

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 5(b)

CX/FFV 09/15/11-Add.1

October 2009

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

Fifteenth Session

Mexico City, Mexico, 19 – 23 October 2009

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THE PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Comments

(Argentina and Iran)

ARGENTINA

Argentina welcomes the introduction of its earlier proposals to the chair of the drafting group (led by France) in this document.

Regarding the **Packer/Packager** definition, we suggest that only **Packer** be retained, as defined in the Codex Code of Hygiene Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.

In respect of the **Lot** definition, we suggest the incorporation of ISO 874: Fresh fruits and vegetables -- Sampling, as follows:

Lot: A stated quantity presumed to be of uniform characteristics (same degree of maturity, same kind of packaging, etc), taken from the consignment, and allowing the quality of the consignment to be assessed.

IRAN

Iran is pleased to submit the following comments in response CX/FFV 09/15/11 AUGUST 2009 -Agenda Item 5(b) on Glossary of Terms Used in the Proposed Standard Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables with the following resulting comments within the term indicated.

1.1 Variety

The definition proposed provides no greater clarity. Iran suggests the following proposed that referred to in ISO 7563:1998 "Fruits and Vegetables-Vocabulary".

“Group of cultivated plants which may be clearly defined by morphological, physical, cytological, chemical or other characteristics and which, after sexual or asexual reproduction, keeps its distinct character”.

1.2 Commercial varieties

The term “commercial varieties” is only used once in the standard layout document, in Section 1 – Scope. No definition is necessary.

1.4 Commercial types

The proposed definition is acceptable.

1.5 Industrial processing

The proposed definition is acceptable.

E

2.1 Intact

Iran supports the definition proposed.

The current definition is inappropriate, since whole refers to the amount of the product present rather than the condition of the product.

“The fruit or vegetable product as it was harvested, but which may have been subjected to trimming.”

2.2 Sound

The term “sound appears once in the Proposed Standard Layout, in Section 3.1 – Minimum Requirements. It is clarified by the subsequent text “produce affected by rotting or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded”, therefore no definition of sound is required. Additionally, the proposed definition includes additional requirements, which is not the role of a definition.

2.3 Clean

The term clean is used in Section 3.1 – Minimum Requirements in the Proposed Standard Layout and is immediately followed by “practically free of visible foreign matter” and in the associated footnote “with regard to traces of soil, a deviation from this provision is allowed depending on the nature of the produce”. No further clarification of the intent of the term is required, therefore no definition is necessary.

If the committee considers that a definition is desirable then Iran suggests the following proposed that referred to in ISO 7563:1998 "Fruits and Vegetables-Vocabulary".

“Free from signs of impurities, blemishes, or other foreign materials such as earth, worms, sand or the visible residues of treatment products”.

2.4 Practically free

The term “practically free” provides flexibility and discretion in the application of the minimum requirements relating to visible foreign matter, pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce. Attempts to define it unnecessarily remove that flexibility and discretion. No definition is necessary.

2.5 Visible foreign matter

Iran supports the proposed definition.

2.6 Pests

Iran supports the comment by Australia and Colombia. Iran suggests amending the definition of pests to the following, from the International Plant Protection Convention(IPPC) Procedural Manual 2007:

“Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plant or plant products.”

2.7 Damage caused by pests

The definition suggested is acceptable.

2.8 Fresh appearance

Iran agrees with the comments made by Colombia and Australia. Iran supports the definition proposed.

2.9 Development

The term “development” is self explanatory and no definition is necessary, if the committee considers that a definition is desirable then a simple definition such as “*Progress of the fruit or vegetable through the stages of growth/maturity*” would be appropriate to its use in the Proposed Standard Layout.

Iran supports the comment by Australia. Defining the scientific stages of development is not necessary as the terms “growth”, “maturation” and “senescence” are not used in the Proposed Standard Layout. The term “ripeness” exists only in conjunction with the term “development”.

3.1 Classification

The term classification is self explanatory and no definition is necessary. If the committee considers that a definition is desirable, then the second sentence of the definition proposed is acceptable:

“Any grouping of fruits and vegetables that have the same commercial quality conditions.”

3.1.1 "Extra" Class

This term is adequately described in the Proposed Standard Layout, and further definition is given by the attributes and requirements determined to be appropriate in each individual standard. No definition is necessary.

Iran supports the comment by Australia.

3.1.2 Class I

This term is adequately described in the Proposed Standard Layout, and further definition is given by the attributes and requirements determined to be appropriate in each individual standard. No definition is necessary.

3.1.3 Class II

This term is adequately described in the Proposed Standard Layout, and further definition is given by the attributes and requirements determined to be appropriate in each individual standard. No definition is necessary.

3.2 Flesh/pulp

The terms “flesh” and “pulp” are self explanatory and no definition is necessary. If the committee considers that a definition is desirable then Iran suggests the following proposed that referred to in ISO 7563:1998 "Fruits and Vegetables-Vocabulary".

“Parenchymatic tissue including reserve substances.”

3.3 Sizing

The meaning of sizing is self explanatory and no definition is necessary. As the term appears only once in the Proposed Standard Layout as the heading to Section 4.1, it is anticipated the requirements for sizing would be defined for each fruit or vegetable in its individual standard. If the term is defined, it should not place restrictions on the methods that may be used to determine size. The definition proposed excludes fruit or vegetables that may be sized according to length, for example, chilli peppers and carrots.

Iran supports the comments by Australia.

If the committee considers that a definition is desirable, then Iran suggests retaining only the first sentence of the definition proposed to read:

“The classification of fruits and vegetables according to physical dimensions.”

4.1 Quality tolerances

This term is only used once in the standard layout document, as heading for Section 5.1. The specific requirements of that section clarify the use of the term. No definition is necessary.

If the committee considers that a definition is desirable, then the definition proposed could be accepted:

“Degree (Percentage) by which a given quality of a specified quality category or size is allowed to differ from requirements”.

4.2 Tolerance for sizes

This term is only used once in the standard layout document, as heading for Section 5.2. The specific requirements of that section clarify the use of the term. Therefore no definition is necessary.

If the committee considers that a definition is desirable, then the definition proposed could be accepted:

“Degree (Percentage) by which a given quality of a specified quality category or size is allowed to differ from requirements”.

5.1 Presentation

The definition proposed imposes restrictions on the presentation of produce, rather than defining the term. Any general requirements of presentation are indicated in the Proposed Standard Layout and specific requirements in individual standards under Section 6 – Provisions Concerning Presentation. Since the requirements of Section 6 are adequate to inform users of the intent of the term, no definition is necessary.

5.2 Packaging

The term packaging appears as the heading of Section 6.2 and adequate advice (including referral to the *Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*: CAC/RCP 44) regarding packaging is included in Section 6.2.

Pre-packaged food and packaging material, these terms do not appear in the Proposed Standard layout, therefore no definitions are necessary.

Iran supports the comment by Australia.

5.2 Uniformity

Uniformity appears only once in the Proposed Standard Layout, as the heading of Section 6.1. The intentions of the word are adequately described within Section 6.1 of the Proposed Standard Layout, being a measure of origin, quality and size. The definition proposed defines “uniform” rather than “uniformity”.

5.3 Packer

Iran supports using the following definition for “packer” found in the *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP 53) and amended the annex I-bibliography, Part 7 from (CAC/RCP 44) to (CAC/RCP 53).

“The person responsible for the management of post-harvest processing and packing of fresh fruits and vegetables”.

5.4 Lot

Iran suggests the following proposed that referred to in ISO 7563:1998 "Fruits and Vegetables-Vocabulary" for the definition of this term.

“Stated quantity of products of the same type (cultivar or variety, origin, quality, size, etc), packed in the same type of package”.

Or Iran suggests the following proposed that referred to Glossary of phytosanitary terms in FAO for the definition of this term.

“A number of units of a single commodity, identifiable by its homogeneity of composition, origin, etc., forming part of a consignment”.

5.5 Bulk

The suggested definition is acceptable.

6.2 Dispatcher

The term “packer and/or dispatcher” seem self explanatory, such that no definition might be necessary, a definition for “packer” can be found in the *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP 53), and should be used without amendment here if needed.

6.3 Identification code

Iran supports the comment by Australia. The definition provided is not a definition, but rather a list of requirements associated with the use of the identification code, which is inappropriate in a definition. Iran suggests using the following definition:

“A permanent mark (code) uniquely identifying the origin and lot.”

7.1 Food Additives

Iran supports the definition proposed, which is that found in the Codex Alimentarius Commission, 17th Procedural Manual, and referred to in the General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1).

8.1 Hygiene

Iran supports the comment by Australia. The references made to the *Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CAC/RCP 1) in the Proposed Standard Layout are adequate to give the intended meaning of hygiene. There is no advantage in incorporating a definition obtained from the regulations of one Codex member organisation when Codex has already adopted suitable definitions. If the working group considers that a definition is desirable in the proposed glossary of terms then the following definition from the *Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene* could be referred to:

“Food hygiene: *all conditions and measures necessary to ensure the safety and suitability of food at all stages of the food chain”.*