number or weight of fruit corresponding to the size immediately above or below that marked on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum;*
- b) For fruit which is not subject to the rules of uniformity, 10% by number or weight of fruit below the minimum size laid down, with a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum size. ”*

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION**5.1 UNIFORMITY**

The contents of each package (or lot for produce presented in bulk) must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, quality and size (if sized) and visibly of the same degree of ripeness and development.

For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform.

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

Uniformity of variety is not required for “Extra” Class and Class I apples in pre-packed units with a net weight not exceeding 2 kg.

GERMANY**5.1 Uniformity**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

The contents of each package (~~or lot for produce presented in bulk~~) must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, quality and size (if sized) and visibly of the same degree of ripeness and development.

remark: apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

In the case of “Extra” Class, uniformity also applies to colouring

remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

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

remark: apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

Uniformity of variety is not required for ~~“Extra” Class and Class I~~ apples in pre-packed units with a net weight not exceeding 2 kg. If different varieties of apples are sold in the same package, uniformity or origin is not required.

remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN**SECTION 5.1 UNIFORMITY**

It is proposed that in the third line the expression: “and size (in case of sizing)” be substituted by “and caliber (in case of sizing)”.

The second paragraph must be substituted with the following: “Uniformity of variety is not required for “EXTRA” Class and Class I apples in pre packed units with a net weight not under 2 kilograms”.

THAILAND**1. Section 5.1 Uniformity, paragraph 2**

We are of the opinion that uniformity of variety in pre-packed units is still necessary for all classes or this will mislead or deceive consumer.

THE UNITED STATES**5.1 Uniformity**

Uniform color in “Extra Class” permits no variation – all of the same % of color – this is impractical unless apples are “full color”. Interpretation would be very subjective.

EUROPEAN UNION

In paragraph 5.1, the proposed draft Codex standard for apples mentions the possibility of apple consignments presented in bulk. According to the European Community, apples are packed in bulk (cartons, wooden bulk bins for the large quantities), but not directly in a transport vehicle as a whole lot. Both brackets (“(or lot for produce presented in bulk)”) are therefore not necessary and can be suppressed.

In paragraph 5.1, the Community approves the possibility of presenting prepackages of less than two kilos containing apples of different varieties. If this possibility is used, the uniformity of origin should not be necessary.

The second subparagraph of paragraph 5.1 would read as follows:

"Uniformity of variety is not required for apples in prepacked units of a net weight not exceeding 2 kg. If different varieties of apples are sold in the same package, uniformity of origin is not required. "

Footnote 4 in paragraph 5.2 (Packaging) stipulates that recycled materials could be used inside the packages. In commercial practice, only packages themselves are recycled, not materials used inside the package (plastic crates for example). The recycling of this type of materials should not be incited or urged, because, in general, these materials are not re-usable. Accordingly, the European Community proposes deleting Footnote (4) in the proposed draft Codex standard for tomatoes.

5.2 PACKAGING

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

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

GERMANY**5.2 Packaging**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

Apples must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly.

The materials used inside the package must be new⁶, 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.

Apples shall be packed in each package in compliance with the ~~Recommended International~~ Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of ~~Tropical~~ Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).

SPAIN**SECTION 5.2 PACKAGING**

It is proposed that “Packaging” be substituted by “Conditioning”.

It is proposed that footnote (3) be suppressed taking into consideration that all the materials used in the interior of the packages must always be new.

THE UNITED STATES

With the international traders talking about new containers that can be reused, the Committee may want to review this section.

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

⁶ 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 apples.

Packages (or lot for produce presented in bulk) must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

GERMANY*5.2.1 Description of Containers*

The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the apples. Packages ~~(or lot for produce presented in bulk)~~ must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

remark: apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN*PARAGRAPH 5.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF CONTAINERS*

The content of this section could be included within section 5.2 Conditioning.

It is proposed that from the third line the expression: "(or lot in the case of produce presented in bulk)" be suppressed.

EUROPEAN UNION

In section 5.2.1 (Description of containers) can not apply to products presented in bulk. The latter are not packed. The European Community proposes therefore deleting the following words : "(or lot for produce presented in bulk)".

5.3 PRESENTATION

The apples may be presented under one of the following forms:

- a) In regular layers according to size, in open or closed containers. This form of presentation is obligatory for the “Extra” Class and optional for Classes I and II;
- b) In bulk, comprising up to three consecutive sizes. This form of presentation is only permitted for Classes I and II.

GERMANY**5.3 Presentation**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

The apples may be presented under one of the following forms:

- a) *In regular layers ~~according to size, in open or closed containers~~. This form of presentation is obligatory for the “Extra” Class and optional for Classes I and II;*
- b) *In bulk in the package, ~~comprising up to three consecutive sizes~~. This form of presentation is only permitted for Classes I and II.*

remark: to harmonise with UN/ECE standard it would be better to replace the paragraph above by the following sentence: “For “Extra” Class fruit must be packed in layers

with reference to b): the proposal does not require special sizes therefore, it is not possible to allow for three consecutive sizes in a bulk package.

SPAIN**SECTION 5.3 PRESENTATION**

It is proposed that in bullet a) “containers” be substituted by “packages”.

In bullet b) it must be specified that up to three consecutive sizes should be authorized only for apples of the same class.

THE UNITED STATES

It is unclear as to what constitutes “three consecutive sizes”. Does this mean 15 mm; i.e., 5 mm variation within each size, (5/8” dia. variation) within the bulk package

EUROPEAN UNION

In paragraph 5.3, the proposed draft Codex standard stipulates that in case the apples are presented in bulk, three consecutive sizes can be present in the same package. As said above, the European Community wishes no homogeneity rule to be imposed for the apples of Class II presented in bulk in the package. It considers on the other hand that, for Class I apples presented in bulk, size uniformity has to be ensured as set out in paragraph 3 (10 mm of difference between the fruit), i.e., with more flexible uniformity criteria than for fruit presented in rows and layers (5 mm). The European Community proposes therefore the following text:

“For Extra Class, fruit must be packed in layers.”

6. MARKING OR LABELLING**GERMANY****6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING**

remark: in line with UN/ECE standard and headings of sections 1 to 5

SPAIN**SECTION 6. MARKING OR LABELING**

The title must be substituted with "Section 6. Provisions concerning marking".

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 2-1999), the following specific provisions apply:

GERMANY**6.1 Consumer Packages**

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 2-1999), the following specific provisions apply:

EUROPEAN UNION

In section 6.1 (Consumer packages), the possibility to present produce in bulk as "lots" is mentioned. This is not possible when packages are intended to the final consumer. The European Community proposes therefore deleting the following parenthesis: "(or lot for produce presented in bulk)".

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

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

GERMANY**6.1.1 Nature of Produce**

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package (~~or lot for produce presented in bulk~~) shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to the name of the variety.

remark: please take note that 6.1.1. deals with consumer packages; apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

SPAIN**PARAGRAPH 6.1.1 NATURE OF THE PRODUCE**

It is considered that besides specifying in the label the name of the produce and variety, it is necessary to also specify the class and size or the number of pieces of fruit presented in rows and layers.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.⁴

For produce transported in bulk these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods.

GERMANY**6.2 *Non-retail Containers***

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

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.~~⁷ For produce transported in bulk these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods.

remark: apples covered by this standard should not be transported in bulk in the transport vehicle; in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

NEW ZEALAND**6.2 *Non-retail Containers***

Codex allows information relating to non-retail containers to be on accompanying documentation.

THE UNITED STATES

Consumer packaging identification is presumed to be a requirement of the master container, not a requirement on the consumer package itself. Need to verify this interpretation.

Does “bulk”, as used in this section, mean non-packaged product; i.e., bulk bins, or bulk product in ocean containers?

⁴ Governments, when indicating their acceptance of this Standard, should notify the Commission as to which provisions of this Section apply.

⁷ *When accepting this Codex standard, governments should notify the Commission which of these provisions apply.*

6.2.1 Identification⁵

Name and address of Exporter, Packer and/or Dispatcher. Identification code (optional).⁶

GERMANY*6.2.1 Identification*⁸

remark referring to footnote: this footnote is used in UN/ECE standards but does not apply to Codex standards which give detailed instructions for consumer packages as shown in sections 6.1 and 6.1.1 above
*Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional).*⁹

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

Name of variety or varieties (where appropriate).

SPAIN*PARAGRAPH 6.2.2 NATURE OF THE PRODUCE*

It is proposed that in the 2nd line, the expression “or varieties (where appropriate)” be substituted by the expression “for Extra Class and Class I.”

⁵ Unit packs of produce pre-packed for direct sale to the consumer shall not be subject to these marking provisions but shall conform to national requirements. However, the markings referred to shall be shown on the transport packaging containing such unit packs.

⁶ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference “packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)” has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

⁸ ~~Unit packs of produce pre-packed for direct sale to the consumer shall not be subject to these marking provisions but shall conform to national requirements. However, the markings referred to shall be shown on the transport packaging containing such unit packs.~~

⁹ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference “packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)” has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

SPAIN*PARAGRAPH 6.2.3 ORIGIN OF PRODUCE*

It is proposed that from the first line the expression: "or countries of origin (where appropriate)" be suppressed.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size, regardless of form of presentation.

GERMANY*6.2.4 Commercial Identification*

- Class;
- Size, ~~regardless of form of presentation~~ or for fruit packed in rows and layers, number of units.

If identification is by the size, this should be expressed:

- for produce subject to the uniformity rules, as minimum and maximum diameters
 - for produce not subject to the uniformity rules, the diameter of the smallest fruit in the package.
- remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard*

EUROPEAN

- *In paragraph 6.2.4, the marking of size is envisaged. The European Community wishes to give indications on the type of marking for size in order that the standard is the most transparent one possible and could not thus give rise to interpretations.*

If fruit are presented in bulk in the package, size will be indicated by means of the diameter of the fruit. If fruit are presented in rows and layers, the indication of size could be either by means of the diameter of the fruit, or by means of the number of fruit present in the package.

The European Community proposes therefore the following text:

"Size or, for fruits packed in rows and layers, number of units.

If identification is by the size, this should be expressed :

- a) For produce subject to the uniformity rules, as minimum and maximum diameters;*
- b) For produce not subject to the uniformity rules, the diameter of the smallest fruit of the package. "*

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)**GERMANY***6.2.5 Official Control Mark (optional)*

remark: in line with existing and revised UN/ECE standard

7. CONTAMINANTS**NEW ZEALAND***7 Contaminants*

Codex has sections on contaminants and hygiene - these are not part of the UN/ECE standard.

POLAND

According to the polish food law, we propose to established maximum level for mercury, arsenic, zinc and for copper in Codex standard for apples

7.1 HEAVY METALS

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

GERMANY*7.1 Heavy Metals*

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

Apples shall not exceed those maximum levels for heavy metals established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

remark: in line with other Codex standards

7.2 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

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

GERMANY*7.2 Pesticide Residues*

remark: typing should be in line with other Codex standards

Apples shall not exceed those maximum residue limits established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

remark: in line with other Codex standards

EUROPEAN UNION

Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 refer, as well as all other Codex standards for fruit and vegetables, to the maximum limits fixed by the Commission for heavy metals and pesticides. Without contesting this principle, the European Community wonders however if the Codex standard for the apples (as well as other Codex standards for fruit and vegetables) would not gain in legibility and in transparency by incorporating a summary table of these maximum limits fixed by the Commission.

8. HYGIENE**NEW ZEALAND**8 *Hygiene*

Codex has sections on contaminants and hygiene - these are not part of the UN/ECE standard.

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 3-1997), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

GERMANY

8.1 *It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 3-1997), and other ~~relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and~~ Codes of Practice recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission which are relevant to this produce.*

remark: should be in line with other Codex standards

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).

GERMANY

8.2 *The product 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).*

remark: should be in line with other Codex standards

ANNEX I

COLOURING

The different varieties of apple shall be classified into four groups according to colouring:

GERMANY**COLOURING**

The different varieties of apple shall be classified into four groups according to colouring:

NEW ZEALAND*Annex I Colouring**Russet*

UN/ECE sets categories that recognise some varieties have varying levels of russet. This is missing from Codex.

Colour Standard

The UN/ECE standard has an appendix that categorises all common varieties of apples into colour bands. The concept of colour bands is included in the Codex standard but there is no list (in the current version) that defines which varieties belong in which categories.

SPAIN**ANNEX I**

The suppression of the listings of the varieties that appear in the CEPE standard, together with the modifications that the project makes to the first class, which reduces the quality requirements, do not insure the fundamental functions of Codex "to insure equity in practices in food commerce". So, we consider that the Codex standard draft for apples must not be approved in step 3 of the procedure, until the draft is not modified in all that supposes a distortion of the loyal competition in the commercial exchanges.

GROUP A: VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING**Extra Class:** At least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**Class I:** At least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**Class II:** At least $\frac{1}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**GERMANY****GROUP A: VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING***Extra Class: At least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**Class I: At least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**Class II: At least $\frac{1}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour**Varieties:*

<i><u>Black Ben Davis</u></i>	<i><u>Red Rome</u></i>
<i><u>Black Stayman</u></i>	<i><u>Red Stayman (Staymared)</u></i>
<i><u>Carmio</u></i>	<i><u>Red York</u></i>
<i><u>Democrat</u></i>	<i><u>Reinette étoilée</u></i>
<i><u>Jonagored</u></i>	<i><u>Roja de Benjama (Verruga,</u></i>
<i><u>King David</u></i>	<i><u>Roja del Valle, Clavelina)</u></i>
<i><u>Red Delicious and mutations</u></i>	<i><u>Rose de Berne</u></i>
<i><u>(Richared, Starking,</u></i>	<i><u>Royal Gala (Tenroy)</u></i>
<i><u>Starkrimson, Well Spur, Oregon,</u></i>	<i><u>Spartan</u></i>
<i><u>Fortuna Delicious,</u></i>	<i><u>Stark Delicious</u></i>
<i><u>Top Red and Royal Red)</u></i>	<i><u>Winesap (Winter Winesap)</u></i>

remark: the description of colouring requirements needs to be completed by a list of varieties underlying these requirements; this proposal is in line with the existing UN/ECE standard but this list is under revision at the moment

THE UNITED STATES

The United States would recommend 66% of the fruit surface with red color.

GROUP B: VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING**Extra Class:** At least ½ of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring**Class I:** At least ⅓ of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring**Class II:** At least ⅒ of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring**GERMANY****GROUP B: VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING***Extra Class: At least ½ of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring**Class I: At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring**Class II: At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring*Varieties:

<u>Akane (Prime Rouge,</u>	<u>Ontario</u>
<u>Tohoku 3)</u>	<u>Ordinary Delicious</u>
<u>Belfort (Pella)</u>	<u>Ortell</u>
<u>Bellavista (Vista Bella)</u>	<u>Paula Red</u>
<u>Cardinal</u>	<u>Piglos</u>
<u>Cherry Cox</u>	<u>Rambour Franc</u>
<u>Cortland</u>	<u>Red Berlepsch</u>
<u>Delicious Pilafa</u>	<u>Red Boskoop</u>
<u>Discovery</u>	<u>Red Gravensteiner</u>
<u>Gloster 69</u>	<u>Red James Grieve</u>
<u>Idared</u>	<u>Reineta Encarnada</u>
<u>Ingrid Marie</u>	<u>Reineta Roja del Canada</u>
<u>Jerseymac</u>	<u>Stalapfel</u>
<u>Jonathan</u>	<u>Stayman Winesap</u>
<u>Katy (Katja)</u>	<u>Summerred</u>
<u>Lobo</u>	<u>Tydemans Early Worcester</u>
<u>McIntosh Red</u>	<u>(Tydemans Early)</u>
<u>Morgenduft</u>	<u>Wagener</u>
<u>(Rome Beauty)</u>	<u>Wealthy</u>
<u>Nueva Orleans</u>	<u>Worcester Pearmain</u>
<u>Odin</u>	<u>York</u>

remark: the description of colouring requirements needs to be completed by a list of varieties underlying these requirements; this proposal is in line with the existing UN/ECE standard but this list is under revision at the moment

SOUTH AFRICA

Delete reference to “semi-red” in the colour classification of Group B and replace with “mixed colouring”

THE UNITED STATES

Depth or shade of color is not defined, but is presumed to be a “fair to medium” shade, given the moderate % of surface area required

GROUP C: VARIETIES WITH STRIPES AND SLIGHT RED COLOURING**Extra Class:** At least $\frac{1}{3}$ of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring**Class I:** At least $\frac{1}{10}$ of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring**Class II:** At least $\frac{1}{10}$ of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring**GERMANY****GROUP C: VARIETIES WITH STRIPES AND SLIGHT RED COLOURING***Extra Class: At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring**Class I: At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring**Class II: At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring*Varieties:

<u>Abbondanza</u>	<u>Karmijn de Sonnaville</u>
<u>Alkmene</u>	<u>Kidd's Orange Red</u>
<u>Apollo</u>	<u>Laxton's Superb</u>
<u>Arlet</u>	<u>Lord Lambourne</u>
<u>Berlepsch</u>	<u>Maigold</u>
<u>Braeburn</u>	<u>Melrose</u>
<u>Carola (Kalco)</u>	<u>Normanda</u>
<u>Casanova de Alcobaça</u>	<u>Nueva Europa</u>
<u>Chata Encarnada</u>	<u>Oldenburg</u>
<u>Commercio</u>	<u>Pimona</u>
<u>Cox's Orange pippin</u>	<u>Pinova</u>
<u>(Cox orange and mutations)²</u>	<u>Piros</u>
<u>Cunha (Riscadinha)</u>	<u>Pomme Raisin</u>
<u>Ellison's Orange</u>	<u>Red Mantet</u>
<u>Elstar</u>	<u>Reglindis</u>
<u>Fuji</u>	<u>Reine des Reinettes</u>
<u>Gala</u>	<u>(Gold Parmoné)</u>
<u>Imperatore</u>	<u>Rose de Caldarò (Kalterer)</u>
<u>(Emperor Alexander)</u>	<u>Shampion</u>
<u>Jamba</u>	<u>Stark's Earliest</u>
<u>Jonagold³</u>	<u>Winston</u>

² Except Cherry Cox³ However, for the variety Jonagold at least one-tenth of the surface of the fruit in Class II must be striped with red-colouring.*remark: the description of colouring requirements needs to be completed by a list of varieties underlying these requirements; this proposal is in line with the existing UN/ECE standard but this list is under revision at the moment***JAMAICA**

Group C Surface area of coloration is similar for class I. Do not know if it is correct.

NEW ZEALAND

Codex standard for Group C class II is 10% red colouring; UN/ECE has no minimum for this category.

THE UNITED STATES

U.S. classifies Braeburn, Elstar, Fuji, Gala, Gala Supreme, Royal Gala, Jonagold as red cheek or blush. How would these varieties be aligned as Group C varieties under the Codex proposal?

GROUP D: GREEN AND YELLOW VARIETIES

GERMANY

II. RUSSETING

1. Varieties of apples for which russeting is a characteristic of the skin of the variety and is not a defect if it corresponds to the typical appearance of the variety. Exhaustive list of varieties of international importance (this list could be completed at national level) :

Varieties:

<i>Ashmead's Kernel</i>	<i>Laxton's Superb</i>
<i>Boskoop Group</i>	<i>Mingan (Peromingan, Mingana)</i>
<i>Cox's Orange Group</i>	<i>Reinette du Canada</i>
<i>Dunn's Seedling</i>	<i>Reinette grise</i>
<i>Egremont Russet</i>	<i>St. Edmunds Pippin</i>
<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Sturmer Pippin</i>
<i>Golden Russet</i>	<i>Sunset</i>
<i>Ingrid Marie</i>	<i>Suntan</i>
<i>Karmijn de Sonnaville</i>	<i>Toreno</i>
<i>Kent</i>	<i>Yellow Newtown</i>
<i>Kidd's Orange Red</i>	<i>(Albermarle Pippin)</i>

2. For varieties other than those listed below, russeting is allowed within the following limits. ⁷

	<i>Extra</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>Tolerances for Class II</i>
<i>(i) <u>Brown patches</u></i>	<i>not outside the stem cavity</i>	<i>May go slightly beyond the stem or pistil cavities</i>	<i>may go beyond the stem or pistil cavities</i>	<i>fruit not seriously detracting from the appearance and condition of the package</i>
<i>(ii) <u>Russeting</u></i>	<i>not rough</i>	<i>Not rough</i>	<i>slightly rough</i>	
<i><u>thin net-like russeting</u> (not contrasting strongly with the general colouring of the fruit)</i>	<i>slight and isolated traces of russeting not altering the general appearance of the fruit and of the package</i>	<i>1/5</i>	<i>1/2</i>	<i>fruit not seriously detracting from the appearance and condition of the package</i>
<i><u>heavy</u></i>	<i>none</i>	<i>1/20</i>	<i>1/3</i>	<i>fruit not seriously detracting from the appearance and condition of the package</i>
<i><u>Cumulative defects</u> (with the exception of brown patches which are excluded from these cumulative defects) In no case may thin russeting and heavy russeting taken together exceed a maximum of:</i>		<i>1/5</i>	<i>1/2</i>	<i>fruit not seriously detracting from the appearance and condition of the package</i>

⁷ For other varieties, the control services will operate by comparison.

ANNEX IILARGE-FRUITED VARIETIES1. Apples

<u>Atländer</u>	<u>Grossherzog Friedrich</u>
<u>Apollo</u>	<u>von Baden</u>
<u>Arlet</u>	<u>Groupe des Calvilles</u>
<u>Belle de Boskoop and</u>	<u>Herma</u>
<u>mutations</u>	<u>Honey gold</u>
<u>Belle fleur double</u>	<u>Horneburger</u>
<u>Bismarck</u>	<u>Howgate wonder</u>
<u>Black Ben Davis</u>	<u>Idared</u>
<u>Black Stayman</u>	<u>Imperatore</u>
<u>Blenheim</u>	<u>Jacob Fisher</u>
<u>Braeburn</u>	<u>Jacques Lebel</u>
<u>Bramley's Seedling</u>	<u>Jamba</u>
<u>(Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel)</u>	<u>James Grieve and mutations</u>
<u>Brettacher</u>	<u>Jester</u>
<u>Carola (Kalco)</u>	<u>Jonagold</u>
<u>Charden</u>	<u>Jonagored</u>
<u>Charles Ross</u>	<u>Jupiter</u>
<u>Cortland</u>	<u>Karmijn de Sonnaville</u>
<u>Cox pomona</u>	<u>Königin (The Queen)</u>
<u>Crimson Bramley</u>	<u>Lane's Prince Albert</u>
<u>Delicious Pilafa</u>	<u>Lemoen Apfel (Lemoenappel)</u>
<u>Democrat</u>	<u>Maigold</u>
<u>Elan</u>	<u>Melrose</u>
<u>Ellison's orange (Ellison)</u>	<u>Morgenduft (Rome Beauty)</u>
<u>Finkenwerder</u>	<u>Musch</u>
<u>Fortuna Delicious</u>	<u>Mutsu (Crispin)</u>
<u>Fuji</u>	<u>Normanda</u>
<u>Garcia</u>	<u>Notarapfel (Notaris,</u>
<u>Gelber Edel</u>	<u>Notarisappel)</u>
<u>Glorie von Holland</u>	<u>Nueva Orleans</u>
<u>Gloster 69</u>	<u>Ontario</u>
<u>Golden Delicious and mutations</u>	<u>Orleans Reinette</u>
<u>Graham (Graham Royal Jubilé)</u>	<u>Ozarkgold</u>
<u>Granny Smith</u>	<u>Pater v.d. Elsen</u>
<u>Gravensteiner</u>	<u>Pero de Cirio</u>
<u>Greensleeves</u>	<u>Pero Mingan</u>
<u>Piglos</u>	<u>Saure Gamerse (Gamerse zure)</u>
<u>Pinova</u>	<u>Septer</u>
<u>Piros</u>	<u>Shampion</u>
<u>Rambour d'hiver</u>	<u>Signe Tillisch</u>
<u>Red Delicious and</u>	<u>Starkrimson</u>
<u>mutations</u>	<u>Staymanred</u>
<u>Reglindis</u>	<u>Stayman Winesap</u>
<u>Reinetta de Orléans</u>	<u>Transparente de Croncels</u>
<u>Reinetta roja del Canada</u>	<u>(Croncels)</u>
<u>Reinette blanche and Reinette</u>	<u>Triomphe de Luxembourg</u>
<u>grise du Canada</u>	<u>Tydemans Early Worcester</u>
<u>Reinette de France</u>	<u>Winter Banana</u>
<u>Reinette de Landsberg</u>	<u>Zabergäu</u>
<u>Royal Red</u>	<u>Zigeunerin</u>

THE UNITED STATES

There is no text – does this mean there are no requirements or is the proposal incomplete?

EUROPEAN UNION

In order to avoid any interpretative problem, it is necessary to specify for each group of coloration what are the varieties, which belongs to each one of them.

In addition, it does not seem necessary to include a "Green and Yellow varieties" category in the annex. This category would include all the varieties of apples not classified in the three others. The European Community proposes suppressing the paragraph D.

It is necessary to envisage russetting criteria. The European Community proposes adopting those of the UN/ECE standard for apples (see document CX FFV 00/4 Add 1, page 11). The Community considers in addition that the format presented within document CX FFV 00/4 Add 1 is clear, and that it is desirable to adopt it in the annex to the Codex standard for apples.

**COMPARISON BETWEEN THE
PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES
AND THE
UN/ECE STANDARD FOR APPLES AND PEARS**

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears¹
<p>1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE</p> <p>This Standard applies to commercial varieties (cultivars) of apples grown from <i>Malus domestica Borkh.</i> to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Apples for industrial processing are excluded.²</p>	<p>I. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE</p> <p>This standard applies to apples and pears of varieties (cultivars) grown from <i>Malus domestica Borkh.</i> and <i>Pyrus communis L.</i> to be supplied fresh to the consumer, apples and pears for industrial processing being excluded.</p>
<p>2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY</p>	<p>II. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY</p> <p>The purpose of the standard is to define the quality requirements of apples and pears at the export control stage, after preparation and packaging.</p>
<p>2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the apples must be:</p>	<p>A. Minimum requirements</p> <p>In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, apples and pears must be:</p>
- whole;	- intact
- sound, produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;	- 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;	- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter
- practically free of pests affecting the general appearance of the produce;	- practically free from pests
- practically free of damage caused by pests;	- practically free from damage caused by pests
- <i>practically free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature during storage;</i>	- free of abnormal external moisture
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;	- free of any foreign smell and/or taste.
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste.	
<p>2.1.1 The apples must have been carefully picked and have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the variety and to the area in which they are grown.³</p> <p>The development and condition of the apples must be such as to enable them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to withstand transport and handling, and - to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination. 	<p>In addition, they must have been carefully picked.</p> <p>The development and condition of the apples and pears must be such as to enable them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to continue their maturing process and to reach the degree of maturity required in relation to the varietal characteristics⁴ - to withstand transport and handling, and - to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.

¹ TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.1, 13 December 2000 (This document contains the revised UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears (FFV-01) as adopted by the 56th Session of the Working Party on Standardization of Perishable Produce and Quality Development, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-8 November 2000)

² Governments, when indicating the acceptance of the Codex Standard for Apples, 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.

³ Due to the varietal characteristics of certain varieties such as Fuji concerning maturity at harvest, radial watercore is permitted provided this is contained within the vascular bundles of each fruit.

⁴ Due to varietal characteristics of the Fuji variety concerning maturity at harvest, radial watercore is permitted providing it is contained within the vascular bundles of each fruit.

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹
<p>2.2 CLASSIFICATION</p> <p>Apples are classified in three classes defined below:</p>	<p>B. Classification</p> <p>Apples and pears are classified in three classes defined below:</p>
<p>2.2.1 “Extra” Class</p> <p>Apples in this class must be of superior quality.</p> <p>Their shape, size and colouring must be characteristic of the variety and the stalk must be intact.</p> <p>They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects <i>of the skin</i>, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.</p>	<p>(i) <i>“Extra” Class</i></p> <p>Apples and pears in this class must be of superior quality. In shape, size and colouring they must be characteristic of the variety⁵ and the stalk must be intact.</p> <p><i>The flesh must be perfectly sound.</i></p> <p>They must be free from defects with the exception of very slight superficial defects provided these do not affect the general appearance of the fruit, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.</p>
<p>2.2.2 Class I</p> <p>Apples in this class must be of good quality.</p> <p>They must be characteristic of the variety.</p> <p><i>The stalk may be missing provided there is no skin damage.</i></p> <p>Slight defects in shape, development, colouring <i>and from scarring</i>, however, may be allowed, <i>as is handling and physiogenetic damage</i>, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.</p> <p>Slight skin defects must not extend beyond the following limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape; - 1 cm² total surface area for other defects, with the exception of scab (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), which must not have a cumulative area of more than 0.25 cm²; - slight bruising not exceeding 1 cm² in area and no discolouring. <p>The stalk may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged.</p>	<p>(ii) <i>Class I</i></p> <p>Apples and pears in this class must be of good quality. <i>In shape, size and colouring</i> they must be characteristic of the variety.⁵</p> <p><i>The flesh must be perfectly sound.</i></p> <p>The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, on individual fruit provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a slight defect in shape - a slight defect in development - a slight defect in colouring - slight skin defects which must not extend over more than: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 cm in length for defects of elongated shape - 1 cm² of total surface area for other defects, with the exception of scab (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), which must not extend over more than 0.25 cm² cumulative in area. - slight bruising not exceeding 1 cm² in area and not discoloured. <p>For apples the stalk may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged.</p>
<p>2.2.3 Class II</p> <p>This class includes apples which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above.</p> <p>Defects in shape, development, colouring <i>and from scarring</i> may be allowed, <i>as is handling and physiogenetic damage</i>, provided the apples retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation.</p>	<p>(iii) <i>Class II</i></p> <p>This class includes apples and pears which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes but satisfy the minimum requirements specified above.⁵</p> <p>The flesh must be free from major defects.</p> <p>The following defects are allowed provided the fruit retains its essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation.</p>

⁵ *The criteria for colouring and russeting are given in the Annex of this standard.*

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹												
<p>Skin defects must not extend beyond the following limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 cm in length for defects of elongated shape; - 2.5 cm² total surface area for other defects, including slight bruising, with the exception of scab (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), which must not have a cumulative area of more than 1 cm². 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - defects in shape - defects in development - defects in colouring - skin defects which must not extend over more than: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 cm in length for defects of elongated shape - 2.5 cm² total surface area for other defects, including slightly <i>discoloured</i> bruising, with the exception of scab (<i>Venturia inaequalis</i>), which must not extend over more than 1 cm² cumulative in area. 												
<p>3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING</p> <p>Size is determined by maximum diameter of equatorial section or by weight.</p> <p>However, when sizing by weight, the minimum weight must be ensured for all fruit, as appropriate, according to the minimum diameters for all categories determined below.</p> <p><i>The minimum diameter for all categories is 50 mm.</i></p> <p>To ensure there is uniformity of size within a package, the difference in diameter between fruit in the same package shall be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 mm for fruit packed in rows and layers; - 10 mm for fruit packed in bulk or in pre-packaging. 	<p>III. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING</p> <p>Size is determined by maximum diameter of the equatorial section or by weight. However, when sizing by weight, the minimum weight must ensure all fruit, as appropriate, meet the minimum diameter sizes listed below:</p> <p>A minimum size by diameter is required for all classes as follows:</p>												
	<table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; padding-right: 20px;"><i>Extra</i></th> <th style="text-align: center; padding-right: 20px;"><i>Class I</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><i>Class II</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Apples</i>^{6 7}</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Large fruited varieties</i>⁸</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>65 mm</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>60 mm</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Other varieties</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>60 mm</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>55 mm</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Extra</i>	<i>Class I</i>	<i>Class II</i>	<i>Apples</i> ^{6 7}			<i>Large fruited varieties</i> ⁸	<i>65 mm</i>	<i>60 mm</i>	<i>Other varieties</i>	<i>60 mm</i>	<i>55 mm</i>
<i>Extra</i>	<i>Class I</i>	<i>Class II</i>											
<i>Apples</i> ^{6 7}													
<i>Large fruited varieties</i> ⁸	<i>65 mm</i>	<i>60 mm</i>											
<i>Other varieties</i>	<i>60 mm</i>	<i>55 mm</i>											
	<p>To ensure there is uniformity of size within a package, the difference in diameter between fruit in the same package shall be limited to:⁹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 mm for “Extra” Class fruit and for Class I and II fruit packed in rows and layers¹⁰ - 10 mm <i>for Class I</i> fruit packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages.¹¹ <p><i>There is no sizing uniformity limit for Class II fruit packed in bulk in the package or in pre-packages.</i></p>												

² The criteria for colouring and russeting are given in the Annex of this standard.

⁶ The European Community has adopted larger minimum sizes for apples as follows:

Large fruit varieties: 70 mm for "Extra" Class; 65 mm for Classes I and II.

Other varieties: 60 mm for Class "Extra"; 55 for Class I and II.

⁷ Australia and New Zealand have placed reservations against changing the present minimum sizes.

⁸ The non-exhaustive list of large fruited varieties is given in the Annex of this standard.

⁹ Reservation from Chile concerning the Fuji variety.

¹⁰ However, for apples of the varieties Bramley's Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger, the difference in diameter may amount to 10 mm.

¹¹ However, for apples of the varieties Bramley's Seedling (Bramley, Triomphe de Kiel) and Horneburger the difference in diameter may amount to 20 mm.

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UNECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹
<p>4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES</p> <p>Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package (<i>or in each lot for produce presented in bulk</i>) for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.</p>	<p>IV. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES</p> <p>Tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.</p>
<p>4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES</p> <p>4.1.1 "Extra" Class</p> <p>Five percent by number or weight of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.</p>	<p>A. Quality tolerances</p> <p>(i) <i>"Extra" Class</i></p> <p>5 per cent by number or weight of apples or pears not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.</p>
<p>4.1.2 Class I</p> <p>Ten percent by number or weight of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.</p> <p><i>This tolerance includes 2% of apples that have unhealed light superficial damage, slight traces of rotting or damage to the flesh.</i></p>	<p>(ii) <i>Class I</i></p> <p>10 per cent by number or weight of apples or pears not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.</p>
<p>4.1.3 Class II</p> <p>Ten per cent by number or weight of apples 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.</p> <p>Within this tolerance, a maximum of 5% by number or weight of fruit may show the following defects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - serious corklike blemishing (bitter pit) or watercore; - slight damage or unhealed broken skin; - very slight traces of rotting. 	<p>(iii) <i>Class II</i></p> <p>10 per cent by number or weight of apples or pears 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.</p> <p>Within this tolerance, a maximum of 2 per cent by number or weight of fruit is allowed which shows the following defects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - serious attacks of cork (bitter pit) or water-core - slight damage or unhealed cracks - very slight traces of rot - <i>presence of internal feeding pests and/or damage to the flesh caused by pests.</i>
<p>4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES</p> <p>For all classes, 10 per cent by number or weight of apples corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed, a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum.</p>	<p>B. Size tolerances</p> <p>For all classes:</p> <p>(a) for fruit which is subject to the rules of uniformity, 10 per cent by number or weight of fruit corresponding to the size immediately above or below that marked on the package, with, for fruit classified in the smallest grade allowed a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum;</p> <p>(b) <i>for fruit which is not subject to the rules of uniformity, 10 per cent by number or weight of fruit below the minimum size laid down, with a maximum variation of 5 mm below the minimum size.</i></p>

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UNECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹
<p>5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION</p> <p>5.1 UNIFORMITY</p> <p>The contents of each package (<i>or lot for produce presented in bulk</i>) must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, variety, quality and size (if sized) and <i>visibly of</i> the same degree of ripeness and development.</p> <p>For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform.</p> <p>The visible part of the contents of the package (<i>or lot for produce presented in bulk</i>) must be representative of the entire contents.</p> <p>Uniformity of variety is not required for “<i>Extra</i>” Class and Class I apples in pre-packed units with a net weight not exceeding 2 kg.</p>	<p>V. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION</p> <p>A. Uniformity</p> <p>The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples or pears of the same origin, variety, quality, and size (if sized) and the same degree of ripeness.</p> <p>In the case of the "Extra" Class, uniformity also applies to colouring.</p> <p>The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.</p> <p>Uniformity of variety is not required for apples in prepacked units of a net weight not exceeding 2 kg. <i>If different varieties of apples are sold in the same package, uniformity of origin is not required.</i></p>
<p>5.2 PACKAGING</p> <p>Apples must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new¹², 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.</p> <p>Apples shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Tropical Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995).</p>	<p>B. Packaging</p> <p>The apples and pears must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly.</p> <p>The materials used inside the package must be new, 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.</p> <p>Packages must be free of all foreign matter.</p>
<p>5.2.1 Description of Containers</p> <p>The containers shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the apples.</p> <p>Packages (<i>or lot for produce presented in bulk</i>) must be free of all foreign matter and smell.</p>	
<p>5.3 PRESENTATION</p> <p><i>The apples may be presented under one of the following forms:</i></p> <p><i>a) In regular layers according to size, in open or closed containers. This form of presentation is obligatory for the “Extra” Class and optional for Classes I and II;</i></p> <p><i>b) In bulk, comprising up to three consecutive sizes. This form of presentation is only permitted for Classes I and II.</i></p>	<p>C. Presentation</p> <p><i>For "Extra" Class fruit must be packed in layers.</i></p>

12

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

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹
<p>6. MARKING OR LABELLING</p>	<p>VI. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING</p> <p>Each package¹³ must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside:</p>
<p>6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES</p> <p>In addition to the requirements of the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 2-1999), the following specific provisions apply:</p>	
<p>6.1.1 Nature of Produce</p> <p>If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package (<i>or lot for produce presented in bulk</i>) shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to the name of the variety.</p>	
<p>6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS</p> <p>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.¹⁴</p> <p><i>For produce transported in bulk these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods.</i></p>	
<p>6.2.1 Identification¹⁵</p> <p>Name and address of Exporter, Packer and/or Dispatcher. Identification code (optional).¹⁶</p>	<p>A. Identification</p> <p>Packer) Name and address or and/or) officially issued or Dispatcher) accepted code mark.¹⁷</p>
<p>6.2.2 Nature of Produce</p> <p>Name of produce if the contents are not visible from the outside.</p> <p>Name of variety or varieties (where appropriate).</p>	<p>B. Nature of produce</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Apples" or "pears", if the contents are not visible from the outside - Name of the variety or varieties (where appropriate)
<p>6.2.3 Origin of Produce</p> <p>Country or countries (where appropriate) of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.</p>	<p>C. Origin of produce</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Country or countries (where appropriate) of origin and, optionally, district where grown, or national, regional or local place name.
<p>6.2.4 Commercial Identification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class; 	<p>D. Commercial specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class

¹³ Package units of produce prepacked for direct sale to the consumer shall not be subject to these marking provisions but shall conform to the national requirements. However, the markings referred to shall in any event be shown on the transport packaging containing such package units.

¹⁴ Governments, when indicating their acceptance of this Standard, should notify the Commission as to which provisions of this Section apply.

¹⁵ Unit packs of produce pre-packed for direct sale to the consumer shall not be subject to these marking provisions but shall conform to national requirements. However, the markings referred to shall be shown on the transport packaging containing such unit packs.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ 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.

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹																								
<p>- Size, <i>regardless of form of presentation.</i></p>	<p>- Size, <i>or for fruit packed in rows and layers, number of units.</i></p> <p><i>If identification is by the size, this should be expressed:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>for produce subject to the uniformity rules, as minimum and maximum diameters;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>for produce not subject to the uniformity rules, the diameter of the smallest fruit in the package.</i></p>																								
<p>6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark</p>	<p>E. Official control mark (optional)</p>																								
<p>7. CONTAMINANTS</p> <p>7.1 HEAVY METALS</p> <p>Apples shall comply with those maximum levels for heavy metals established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.</p> <p>7.2 PESTICIDE RESIDUES</p> <p>Apples shall comply with those maximum residue limits established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.</p>																									
<p>8. HYGIENE</p> <p>8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 3-1997), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.</p> <p>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).</p>																									
<p>ANNEX</p>	<p>ANNEX</p>																								
<p>COLOURING</p> <p><i>The different varieties of apple shall be classified into four groups according to colouring:</i></p>	<p>1. Colouring, Russeting and Size Criteria for Apples</p>																								
<p>GROUP A: VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING</p> <p>Extra Class: At least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour</p> <p>Class I: At least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour</p> <p>Class II: At least $\frac{1}{4}$ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="807 1574 1457 1608">Colour Groups and Codes</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="807 1608 986 1641">Colour Group</th> <th data-bbox="986 1608 1126 1641">A</th> <th data-bbox="1126 1608 1289 1641">B</th> <th data-bbox="1289 1608 1457 1641">C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="807 1641 986 1787"></td> <td data-bbox="986 1641 1126 1787">varieties with red colouring</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1641 1289 1787">varieties with mixed red colouring</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1641 1457 1787">striped varieties, slightly coloured</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="807 1787 986 1832">Class Extra</td> <td data-bbox="986 1787 1126 1832">3/4</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1787 1289 1832">1/2</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1787 1457 1832">1/3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="807 1832 986 1865">Class I</td> <td data-bbox="986 1832 1126 1865">1/2</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1832 1289 1865">1/3</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1832 1457 1865">1/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="807 1865 986 1897">Class II</td> <td data-bbox="986 1865 1126 1897">1/4</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1865 1289 1897">1/10</td> <td data-bbox="1289 1865 1457 1897">-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Colour Groups and Codes				Colour Group	A	B	C		varieties with red colouring	varieties with mixed red colouring	striped varieties, slightly coloured	Class Extra	3/4	1/2	1/3	Class I	1/2	1/3	1/10	Class II	1/4	1/10	-
Colour Groups and Codes																									
Colour Group	A	B	C																						
	varieties with red colouring	varieties with mixed red colouring	striped varieties, slightly coloured																						
Class Extra	3/4	1/2	1/3																						
Class I	1/2	1/3	1/10																						
Class II	1/4	1/10	-																						

Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Apples	UN/ECE Standard for Apples and Pears ¹
<p>GROUP B: VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING</p> <p>Extra Class: At least 1/2 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring</p> <p>Class I: At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring</p> <p>Class II: At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring</p>	
<p>GROUP C: VARIETIES WITH STRIPES AND SLIGHT RED COLOURING</p> <p>Extra Class: At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring</p> <p>Class I: At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring</p> <p>Class II: <i>At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has striped red colouring</i></p>	
<p>GROUP D: GREEN AND YELLOW VARIETIES</p>	
<p>There is no Annex on Variety (Colour, Russeting and Size Criteria)</p>	<p>See CX/FFV 02/4</p>