

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

ALINORM 07/30/35

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

30th Session

Rome, Italy, 2 - 7 July 2007

**REPORT OF THE 13th SESSION OF THE
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

Mexico City, Mexico

25 - 29 September 2006

NOTE: This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2006/55-FFV.

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

CX 5/95.2

CL 2006/55-FFV
December 2006

TO : - Codex Contact Points
- Interested International Organizations in Observer Status with Codex

FROM : Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission,
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153,
Rome, Italy

SUBJECT : **REPORT OF THE 13TH SESSION OF THE
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (ALINORM 07/30/35)**

**PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 30th SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS
COMMISSION**

Draft Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure

1. **Draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes** (para. 60 and Appendix IV).

Proposed draft Standards at Step 5/8 of the Procedure

2. **Proposed draft Sections 2.1.2 - Maturity Requirements and 3.1 - Minimum Bunch Weight** (draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes) (para. 60 and Appendix V).

Governments and interested international organizations in observer status with Codex wishing to submit comments on the above documents should do so in writing in conformity with the *Guide to the Consideration of Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards including Consideration of any Statements relating to Economic Impact* (Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission) to the above address, PREFERABLY BY E-MAIL, **before 30 April 2007**.

Proposed draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 5 of the Procedure

3. **Proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava** (para. 82 and Appendix VI).

4. **Proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards** (para. 92 and Appendix VII).

Governments and interested international organizations in observer status with Codex wishing to submit comments on the above documents, including implications which these documents or any provisions thereof may have for their economic interests, should do so in writing in conformity with the *Uniform Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* (Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission) to the above address, PREFERABLY BY E-MAIL, **before 30 April 2007**.

PART B: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND INFORMATION

5. **Draft Section 3 - Provisions concerning Sizing** (draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes) (para. 43 and Appendix III).

6. **Proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables** (para. 19 and Appendix VIII).

7. **Proposals for Amendments to the Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables** (para. 103 and Appendix IX).

Governments and interested international organizations in observer status with Codex wishing to submit comments on the above documents should do so in writing, PREFERABLY BY E-MAIL, **before 31 July 2007**.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 13th session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables reached the following conclusions:

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

The Committee agreed to:

- forward the *draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes* (at Step 8) including its *proposed draft Sections 2.1.2 - Maturity Requirements and 3.1 - Minimum Bunch Weight* (at Step 5/8) to the 30th Session of the Commission for final adoption at Step 8 and 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) respectively (para. 60 and Appendices IV and V correspondingly).
- forward the *proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava* and the *proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards* to the 30th Session of the Commission for preliminary adoption at Step 5 (paras. 82 & 92 and Appendices VI & VII respectively).

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

The Committee agreed to:

- retain the *draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes* at Step 7 pending finalization of the *draft Section 3 - Provisions concerning Sizing* which was returned to Step 6 for additional comments and consideration at its next session (paras. 42 - 43 and Appendices II & III respectively).
- return the *proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples* to Step 2 for redrafting by a Working Group led by the United States of America. The revised text will be subsequently circulated for comments at Step 3 and consideration at its next session (para. 70).
- append the *proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* to the report for comments and consideration at its next session (para. 19 and Appendix VIII).
- left unchanged the *Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* while continuing to request comments on proposals for amendments to the *Priority List* for consideration at its next session (para. 103 and Appendix IX).
- set up the following timeframes for completion of work of the standards and related texts under consideration in the Step Procedure in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission:
 - *draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes including draft Section 3 - Provisions concerning sizing*: Finalization by the 31st Session of the Commission (2008) (para. 44).
 - *proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples*: Finalization by the 33rd Session of the Commission (2010) (para. 72).
 - *Proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava*: Finalization by the 31st Session of the Commission (2008) (para. 82).
 - *proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards*: Finalization by the 33rd Session of the Commission (2010) (para. 94).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS -----	page iii
REPORT OF THE 13TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES -----	page 1
STATUS OF WORK -----	page 14
	<u>Paragraphs</u>
INTRODUCTION -----	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION -----	2
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1) -----	3 - 5
MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 2a) -----	6 - 7
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2b)	
- Organization for the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) -----	8
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) -----	9 - 11
UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2c) -----	12
PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2d) -----	13 - 19
CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AT STEP 7	
DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES (Agenda item 3a) -----	20 - 23
DRAFT SECTIONS 3 - PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING AND 4.2 - SIZE TOLERANCES (draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes) (Agenda item 3b) -----	24 - 44
DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TABLE GRAPES (Agenda item 3c) -----	45 - 47
CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 4	
PROPOSED DRAFT SECTIONS 2.1.2 - MATURITY REQUIREMENTS AND 3.1 - MINIMUM BUNCH WEIGHT (draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes) (Agenda item 4a) -----	48 - 60
PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES (Agenda 4b) -----	61 - 72
PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA (Agenda item 4c) -----	73 - 82
PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR THE QUALITY CONTROL OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 4d) -----	83 - 94
PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 5) -----	95 - 104
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 6) -----	105
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda item 7) -----	106
Appendices	
<u>Appendix I</u> - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS -----	page 15
<u>Appendix II</u> - DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES -----	page 26
<u>Appendix III</u> - DRAFT SECTION 3 - PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING (draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes) -----	page 30
<u>Appendix IV</u> - DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TABLE GRAPES -----	page 31
<u>Appendix V</u> - PROPOSED DRAFT SECTIONS 2.1.2 - MATURITY REQUIREMENTS AND 3.1 - MINIMUM BUNCH WEIGHT (draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes) -----	page 35
<u>Appendix VI</u> - PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA -----	page 36

Appendix VII - PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR
THE QUALITY CONTROL OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES ----- page 40

Appendix VIII - PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES ----- page 50

Appendix IX - PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES ----- page 58

INTRODUCTION

1. The 13th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was held in Mexico City from 25 to 29 September 2006 at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. The Chairperson of the Committee, CP Miguel Aguilar Romo, appointed Lic. Carlos R. Berzunza Sánchez, Director of International Standardization, Secretary of Economy, to chair the Session on his behalf. The Session was attended by delegates from 34 Member countries, one Member Organization and observers from 4 international organizations. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. His Excellency Lic. Sergio Alejandro García de Alba Zepeda, Secretary of Economy of Mexico, opened the Session. Dr. Irma Gómez Cavazos, Head of the Economical Relations and International Cooperation Unit, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico and Mr. Norman Bellino, FAO Representative in Mexico also addressed the Committee.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)¹

3. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.

4. The Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of Agenda Item 2 (d) - Proposed Layout for Codex Standards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables after Agenda Item 4, on the understanding that it would be more effective to consider the Proposed Layout after concluding the technical discussion on the draft and proposed draft Standards under Agenda Items 3 and 4.

5. The delegation of the European Community presented CRD 1 (Provisional Annotated Agenda) on the division of competence between the European Community and its Member States according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 2a)²

6. The Committee acknowledged that the document was presented mainly for information therefore, no action needed to be taken on the matters contained therein except for the recommendation of the Commission to Codex committees and task forces to propose a timeframe for all items under consideration in the Step Procedure that were adopted as new work prior to 2004. This request would be considered under the relevant Agenda items.

7. The Committee noted that the 28th Session of the Commission (July 2005) adopted the proposed draft Codex Standard for Rambutan at Step 5/8 and approved the elaboration of a Standard for Bitter Cassava as new work for the Committee (see Agenda Item 4c). The Committee also noted that the Commission agreed to delete the footnotes to Sections 1 - Definition of Produce and 7.2 - Non-retail Containers on the notification of acceptance throughout Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables for consistency with its decision to abolish the Acceptance Procedure. As regards the revision (partial) of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, the Committee noted that the Commission agreed that this request should be considered in a general context and that the Codex Committee on General Principles was considering the revision of the *Guide to the Procedure for the Revision and Amendment of Codex Standards* in order to clarify and streamline the procedures to be applied when addressing amendments to or revision of adopted Codex standards and related texts.

MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2b)³

ORGANIZATION FOR THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

8. The Observer from the OECD informed the Committee about recent developments in the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables since the last Session of the Committee. The following was noted:

¹ CX/FFV 06/13/1 and EC Annotated Agenda; Division of Competence between the European Community and its Member States according to the Rule of Procedure II paragraph 5 of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CRD 1).

² CX/FFV 06/13/2.

³ CX/FFV 06/13/3.

- The Council Decision C(2006)95 revising the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables had been adopted in July 2006. As part of this revision, a reference to the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme was included so that also the relevant standards adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, once approved by the Plenary Meeting, shall be applied under the “Scheme” to the products specified in Annex I to this Decision, at the export stage, when these products enter into international trade between countries participating in the “Scheme”. The standards approved by the Plenary Meeting could be also used in the elaboration of explanatory brochures.
- The 63rd Session of the Plenary Meeting of the Scheme (November 2005) approved the revised Action Plan for the Reform of the Scheme which encouraged good relationship with the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables and other relevant Codex committees.
- Explanatory brochures on a number of fruits and vegetables and guidelines on objective tests to determine the quality of fruits and vegetables and dry and dried products had been published and were available at the OECD Scheme website. Other explanatory brochures for fruits and vegetables were ongoing and expected to be completed by the end of 2007. The explanatory brochure on table grapes would be published shortly.
- The OECD continued to sponsor training courses and other capacity building related activities, such as workshops, in the area of fruits and vegetables in cooperation with Member countries and other organizations.
- The 64th session of the OECD Plenary Meeting would be held on 30 November – 1 December 2006 in Paris. At this session, the Plenary Meeting would continue to make progress on implementing the reforms of the Scheme covering the period 2004-2008.
- The next Head of National Inspection Services Meeting of the Scheme would be held on 5-8 December 2006 in Agadir, Morocco.

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (UNECE)

9. The UNECE Secretariat informed the Committee on the main outcome of the discussions at the 61st Session of the Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards (October 2005) and the 52nd Session of its Specialized Section on the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (May 2006).

10. In addition, the UNECE Secretariat informed the Committee that a major independent evaluation of UNECE took place, and that one of the results of that process was a request to initiate discussions with the OECD for the concentration of activities on agricultural quality standards in the UNECE. This had resulted in a decision to develop a draft Transition Plan for approval within the UNECE and then to transmit it to the OECD Scheme responsible for the work on explanatory brochures (based on UNECE standards) for their consideration.

11. The UNECE Secretariat pointed out that the Specialized Section agreed that, subject to the acceptance of the Plan by the OECD Scheme meeting in November 2006, the UNECE Secretariat should start working on explanatory brochures without delay, as well as cooperating in the work on OECD brochures that were under preparation.

UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2c)⁴

12. The Committee noted that UNECE standards, as contained in working document CX/FFV 06/13/4, were made available as references for the development of corresponding Codex standards as directed by the Executive Committee⁵. The Committee agreed that the UNECE standards would be taken into account when discussing the relevant Agenda items.

PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2d)⁶

13. The Committee recalled that the purpose of the Layout was to ensure consistency as regards format and standardized text for common provisions usually applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

⁴ CX/FFV 06/13/4.

⁵ ALINORM 97/3, para. 15.

⁶ CX/FFV 06/13/5; and comments from Mexico (CX/FFV 06/13/5 – Add. 1); European Community (CRD 14).

14. The Codex Secretariat introduced the document and explained the changes made based on the decisions taken at the last Session of the Committee. In addition, two new sections on food additives and methods of analysis and sampling were included for alignment with the format of Codex commodity standards as set out in the Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual⁷. The Secretariat noted that the Layout was a guidance when the Committee was developing individual standards for a given produce, and that sections or provisions indicated therein might be omitted or adjusted vis-à-vis the peculiarities of the produce.

15. A number of delegations provided general comments on the proposed Layout as follows:

- A new section concerning terminology after the introductory statement should be included in order to promote common understanding of the terms used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.
- The Layout should provide guidance on how to approach provisions in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables, for instance, sizing provisions, as this issue was a matter of intensive discussion in a number of standards under consideration by the Committee. Furthermore, in certain sections such as sizing, specific provisions e.g. size code should be included to facilitate the development of the Standard.
- Allowances for exemptions of uniformity provisions in the case of packages containing mixed varieties should be considered as it was becoming a common industry practice.
- Minimum requirements should be accompanied by a table of tolerances with fixed values to avoid the use of normative languages like “slight”, “practically”, etc. which might be subject to different interpretations worldwide. Some provisions such as sizing should be flexible and optional.
- Provisions for “firmness” should be incorporated as it applied to a number of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.
- Definitions for terms commonly used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should be incorporated for easy reference.

16. The delegation of Canada, supported by some countries, questioned the mandatory labelling requirement for country of origin in the labelling Section as, in accordance with the Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Pre-packaged Foods (CODEX STAN 1-1985), country of origin of the food shall be declared if its omission would mislead or deceive the consumer. These delegations pointed out that countries had their own right to establish country of origin labelling in their national regulations but that they would not support mandatory country of origin labelling. These delegations also recommended that the Committee should carefully look into this provision and follow-up on the discussion that, in a more general framework, was ongoing in the Codex Committee on Food Labelling and the Codex Alimentarius Commission. A Delegation indicated that country of origin was an useful provision due to quarantine concerns of certain countries and for consumers concerned about the quality of fresh fruits and vegetables. The Codex Secretariat indicated that provisions concerning country of origin labelling applied across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

17. Some delegations questioned the safety provisions in Sections 7 (Food Additives) through 10 (Methods of Analysis and Sampling) as they did not relate to the quality of fresh fruits and vegetables. The Codex Secretariat informed that, although the Committee did not discuss safety provisions for fresh fruits and vegetables, these sections applied across Codex commodity standards by referencing to the Codex general texts developed by the relevant safety horizontal committees and were in accordance with the format for Codex commodity standards⁷. In addition, the wording in Sections 8 (Contaminants) and 9 (Hygiene) were standardized text applying throughout Codex commodity standards.

18. The delegation of European Community indicated that it needed more time to examine the Layout, due to the late distribution of the document, and informed the Committee that their preliminary comments were contained in CRD 14.

Conclusion

19. Due to time constraints, the Committee suspended the discussion on the Layout and agreed to attach the proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables to the report of its session for further comments and consideration at its next session. (Appendix VIII).

⁷ Format for Codex Commodity Standards, Section II, Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, 15th Edition, pages 88-91.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AT STEP 7

DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES (Agenda Item 3a)⁸

20. The 12th Session of the Committee considered the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes and agreed on a number of changes. The Committee recognized the important progress and decisions made on the major sections of the draft Standard. However, the Committee decided to retain the draft Standard at Step 7, with the exception of Sections 3 - Provisions concerning Sizing and 4.2 - Size Tolerances, on the understanding that additional comments would not be requested on the agreed sections.

21. This decision was taken with the understanding that the next session of the Committee would restrict its discussion to the finalization of Sections 3 and 4.2 so that a single document could be forwarded to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8.

22. The Committee noted the comments from the delegation of India in relation to the deletion of the words "and development" in Section 2.2.2 – Class I as it was a defect not appropriate for this class which was difficult to measure thus having the potential to become a technical barrier to trade.

23. The Committee agreed to introduce consequential amendments arising from the decision taken during the discussion of sizing and tolerance requirements (see Agenda Item 3b).

DRAFT SECTIONS 3 – PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING AND 4.2 – SIZE TOLERANCES (*draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes*) (Agenda Item 3b)⁹

24. The Committee based its discussion on the outcome of the deliberations of the Working Group on Tomatoes that met prior to the meeting as indicated in CRD 12, which collected the proposals made by the delegations of the European Community (CRD 12/Proposal B), United States of America (CRD 12/Proposal C) and Mexico/Cuba (CRD 12/Proposal A).

25. The delegation of the European Community, as leader of the Working Group on Tomatoes, informed the Committee that considerable discussions had been held on sizing provisions and their tolerances, however, the Working Group could not reach an agreement on the approach that should be taken as regards sizing provisions in the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes.

26. The Committee noted that two main approaches were tabled for consideration namely:

- (1) having no specific provisions concerning sizing but only size tolerances to ensure uniformity in the package (CRD 12/Proposal C) or
- (2) keeping sizing provisions in the Standard (CRD 12/Proposals A & B).

If sizing provisions were to be retained, two different approaches were presented for consideration namely:

- (2a) to keep the size code table with fixed values for a range of maximum/minimum diameters with the corresponding tolerances (CRD 12/Proposal A).
- (2b) to set maximum/minimum limitations for range of tomato sizes in the same package with the corresponding tolerances (CRD 12/Proposal B).

27. The Committee agreed to consider the advantages of each proposal in order to determine how to proceed further.

Approaches to Sizing Provisions

Proposals A, B and C

28. Some delegations were of the view that sizing provisions and tolerances should not be included in an international Standard as trade practices differed across regions or countries and therefore, the setting of such provisions could impede the introduction of new varieties while having the potential to become a technical barrier to trade. These delegations supported that such provisions should be left to the industry practices.

⁸ ALINORM 06/29/35-Appendix II and comments from India (CRD 4).

⁹ CX/FFV 06/13/6 and comments from Australia, United States of America, Switzerland, European Community (CX/FFV 06/13/6-Add.1); Kenya (CRD 2); Mexico (CRD 3); India (CRD 4); Thailand (CRD 5); Cuba (CRD 9); Report of the Working Group on Tomatoes (CRD 12); Explanation of grading possibilities with Proposal B (CRD 13); Proposals presented by Cuba and Mexico (CRD 15); US proposal for tomato sizing (CRD 18) and EC proposal for tomato sizing (CRD 19).

29. The delegation of the EC recognized that mentioning different sizing methods was useful guidance for the elaboration of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and in line with the purposes of the Codex Alimentarius. However, the purpose of facilitating and harmonizing trade would be jeopardized if such lists were not accompanied by provisions on the methods listed. The EC delegation reminded the Committee that including only a list of sizing methods without provisions in this Standard would allow countries to create technical barriers to trade.

30. Some other delegations indicated that a sizing code table was important especially for countries where legislation did not exist and Codex texts were taken as a guidance to built up national regulations. These delegations supported the introduction of a sizing code table to ensure uniformity in the package and to promote international harmonization. They also indicated that national and regional standards might contain different sizing provisions and tolerances which could make it difficult to get an agreement on a unique sizing table, however, they emphasized that the goal of Codex standards were to promote international harmonization in order to facilitate fair trade practices.

Proposals B and C

31. The delegation of the United States indicated that, in order to accommodate different countries needs, it proposed the use of an existing size code table along with the proposal put forward by the European Community provided that a maximum difference of 15 mm be allowed if the diameter of the smallest fruit was under 70 mm and that other sizing practices such as count or weight be also included as this was a established practice for trading tomatoes in North America. Some delegations supported the inclusion of the count code and sizing by weight to provide for flexibility in the Standard and explained that 10 mm was too tight to allow for flexibility due to seasonal variations in the harvesting of tomatoes.

32. The delegation of the European Community proposed to apply (i) 12 mm instead of 15 mm for fruits smaller than 70 mm or (ii) a range of 10 mm for fruits less than 40 mm and 15 mm for fruits between 40 and 70 mm. In addition, the Delegation indicated that the count code was a type of sizing by weight and that both practices were already covered by the EC proposal and thus, there was not need to specifically mention them in the Standard. However, as a compromised solution, the EC would agree to specifically reference these provisions in the Standard provided they comply with the remaining sizing provisions in Section 3.

33. The Committee could not come to an agreement in regard to the limits allowed for tomatoes below 70 mm and the inclusion of the other sizing practices and decided to put both figures, 10 and 15 mm, in square brackets for tomatoes with a diameter less than 70 mm. The Committee further decided to place the provisions for sizing by count and weight plus the requirement for the remaining sizing provisions in Section 3 in square brackets for further consideration at its next Session.

Proposal A

34. The Committee also considered the additional approach concerning Proposal A in CRD 12 namely, the possibility of retaining the size code table as an alternative sizing provision in the Standard. In order to accommodate other Codex member needs, the Committee agreed to retain a simplified size code table based on the corresponding UNECE Standard for Tomatoes.

Maximum/Minimum Sizes for Tomatoes – “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes

35. The delegation of Switzerland indicated that the elimination of the minimum size for tomatoes might create confusion in international trade. In particular, for “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes, this elimination would allow for larger size of tomatoes to be classified as “cherry” or “cocktail”. A number of delegations indicated that there was an added value for these types of tomatoes on the market and that this was a quality characteristic that deserved to be retained in the Standard. These delegations also indicated that “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes were extensively traded and that establishing a maximum size limit would help to ensure fair trade practices.

36. Other delegations expressed that there was neither definition nor scientific basis to determine a maximum/minimum diameter for these types of tomatoes which could vary according to regions/countries. These delegations supported the deletion to any reference to maximum/minimum sizes for the different commercial types of tomatoes cited in Section 1 of the Standard. The Observer from the OECD proposed the elaboration of explanatory guidelines for recognizing the commercial types of tomatoes.

37. The delegation of the European Community proposed to include a maximum diameter of 30 mm for “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes. A number of delegations expressed that they had greater maximum limits of up to 40 or 45 mm for these types of tomatoes and therefore could not agree on the proposed 30 mm.

38. The Committee could not come to an agreement in regard to the retention of provisions for a maximum diameter for “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes and therefore it agreed to leave provisions for these types of tomatoes in square brackets with two figures of 30 and 40 mm as maximum diameter for further comments and consideration at its next session.

Common Sizing and Tolerance Provisions

39. The Committee acknowledged the commonalities between the different sizing proposals presented for consideration and agreed that sizing: was determined by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section of the fruit, did not apply to trusses of tomatoes and was not compulsory for Class II. In addition, Section 4.2 on size tolerances was also common to all proposals and therefore, the Committee agreed that these provisions could be included in the body of the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes.

Other considerations

40. However, the Committee noted that there were still remaining matters in regard sizing that would not allow the advancement of the draft Standard for final adoption by the Commission at Step 8. It therefore decided to continue to consider further sizing provisions at its next Session.

41. The delegation of the European Community, among other delegations, pointed out that they had made every possible effort to finalize the draft Standard at the current session and expressed its disappointment that the Committee was unable to accomplish this task.

STATUS OF THE DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES (AT STEP 7) AND ITS DRAFT SECTION 3 – PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING AND DRAFT SECTION 4.2 – SIZE TOLERANCES (AT STEP 6) (Agenda Items 3a and 3b)

42. The Committee agreed to retain the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes at Step 7. In taking this decision, the Committee decided to incorporate the agreed sizing provisions (Section 3) and size tolerances (Section 4.2) into the main body of the draft Standard on the understanding that comments would not be requested neither on the draft Standard nor on the agreed sizing and size tolerance provisions (Appendix II).

43. The Committee agreed to return the remaining sizing provisions to Step 6 for further comments, in particular the sections in square brackets, and consideration at its next session (Appendix III).

44. The Committee concluded that the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes – including sizing provisions - could be finalized by the 31st Session of the Commission in 2008.

DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TABLE GRAPES (Agenda Item 3c)¹⁰

45. The 12th Session of the Committee considered the draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes and made a number of consequential amendments to bring the text into line with previous decisions taken applicable across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. The Committee reasserted its previous decision to retain the draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes at Step 7 pending finalization of the sections on maturity requirements and minimum bunch weight with the understanding that no additional comments would be requested on the agreed sections.

46. This decision was taken on the understanding that the next session of the Committee would focus its discussion on the finalization of Sections 2.1.2 - Maturity Requirements and 3.1 - Minimum Bunch Weight so that a complete document could be forwarded to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption at Step 8.

47. However, in view of the decisions taken on the provisions for maturity requirements and sizing (minimum bunch weight) a number of consequential amendments were agreed to by the Committee which are described under Agenda Item 4a.

¹⁰ ALINORM 05/28/35-Appendix IV.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS**AT STEP 4****PROPOSED DRAFT SECTIONS 2.1.2 - MATURITY REQUIREMENTS AND 3.1 – MINIMUM BUNCH WEIGHT (*draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes*) (Agenda Item 4a)¹¹**

48. The 12th Session of the Committee agreed to reconvene the Working Group led by Chile to revise sections 2.1.2 – Maturity Requirements and 3.1 – Minimum Bunch Weight based on a simplified approach by identifying two minimum maturity parameters i.e. soluble solids content and sugar/acid ratio and a single minimum bunch weight for all varieties. In view of this decision, the Committee agreed to discontinue work on a list of small berry varieties. Consequential amendments to other sections of the draft Standard should be also considered when revising these sections.

49. The Committee based its discussion on the outcome of the deliberations of the Working Group on Table Grapes that met in Santiago, Chile (February 2006) as indicated in Annex I to CX/FFV 06/13/7. The delegation of Chile, as leading country of the Working Group on Table Grapes, gave a summary account of the main issues discussed in the physical meeting of Working Group prior to this session as indicated in CRD 11.

Section 2.1.2 – Maturity Requirements

50. The Committee had an extensive discussion on the opportunity to follow a more general approach (Proposal A) or to allow for the inclusion of exceptions to the general requirements for specific varieties (Proposal B). Most of delegations were in favour of a more horizontal approach by setting threshold levels for maturity parameters (°Brix levels and sugar/acid ratio) applying across table grape varieties traded internationally. This approach would avoid the inclusion of list of varieties and the maintenance of such a list. Other delegations felt that Proposal A did not account for the differences in maturity levels and special attributes for certain table grape varieties due to climatic/soil condition, production zones, etc. These delegations felt that the general requirements should allow for exceptions in order to ensure fair trade practices. The Observer from the OIV referred to the information contained in CRD 8 which indicated that it would be difficult to set minimum Brix levels based on varieties/group of varieties as this parameter might vary for the same varieties throughout the world depending on the climatic/soil/etc. conditions of the growing area and that if this was to be the case a more reliable parameter could be the sugar/acid ratio.

51. The Committee agreed that Proposal A generally covered the requirements to ensure maturity of table grapes. It was mentioned that further work on allowances for certain varieties should be undertaken and that the mechanism to determine their consideration and possible inclusion as exceptions to the general maturity requirements could be examined in the future.

52. Because of the decision of the Committee not to allow exceptions or exemptions from minimum maturity requirements agreed to by the Committee, the delegation of the United States expressed its reservation to the minimum maturity requirements for table grapes and stated that the uniform approach applied to the minimum maturity requirements and the values therein, indicated in the draft Standard, did not correctly reflect maturity requirements for all table grape varieties, and the practices of the table grape industry. The delegation of India also expressed its reservation to the decision of the Committee.

Section 3.1 – Minimum Bunch Weight

53. The Committee had an exchange of views on the need to retain such a provision in the Standard. Some delegations were of the opinion that this type of requirement should be left to the market forces as it had no impact on the safety/eating quality of the product and depended on a number of factors that made it difficult to set up a minimum value applicable internationally without a risk to become a technical barrier to trade. These delegations were of the view that, if such a provision was included in the Standard, it should be of advisory nature to allow for flexibility in the Standard. Other delegations were of the view that a minimum bunch weight was necessary to guarantee the quality of the product and that there were country regulations which required the specific declaration of the minimum bunch weight. Therefore, harmonization of this provision in an international Standard was necessary. The Committee agreed to retain provisions for minimum bunch weight in the Standard.

¹¹ CX/FFV 06/13/7 and comments from Australia, India, Peru, Switzerland and European Community (CX/FFV 06/13/7-Add.1); Kenya (CRD 2); Mexico (CRD 3); Thailand (CRD 5); Information presented by the OIV (CRD 8); Cuba (CRD 9); Report of the Working Group on Table Grapes (CRD 11).

54. The Committee considered the appropriateness of setting the minimum bunch weight at 75 or 100 gr. Some delegations felt that 100 gr was an appropriate figure to guarantee uniformity in the package. They indicated that this figure represented common trading practices. Other delegations noted that the difference between the two values were negligible in terms of ensuring fair trade practices and that a minimum bunch weight of 75 gr corresponded to the minimum weight for the small berry varieties in the previous sizing scale. The delegation of India stated that it supported minimum bunch weights for large/small berries in the different classes of table grapes. In view of this, the Committee considered the possibility to refer to a range of values based on the quality class/variety (large/ small berry fruits). Several delegations felt that a range of values did not provide for harmonization of this provision. The Committee therefore agreed to retain the minimum bunch weight at 75 gr as a compromised solution.

Section 3.1 – Minimum Bunch Weight

Section 4.2.3 – Size Tolerances (for all classes)

55. The Committee had an extensive discussion on the interpretation of the terms “institutional”/“catering” packages and the introduction of bunches below 75 gr to adjust the weight as well as the tolerances allowed in this case. A number of delegations noted that tolerances should be set by number of bunches and not by percentages of weight of bunches to ensure compliance with the minimum size and uniformity in the package especially when considering large-fruited varieties. Other delegations indicated that tolerances by number of bunches were not practicable in terms of inspection and that would not work for small packages below 1.5 kg. Some delegations noted that this concern was already covered in the size tolerances for the different classes and for consistency, sizing tolerances should be kept in percentages which was easier to harmonize worldwide. Those delegations favouring tolerances by number of bunches noted that Section 4.2.3 referred to packages destined to the final consumer which required different tolerances than those setting for packages in Sections 4.2.1 through 4.2.2 of the draft Standard.

56. In view of the above discussion, a number of delegations indicated that provisions in Codex standards were set for international trade and not for domestic practices. In this regard, other delegations noted that “institutional”/“catering” trade was a growing worldwide trading practice not only referring to distribution of food at domestic level (e.g. schools, hospitals, etc.) but also for foods shipping overseas (e.g. airlines, cruisers, etc.) and therefore, it needed to be regulated in an international Standard. Some other delegations indicated that consumer packages would also need to be harmonized on international grounds.

57. As a compromise solution, the Committee agreed to delete provisions for tolerances for packages not exceeding 1.5 kg in Section 4.2.3 and to amend Section 3.1 to exempted packages intended for single servings from the minimum bunch weight requirement without referring to types of packages.

58. However, in order to ensure that this exception would not be used to round the minimum size requirement by having pieces of grapes attached in small bunches to complete the weight, the Committee agreed to introduce relevant provisions under the uniformity and labelling sections by establishing (a) separate provisions for a slight variation in size uniformity in Class I as this was the most common class traded internationally (Section 5.1) and (b) by setting mandatory labelling requirements for institutional packages containing packages intended for single servings with bunches below 75 grs (Section 6.2.4).

59. In addition, consequential amendments due to the changes in the sizing and the tolerances provisions in Sections 3.1 and 4.2.3 were introduced in the draft Standard by deleting the tolerances by quality classes (Sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.2) and setting a single sizing tolerance for all classes at 10% of the specified size as the sizing scale based on quality classes/varieties was replaced by a single sizing requirement corresponding to the minimum bunch weight.

STATUS OF THE DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TABLE GRAPES (AT STEP 7) AND ITS PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 2.1.2 – MATURITY REQUIREMENTS AND PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 3.1 – MINIMUM BUNCH WEIGHT (AT STEP 4) (Agenda Items 3c and 4a)

60. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix IV). The Committee further agreed to forward the proposed draft Section 2.1.2 – Maturity Requirements and proposed draft Section 3.1 – Minimum Bunch Weight to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) (Appendix V) on the understanding that, once both documents had been adopted by the Commission, the provisions for maturity requirements and sizing (minimum bunch weight) would be incorporated into the body of the Standard so that one single document can be published as a Codex Standard for Table Grapes.

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES (Agenda Item 4b)¹²

61. The 12th Session of the Committee made some general and specific comments on the proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples. However, in view of time constraints and the extensive comments received, the Committee suspended the consideration of the document and returned to Step 2 while reconvening the Working Group led by the United States of America to revise the text.

62. The delegation of the United States, as leading country of the Working Group on Apples, introduced document CX/FFV 06/13/8, highlighting the main points of discussion held at the physical meeting of the Working Group of Apples in Santiago, Chile (February 2006).

63. The Committee made general comments on a number of key provisions as follows:

Section 2.1 – Minimum Requirements

64. Some delegations questioned the inclusion of provisions allowing the stalk to be missing as this should be regarded as a defect that might cause decay of the fruit. It was noted that apples were separated from the plant at the level of the peduncle which remained adhered to the fruit, being therefore part of the fruit, so its absence could be caused by inadequate harvesting or over ripeness. Other delegations supported the retention of this provision as the stalk may be missing due to normal harvesting practices and transport conditions and that, provided that the break was clean and the adjacent skin was not damaged, apples without stalk should not be excluded from the international market. In addition, there were apple varieties that could easily lose the stalk without implying any damage to the fruit.

65. Some delegations questioned the exclusion of provisions for water core as, although this was considered as a desirable quality characteristic in certain situations, it was regarded as a defect in others, so provisions in this respect should be included to cover both varieties. In this regard, some delegations indicated that the terms “sound” and “free of any foreign smell and/or taste” already took care of “water core”.

66. Some delegations requested the inclusion of provisions for firmness as this was an important attribute in ensuring that quality of the produce remained in good condition until it reached the final consumer particularly in cases where the shipment or transit was for a long period. Other delegations proposed to include the term “disease” when addressing pests under this Section. The Codex Secretariat informed that this was standardized text usually applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and that the inclusion of “disease” had been previously considered by the Committee which noted that this term was already included in the definition of pests in the relevant IPPC phytosanitary specification¹³.

Section 2.2 – Maturity Requirements**Section 3 – Provisions concerning Sizing**

67. The Committee noted different views on the possibility of establishing a link between the size and the maturity of the fruit in order to avoid immature fruit entering into the international market. A number of delegations considered that it was not necessary to specify a minimum size. These delegations indicated that there was a market for small apple varieties with a size below the minimum recommended but having completed their ripeness process under appropriate conditions. Some delegations were of the view that Brix level was not a reliable parameter considering the varieties (e.g. large acid fruited varieties as opposed to small sweet fruited varieties) for which in some cases it would be more appropriate to measure other parameters for the determination of maturity. These delegations indicated that maturity parameters such as Brix levels could vary subject to the growing area, climatic conditions, etc. In addition, the starch content or the firmness of the fruit could be also considered as valid maturity parameters depending on the variety or the state of development of the fruit. Other delegations indicated that when there was a high demand of apples there might be a possibility of placing immature fruit on the market and that the Brix level was up to date the most common parameter to determine maturity of the fruit. This was the reason why these delegations adhered to the proposal not to eliminate the Brix level until other mechanisms to define the maturity of the fruit were determined. The delegation of Thailand pointed out that maturity indexes of each variety needed to be determined.

¹² CX/FFV 06/13/8 and comments from Argentina, Australia, India, Iran, New Zealand and Switzerland (CX/FFV 06/13/8-Add.1); Kenya (CRD 2); Thailand (CRD 5); Mexico (CRD 3); Malaysia (CRD 6); European Community (CRD 7) and Cuba (CRD 9).

¹³ ALINORM 05/28/35, para. 24.

68. The Committee was informed about ongoing researches in the European Community, the US and New Zealand on the correlation between the size of the apples and the maturity of the fruit. Some delegations noted that, as currently drafted, the Minimum Brix level was mandatory for sizing provisions while optional in the maturity requirements. The Committee concluded that it would not be appropriate to discuss maturity requirements until the relationship between the maturity (Section 2.2) and the size (Section 3) was resolved.

Section 5.1 – Uniformity

69. The Committee had an exchange of views on the 3 proposals tabled for consideration. The Committee noted that Proposal (1) relayed on uniformity provisions to ensure compliance with sizing requirements while Proposal (2) and (3) elaborated more on the numerical values to ensure uniformity in the package. Most of delegations favoured Proposal (3), particularly the first paragraph, with the exception of the words in parenthesis, and considered that the remaining provisions would need to be further considered.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES

70. The Committee acknowledged the important progress made on the revision of the proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples. The Committee agreed to continue to discuss this matter at its next session. Meanwhile, it decided to reconvene the Working Group¹⁴ led by the United States to continue to work on the revision of the document based on the written comments submitted to this session and consideration at the Plenary with a view to producing a revised version that would be circulated for comments at Step 3 and consideration by the next session of the Committee.

71. The Committee noted that there might be a need for a physical meeting of the Working Group and if so, it would be held in accordance with the Guidelines on Physical Working Groups as set out in the Procedural Manual of the Commission¹⁵. The Codex Secretariat indicated that working groups were opened to all Codex Members and Observers.

72. The Committee concluded that the proposed draft Standard could be finalized by the 33rd Session of the Commission in 2010.

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA (Agenda Item 4c)¹⁶

73. The Committee noted that the 28th Session of the Commission (July 2005) agreed to initiate work on the standardization of bitter varieties of cassava, as a separate Standard, with the understanding that the Committee might consider, at a later stage, the possibility of having a single Standard applicable to both sweet and bitter types of cassava, consistent with the Codex approach to develop more horizontal and inclusive standards when possible¹⁷.

74. The delegation of Tonga, as leading country of the Working Group on Bitter Cassava, informed the Committee that the Working Group, which met during the current session, revised all comments received in response to document CX/FFV 06/13/9 and based on these comments prepared a revised version presented in CRD 17. The Delegation informed about changes made in the document and emphasized that, in order to ensure harmonization of provisions, the Codex Standard for Sweet Cassava was used for the initial drafting of the corresponding on bitter cassava.

75. The delegation of Tonga indicated that, based on the consumption data of bitter cassava varieties that had been consumed for many years in Tonga and Fiji, the range of safe levels of hydrogen cyanide for bitter cassava was recommended to be set between 50 and 200 mg/kg hydrogen cyanide on a fresh weight basis. The delegation of India proposed this range to be set between 40 and 140 mg/kg and that this value should be expressed in cyanide equivalent.

76. The delegation of Fiji indicated that the consumption of raw cassava varieties containing a maximum amount of 212 mg/kg of hydrogen cyanide did not pose any health problems in Fiji. In this regard, the Delegation noted that the name “sweet” in the Codex Standard for Sweet Cassava was not accurate as cassava did not contain much sugar while the relevant factor was the content of hydrogen cyanide for which the term “bitter” accounted for.

¹⁴ Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, India, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, South Africa, Thailand, European Community, UNECE and IFAP.

¹⁵ Guidelines on Physical Working Groups, Section II, Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, 15th Edition, pages 61-63.

¹⁶ CX/FFV 06/13/9 and comments from Australia, European Community (CX/FFV 06/13/9-Add.1); India (CRD 4); Malaysia (CRD 6) and Report of the Working Group on Bitter Cassava – proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava - as revised by the Working Group (CRD 17).

¹⁷ ALINORM 05/41, paras 99-101.

77. The delegation of Switzerland noted that the risk of consumption of high levels of hydrogen cyanide in different varieties of bitter cassava had not been yet evaluated and thus more research was needed before the Standard could be finalized by the Committee.

78. Several delegations pointed out that both standards were almost identical except for certain provisions (e.g. content of hydrogen cyanide and sizing provisions) and suggested to limit the consideration of the Committee only to those divergent sections with a view to including these provisions into the Codex Standard for Sweet Cassava in order to have a single Standard for these products.

79. The Committee noted that deviations from the Codex Standard for Sweet Cassava related mainly to the content of hydrogen cyanide and the size for this type of cassava. The Committee also noted a few changes under the minimum requirements to specify that the permitted substances to prolong the shelf life of the produce should be in accordance with the food additive provisions of the General Standard for Food Additives and to include additional provisions for the stalk end of the root to allow for bitter cassava varieties without stalk.

80. The Committee agreed to put in square bracket the footnote on the content of hydrogen cyanide in order to get more information on safe levels of this compound in different varieties of bitter cassava. The Committee also agreed to place in square brackets the sizing table for further comments. The Committee further agreed to put the term “edible quality” in square brackets (Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 – Classes I and II respectively) as this was a standardized language applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables and justification on technical grounds to apply this qualifier should be provided.

81. In addition, the Committee agreed to establish an electronic Working Group¹⁸ led by Tonga to gather information on consumption and levels of hydrogen cyanide in different varieties of bitter cassava in various countries in order to facilitate the revision of the Standard. The Committee noted that there might be a need for a physical meeting of the Working Group to facilitate the finalization of the Standard. The Codex Secretariat noted that physical meetings of working groups should be held in accordance with the Guidelines on Physical Working Groups as set out in the Procedural Manual of the Commission¹⁴ and that working groups were opened to all Codex members and observers.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA

82. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix VI). The Committee concluded that the Standard could be finalized by the 31st session of the Commission in 2008.

PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE QUALITY CONTROL OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES AT STEP 3 (Agenda Item 4d)¹⁹

83. In view of time constraints, the 12th Session of the Committee suspended the consideration of the proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Quality Control of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables and agreed to return it to Step 2 for redrafting by a Working Group led by Canada for comments and consideration at its next session.

84. The delegation of Canada introduced the document and indicated that the Working Group revised the document taking into consideration all the comments received. The Delegation pointed out the following broader issues addressed in the introductory paragraphs:

- the Scope of the Guidelines was clarified to indicate that this document specifically dealt with inspection of quality factors contained in quality standards and did not include parameters for health/safety inspection or food manufacturing practices;
- the introduction attempted to clarify that these Guidelines did not include parameters for the inspection of quality management systems, although the Control Certificate contained in Annex II could also apply in this regard.

85. The Delegation indicated that some countries expressed their concerns regarding the status of the Guidelines, it was therefore necessary to ensure that they would be used as guidance rather than an official inspection document.

¹⁸ Australia, Fiji, India, Jamaica, New Zealand, Thailand and Trinidad & Tobago.

¹⁹ CX/FFV 06/13/10 and comments from Argentina, Australia, New Zealand (CX/FFV 06/13/10-Add.1); Kenya (CRD 2); Mexico (CRD 3); India (CRD 4); Thailand (CRD 5); OECD document including Annex II on operating rules for the conformity checks of produce exported under the “Scheme” (CRD 10).

86. The Observer from the OECD noted that the OECD had made available CRD 10 containing the Council Decision C(2006)95 revising the OECD “Scheme” for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables. The Observer indicated that Annex II to the Council Decision contained operating rules for the conformity checks of produce exported under the “Scheme” and procedure for the extension of the OECD “Scheme”. The Observer also noted that the document described methods for inspection, sampling procedures, implementation of conformity checks and how to deal and report control results while the Appendices contained an example of a Model Conformity Certificate and the explanatory notes to facilitate its use.

87. The delegation of the European Community indicated that Annex II and the Model Conformity Certificate in the OECD document was quite similar to the Codex Guidelines and asked for the possibility of making a cross reference in order to avoid duplication of work. This proposal was supported by a number of delegations. The delegation of Mexico indicated the importance of making a cross reference between both the Codex Guidelines and the OECD document.

88. The Codex Secretariat clarified that some Codex committees, like the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling, used cross references to documents elaborated by other relevant organizations such as IUPAC when appropriate.

89. Several delegations, while appreciating the valuable work done by the OECD Scheme, noted that membership of OECD Scheme was not the same as Codex and that Codex members should have an opportunity to study the Guidelines as they also had their own inspection and certification procedures. These delegations supported the development of the Codex Guidelines for the Quality Control of Fresh fruits and Vegetables while taking into account all pertinent documentation developed by other relevant Codex committees and international organizations.

90. In this regard, the Codex Secretariat clarified that the Guidelines were drafted in line with relevant texts developed by the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems and took into consideration other relevant texts of the UNECE, OECD and ISO as directed by the Committee.

91. The Committee recognized the excellent work and progress that had been made on the revision of the Guidelines and agreed to continue to discuss this matter at its next session.

STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR THE INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR CONFORMITY TO QUALITY STANDARDS

92. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix VII).

93. The Committee agreed that, after the adoption of the Guidelines at Step 5, the Working Group led by Canada²⁰ would work electronically on the revision of the document in order to provide a revised version that would be circulated again for further comments at Step 6 and consideration by the next session of the Committee. The Committee noted that there might be a need for a physical meeting of the Working Group and if so, it would be held in accordance with the Guidelines on Physical Working Groups as set out in the Procedural Manual of the Commission¹⁴. The Codex Secretariat indicated that working groups were opened to all Codex Members and Observers.

94. The Committee concluded that the Guidelines could be finalized by the 33rd Session of the Commission in 2010.

PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 5)²¹

95. The Committee considered proposals for amendments to the Priority List on the basis of the comments submitted as well as those arising from the floor. The following was noted:

²⁰ Brazil, Cuba, Germany, France, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, South Africa, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, New Zealand, OECD.

²¹ ALINORM 05/28/35-Appendix VII and comments submitted in response to CL 2005/25-FFV from Australia and South Africa (CX/FFV 06/13/11); Cuba (CRD 9) and Thailand (CRD 16).

DURIAN

96. The delegation of Thailand presented a project document to initiate work on the standardization of durian. A number of delegations supported this proposal stating that it was a product comparatively easy to conclude. Other delegations considered that it would not be advisable to take up new items in view of workload of the Committee and the need to finalize certain standards that had been on the Agenda for some time taking into account the recommendation of the Codex Alimentarius Commission vis-à-vis the Critical Review Process²².

97. The Committee agreed to give priority to the standardization of durian based on the outcome of its next session's deliberations.

AVOCADO

98. The Committee recalled that the 12th Session of the Committee had agreed to set up a Working Group led by Cuba to determine the extend of the revision of the Codex Standard for Avocado for consideration at this session.

99. The delegation of Cuba informed that only a partial revision of the Standard was necessary to align it with the UNECE Standard for Avocados (FFV-42) in order to include small-sized Hass and other varieties (e.g. hybrids of Antillean, Guatemalan and Mexican varieties) currently marketed in international trade or having a potential regional market. In order to accommodate these new varieties, the sections to be amended referred to minimum requirements (minimum dry matter content) and sizing provisions. The Delegation noted that this revision was in compliance with the Criteria with the Establishment of Work Priorities as set out in the Procedural Manual of the Commission.

100. The Committee agreed to keep the revision of the Codex Standard for Avocados as a priority for new work. It further agreed to revisit this matter in light of the results of its next session's deliberations. In order to facilitate the decision-making process, a project document with the revised text could be presented at the next Session of the Committee.

YAM

101. The Committee recalled that the 12th Session of the Committee had agreed that a project document on the standardization of this produce could be prepared for consideration at this session. The Committee noted that problems in trade for yams related to phytosanitary measures were out of the terms of reference of the Committee. Therefore, there was no need for standardization of this commodity for the time-being.

OTHER REQUESTS

102. The Committee noted the request of Mexico to start work on the standardization of garlic. The Delegation indicated that it would present the relevant documentation for consideration by the next session of the Committee.

CONCLUSION

103. The Committee agreed not to take any new work for consideration at its next Session and not to introduce any amendments to the Priority List. The Committee also agreed to continue to request comments for amendments to the Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for consideration at its next session (Appendix IX).

104. The Committee further agreed that, in light of the outcome of its current session, the items scheduled for discussion at its next session would be as follows: Layout for Codex standards on fresh fruits and vegetables, sizing provisions for tomatoes, guidelines for the quality control of fresh fruits and vegetables, bitter cassava and apples.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 6)

105. The Committee did not have other business to discuss.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 7)

106. The Committee was informed that the 14th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was tentatively scheduled to be held in Mexico during the first semester of 2008. The exact time and venue would be decide between the Codex and the Mexican Secretariats.

²² ALINORM 06/29/41, para. 8 and ALINORM 06/29/3, paras. 64-65.

STATUS OF WORK

SUBJECT	STEP	FOR ACTION BY :	DOCUMENT REFERENCE ALINORM 07/30/35
Draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes	8	30 th CAC	para. 60 and Appendix IV
Proposed draft Sections 2.1.2 - Maturity Requirements and 3.1 - Minimum Bunch Weight	5/8		para. 60 and Appendix V
Draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes	7	14 th CCFFV	para. 42 and Appendix II
Draft Section 3 - Provisions concerning Sizing (draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes)	6		para. 43 and Appendix III
Proposed draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava	5	30 th CAC Working Group 14 th CCFFV	para. 82 and Appendix VI
Proposed draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for conformity to Quality Standards	5		para. 92 and Appendix VII
Proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples	2/3	Working Group 14 th CCFFV	para. 70
Proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	-----	14 th CCFFV	para. 19 and Appendix VIII
Proposals for Amendments to the Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	-----		para. 103 and Appendix IX

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

Chairperson: C.P. MIGUEL AGUILAR ROMO
Président: Director General de Normas
 Secretaría de Economía
Presidente: Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 Estado de México
 C.P. 53950
 Tel: 57 29 91 00
 Fax: 55 20 97 15
maromo@economia.gob.mx

Assistant to the Chairperson: CARLOS RAMÓN BERZUNZA SÁNCHEZ
Assistant du Président: Director de Normalización Internacional
 Dirección General de Normas
Asistente del Presidente: Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
 Sección Fuentes
 Naucalpan de Juárez
 Estado de México
 C.P. 53950
 Tel: 57 29 91 00
 Fax: 55 20 97 15
 E-mail: cberzunz@economia.gob.mx

**ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA
ANTIGUA-ET-BARBUDA
ANTIGUA Y BARBUDA**

Maynard Jennifer
 Director of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Marine Affairs and
 Agro-Industry
 P.O.Box 1282, St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda
 Tel: 1-268-462-1213
 Fax: 1-268-462-4962
 E-mail: maynard4@candw.ag

**ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE**

SANTOS Silvia
 Coordinadora de Frutas y Hortalizas
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad
 Agroalimentaria
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y
 Alimentos
 Avenida Paseo Colón 367(1063)
 3° Piso, frente-Bs. As. Argentina
 Tel: 54114121-5293
 Fax: 54114121-5299
 E- Mail: ssantos@senasa.gov.ar

CAMPANA Beatriz Maria Remedios
 Profesional de la Coordinación de Frutas y
 Hortalizas
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad
 Agroalimentaria
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y
 Alimentos
 Avenida Paseo Colón 367(1063)
 3° Piso, frente-Bs. As. Argentina
 Tel: 54114121-5293
 Fax: 54114121-5299
 E- Mail: bcampana@senasa.gov.ar

**AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE**

USHA Sriram-Prasad
 Manager, International Standards
 Australian Government Department of Agriculture
 Fisheries and Forestry
 GPO Box 858
 Canberra ACT 2601
 Australia
 Tel: 61 2 6272 3547
 Fax: 61 2 6272 4367
 E-mail: usha.sp@daff.gov.au

BENNETT Richard

Portfolio Manager- QA & Food Safety
Horticulture Australia Limited
PO Box 1968 Shepparton Victoria 3632
Australia
Tel: 61358253753
Fax: 61358255031
E-mail: richard.bennett@horticulture.com.au

BRAZIL
BRÉSIL
BRASIL

GUIDO PENARIOL Fernando

Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério Da Agricultura, Pecuária E
Abastecimento
Esplanada Dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B, 3º
Andar, Sala 348,
Cód. 70.043-900, Brasília, Df, Brasil.
Tel: 00(XX)(55)(61)3218.2551
Fax: 00(XX)(55)(61)3224.4322
E-mail: fpenariol@agricultura.gov.br

MARTINS ARAÚJO Emival

Fiscal Federal Agropecuário
Ministério Da Agricultura, Pecuária E
Abastecimento
Esplanada Dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B, 3º
Andar,
Sala 348, Cód. 70.043-900, Brasília, Df, Brasil.
Tel: 00(XX)(55)(61)3218.2551
Fax: 00(XX)(55)(61)3224.4322
E-mail: emivalmartins@agricultura.gov.br

CANADA
CANADÁ

ZOHAR-Picciano Helen

Chief, Fresh Produce Inspection
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Drive
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1A 0Y9
Tel: (613) 221-7212
Fax: (613) 221-7294
E-mail: hpicciano@inspection.gc.ca

REDDICK Ronna

Program Standards Officer
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Drive
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1A 0Y9
Tel: (613) 221-7179
Fax: (613) 221-7294
E-mail: redtickr@inspection.gc.ca

CHILE**CHILI****URRUTIA Anabalón Antonieta**

Coordinadora Subcomité De Frutas y Hortalizas
Frescas
División de Asuntos Internacionales, Servicio
Agrícola y Ganadero de Chile
Av. Bulnes 140, 5º Piso
Asuntos Internacionales, SAG
Tel: 56-2- 3451 585
Fax: 56-2- 3451 578
E-mail: antonieta.urrutia@sag.gob.cl

PANIAGUA Karla

Asistente
Consejería Agrícola de Chile en México,
Ministerio de Agricultura de Chile
Melchor Ocampo 18
Barrio de Santa Catarina
CP: 04100
Coyoacán
Tel: 5554 0258 / 5659 9793
Fax: 5659 9803
E-mail: karla.paniagua@consejagri.org

ESCUADERO Paulina

Coordinadora de Control de Calidad
Asociación de Exportadores de Chile, A.G.
Cruz del Sur 133, Piso 2, Los Condes, Santiago
Chile
Tel: 5624724700
Fax: 5622064163
E-mail: pescudero@asoex.cl

CHINA**CHINE****QIAN Hong**

Associate Researcher
Istitute of Vegetables and Flowers,
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
12 Zhongguancun Nandajie, Haidian District,
Beijing
100081
Tel.:861062137926
Fax: 861062137926
E-mail: qianhong@mail.caas.net.cn

WANG Yan

Engineer
Development Centre of Sci & Tech Ministry of
Agriculture
18#, Meizidian Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing
China 100026
Tel: 861064195082
Fax: 861064194550
E-mail: wang_yan@agri.gov.cn

**COLOMBIA
COLOMBIE****PALACIOS G3nzales Luz Marina**

Segundo Secretario
Embajada de Colombia
Paseo de la Reforma 379, 5° Piso
Col. Cuauht3moc, Del. Cuauht3moc
C.P.06500, M3xico, D.F.
Tel: 55250277 ext.17
Fax: 52082876
E-mail: Impalacios@colombiaenmexico.org

CUBA**CIRA MARGARITA S3NCHEZ GARC3A**

Jefe 3rea gesti3n de la Calidad, Bioseguridad y
Medio Ambiente
Instituto Pdte. Ctn/ONN-54 FFV.
Instituto de Investigaciones en Fruticultura Tropical
Ministerio de la Agricultura
7ma Ave. # 3005 entre 30 y 32, Miramar
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
C.P. 10600
Tel: (537) 209-3401/202-7844/209-3585
Fax: (537) 2046794
E-mail: calidad@iift.cu

IBIS MONTAN3 RIZO

Ministerio de la Agricultura
Especialista en Cuarentena Exterior
Centro Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal
Ayuntamiento N3. 231 e/ San Pedro y Lombillo
Plaza de la Revoluci3n
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
Tel: (537) 879 4805, 8784976
Fax: (537) 870 3277
E-mail: exterior@sanidadvegetal.cu

PEREZ Periche Maria Ana

Jefa de gesti3n de la Calidad
Uni3n Nacional de Acopio del Ministerio de la
agricultura
Calzada de Bejucal y Calle 100 No. 2010,
Boyeros, La Habana, Cuba
Tel: (53-7) 6432815/6432816
Fax: (53-7) 6432817/443018
E- mail: direccion@una.sih.cu;
controlcalidad@una.sih.cu

**CZECH REPUBLIC
R3PUBLIQUE TCH3QUE
REP3BLICA CHECA****KOSKOVA Alena**

Coordinator
Czech Agricultural and Food Inspection Authority
Kvetna 15, 603 00 BRNO, CZECH REPUBLIC
Tel: +420 543 540 111
Fax: +420 543 540 202
E-mail: alena.koskova@szpi.gov.cz

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
(MEMBER ORGANIZATION)
COMMUNAUT3 EUROP3ENNE
(ORGANISATION MEMBRE)
COMUNIDAD EUROPEA
(ORGANIZACI3N MIEMBRO)****DE FROIDMONT Denis**

Administrator
European Community
130 Rue de la Loi, BE_1040
Bruxelles
Tel: +32-2-2956438
Fax: +32-2-2953709
E-mail: denis.de-froidmont@ec.europa.eu

FIJI**RATUVUKI Luke V.**

Chief Executive Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
Private Mail Bag, Raiwaqa
Republic of the Fiji Islands
Tel: (679)3384233
Fax: (679) 3370307
E-mail: luraturvuki@hotmail.com

FINLAND**FINLANDE****FINLANDIA****LANDON Philip**

Administrator
General Secretariat of the Council of the European
Union
Rue de la Loi 175, 1048 Bruxelles,
Belgium
Tel: +32-2 2814966
Fax: +32-2 2819425
E-mail: philip.landon@consilium.europa.eu

RAININKO Mari

Senior Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
B. O. Box 30
00023 Government Finland
Tel: +358916054841
Fax: +358916053400
E-mail: mari.raininko@mmm.fi

KAUHAJ3RVI Niina

Senior Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
B. O. Box 30
00023 Government Finland
Tel: +358916054274
Fax: +358916053400
E-mail: niina.kauhajarvi@mmm.fi

**FRANCE
FRANCIA****LAFOND-PUYET Laurent**

Inspecteur
D.G.C.C.R.F.
DGCCRF-Bureau D4
59 Boulevard Vincent Auriol-Télédoc 251
75703 Paris Cedex 13
Tel: 01 44973143
Fax: 01 44970527
E-mail: laure.lafond-puyet@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr

**GREECE
GRÈCE
GRECIA****VASILEIOS Kontolaimos**

Legal Advisor
Ministry of Rural Development and Food of Greece
29 Acharnon Street 10439 Athens Greece
Tel: +309108250307
Fax: +309108254621
E-mail: cohalka@otenet.gr

**GERMANY
ALLEMAGNE
ALEMANIA****JOHANNES Graf**

Administrator
Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and
Consumer Protection
Rochusstrasse 1
D-53123 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49-(0)1888-529 3531
Fax: +49-(0)1888-529 3531
E-mail: johannes.graf@bmdv.bund.de

KERSTIN Funke

Deputy of Section Standards and Inspection
Federal Agency for Agriculture and Food
Deichmanns Aue 29
53179 Bonn, Germany
Tel: +49-(0)1888-6845 3429
Fax: +49-(0)1888-6845 3945
E-mail: kerstin.funke@ble.de

**INDIA
INDE****JOSE C. Samuel**

Additional Commissioner
Ministry of Agriculture
Krishi Bhawan
New Delhi -110001
Tel: 91-011-23382773
Fax: 91-011-23382773
E-mail: jose.krishi@nic.in

S. Dave

Director (APEDA)
Agricultural & Processed Food Products Export
Development Authority
3rd Floor NCUI Building 3 Siri Institutional Area
New Delhi-110016
Tel: 91-11-2651 3162
Fax: 91-11-2651 9259
E-mail: director@apeda.com

G. S. Naqash

Director (Hort)
Directorate of Horticulture, Govt. of J&K, Srinagar,
Kashmir
Tel: 91-194-2401192

91-194-2311287

E-mail: naqashs@nediffmail.com

**INDONESIA
INDONÉSIE****SRI Wahyuni**

Embajada de Indonesia
Julio Verne 27, Col. Polanco 11560
México, D.F.
Tel: 52806363
Fax: 52807062
E-mail: bima65@hotmail.com

RATNA WIDJAJANTI

Asistente de la Embajada de Indonesia
Julio Verne 27, Col. Polanco 11560
México, D.F.
Tel: 52803449
Fax: 52807062
E-mail: economics3@hotmail.com

**ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA****FIDEGHELLI Carlo**

Director
Istituto Sperimentale per la Frutticoltura
Via Fioranello, 52,
00134 Roma
Tel: 0039-06-79348110
Fax: 0039-06-79340158
E-mail: isfrmfid@mclink.it

IMPAGNATIELLO Ciro

Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali
Via XX Settembre, 20
00187 Roma – Italia
Tel:+39 06 46656511
Fax: +39 06 4880273
E-mail: c.impagnatiello@politicheagricole.it

SETTANNI Incola

Expert
Organismo Interprofessionale
Via XX Settembre
00134 Roma
Tel: +34 3395056454
Fax: +34 3395056454
E-mail: settaninicola@virgilio.it

**JAMAICA
JAMAÏQUE****WHITE Fitzroy**

Senior Plant Quarantine / Producer Inspector
(Ministry of Agriculture and Lands)
Plant Quarantine Unit
Hope Road, Kingston
Tel: 8769770637
Fax: 8769776401
E-mail: fswhite@moa.gov.jm;
hobijah@hotmail.com

**MALAYSIA
MALAISIE
MALASIA****ABDULLAH Hassan**

Deputy Director
Horticulture Research Centre
Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development
Institute (MARDI)
P.O. Box 12301, 50774 Kuala Lumpur
Malasia
Tel: +603 8943 7111
Fax: +603 8942 2906
E-mail: abhassan@mardi.my

NORMA Toman

Deputy Director
Department of Agriculture Malaysia,
Crop Quality Control Division Department of
Agriculture
7th Floor, Wisma Tani, Block 4G2, Precint 4 Federal
Government Administrative Centre 62632 Putrajaya
Malaysia
Tel: +603 88703454
Fax: +603 88887639
E-mail: norma@doa.gov.my

MANSOR Omar

Division Director
Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority (FAMA)
FAMA Headquarters
Bangunan FAMA Point, Lt 17304
Jaland Persiaran Satu
Bandar Baru Selayang
68100 Batu Caves, Celangor Malaysia
Tel: +603-61204540 / +6019-3151507
Fax: +603-61206957
E-mail: mansor1958@yahoo.com

**MEXICO
MEXIQUE
MÉXICO****GARCÍA Perera Mauricio**

Subdirector de Fomento a Cultivos Agroindustriales
Subsecretaría de Agricultura
Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo
Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
Av. Municipio Libre 377, Piso 2, Ala "B"
Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac, C.P. 03310, Del. Benito
Juárez, México D.F.
Tel: (01 55) 9183 1000 Ext. 33350
Fax: (01 55) 9183 1000 ext 33359
E-mail: norma.mx@sagarpa.gob.mx

JIMENEZ RODRIGUEZ Gabriela A.

Jefa de Departamento de Normas Agrícolas
Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo
Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
Av. Municipio Libre 377, Piso 2, Ala "B"
Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac
C.P. 03310
Del. Benito Juárez, México D.F.
Tel: (01 55) 9183 1000 Ext. 33350
Fax: 801 55) 9183 1000 ext 33359
E-mail: gjimenez.dgvd@agarpa.gob.mx
mvzgary@yahoo.com

REYES SANDOVAL Arturo Juan

Técnico en Evaluación de la Conformidad
Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación
Manuel María Contreras No. 133, 6° piso
Col. Cuauhtemoc
Del. Cuauhtemoc
Tel: +52(55) 55464546
Fax: 52(55) 57053686
E-mail: agropro@imnc.org.mx

GALLARDO Barrón Lisbeth Mayra

Técnico Verificador de Distintivo H
Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación
Manuel María Contreras No. 133, 6° piso
Col. Cuauhtemoc
Del. Cuauhtemoc
Tel: +52(55) 55464546
Fax: 52(55) 57053686
E-mail: agropro@imnc.org.mx

FABIAN Canales Alejandro

Técnico en Evaluación de la Conformidad
Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación
Manuel María Contreras No. 133, 6° piso
Col. Cuauhtemoc
Del. Cuauhtemoc
Tel: +52(55) 55464546
Fax: 52(55) 57053686
E-mail: agropro@imnc.org.mx

NICOLS Santos Carlos Alberto

Gerente General
Asociación Nacional de Productores de Frutas y
Hortalizas de Caborca
Av. Juan Chatt S/N Caborca, Sonora México
Tel: (637) 372-2192
Fax: (637) 372-2575
E-mail: proy.@prodigy.net.mx

DEL CASTILLO Díaz Emilio

Asesor
Agroindustrial Sonora
Av. #39 Sur Col. Centro, Caborca, Sonora, México
Tel: 016373726638 / 016622689855
Fax: 016622149580
E-mail: edelcastillo@agnoison.com

VAZQUEZ Morales Mateo

Ingeniero
Miembro Vitalicio del Comité Mexicano para la
Atención del Codex
Antonio Torres 804, Depto. 8, Col. Viaducto Piedad,
Del. Iztacalco, 08200, México, D.F.
Tel: (0155) 3640-9094
E-mail: mateo360921@hotmail.com

BARRERA Mario Alberto

Coordinador de Calidad
SENASICA – SAGARPA
Av. Municipio Libre 377, Piso 7, Ala “A”
Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac
C.P. 03310
Del. Benito Juárez
México D.F.
Tel: 91831000 ext. 34160
E-mail: mbarrera@senasisa.sagarpa.gob.mx

BAUTISTA Parada Luis Enrique

Representante no Gubernamental del Sistema
Producto Manzana
Consejo Nacional de Productores de Manzana, A.C.
División del Norte 2906
Col. Altavista
31320 Chihuahua, Chihuahua
Tel: (01614) 413-3551
Fax: (01614) 413-1833
E-mail: enrique.bautista@hotmail.com

SUÁREZ Estrada Jorge

Presidente de UNIFRUT
UNIFRUT, A.C.
División del Norte 2906
Col. Altavista
31320 Chihuahua, Chihuahua
Tel: (01614) 413-3551
Fax: (01614) 413-1833
E-mail: jorge.suarez@unifrut.org.mx

CHÁVEZ González Carlos H.

UNIFRUT, A.C.
División del Norte 2906
Col. Altavista
31320 Chihuahua, Chihuahua
Tel: (01614) 413-7726
Fax: (01614) 413-1833
E-mail: carlos.chavez@unifrut.org.mx

MOROCCO**MAROC****MARRUECOS****BENCHEKROUN Saâd**

Directeur Général
Etablissement Autonome de Contrôle et de
Coordination des Exportations Alimentaires
72 Rue Mohamed Smiha
Casablanca Maroc
C.P. 20000
Tel: (212) 22 30 61 98
Fax: (212) 22 30 25 67
E-mail: eacce@eacce.org.ma

NETHERLANDS**PAYS-BAS****PAÍSES BAJOS****TANS Raymond**

Head EU Horticulture Policy
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
Department of International Affairs
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
The Netherlands
Tel: 0031 70 378 4359
Fax: 0031 70 378 6106
E-mail: r.tans@minlnv.nl

LEONORA Hammer

Asesor - Agricultura, Naturaleza y Calidad
Alimentaria
Embajada del Reino de los Países Bajos en México
Av. Vasco de Quiroga 3000 - 7
Col. Santa Fé
C.P. 01210 México, D.F.
Tel: (55) 52-58-99-21 ext. 205
Fax: (55) 52-58-81-39
E-mail: mex-lnv@minbuza.nl

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

FAWCET Phil

Señor Programme Manager
 (International/Standards)
 New Zealand Food Safety Authority
 PO Box 2835, Wellington
 New Zealand
 Tel: +64 4 463 2656
 Fax: +64 4 463 2675
 E-mail: phil.fawcet@nzfsa.govt.nz

JONES Gary

Advisor
 PIPFRUIT NEW ZEALAND INC.
 PO Box 11094
 Hastings
 New Zealand
 Tel: 6468737080
 Fax: 6468737089
 E-mail: gary.jones@pipfruitnz.co.nz

PERU

PÉROU
PERÚ

SOLANO Claudia Oré

Consultora de Calidad y Normatividad
 Comisión para la Promoción de Exportaciones
 PROMPEX
 Av. República de Panamá 3647, San Isidro
 Tel: 511-2221222 Ext. 301
 Fax: 5114213179
 E-mail: csolano@prompex.gob.pe

POLAND

POLOGNE
POLONIA

MICHALISZYN Agnieszka

Specialist
 Control of Comercial Quality of Agricultural and
 Foods Products Department
 Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
 00-930 Warsaw, 30 Wspólna St., Poland
 Tel: +4822623-29-36
 Fax: +4822623-29-28
 E-mail: amichaliszyn@ijhars.gov.pl

KRZYZANOWSKA Dorota

Head of the Department
 Control of Comercial Quality of Agricultural and
 Food Products Department
 Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
 00-930 Warsaw, 30 Wspólna St., Poland
 Tel: +4822623-29-13
 Fax: +4822623-29-28
 E-mail: dkrzyzanowska@ijhars.gov.pl

SOUTH AFRICA
AFRIQUE DU SUD
SUDÁFRICA

MAKHAFOLA Billy

Assistant Director Agronomy and Vegetables
 National Department of Agriculture
 Private Bag X343
 Pretoria
 0001
 RSA
 Tel: 0123196023
 Fax: 0123196055
 E-mail: BillyM@nda.agric.za

MADIBA Willy

Senior Quality Control Officer
 National Department of Agriculture
 Private Bag X343
 Pretoria
 0001
 Tel: +27123196051
 Fax: +27123196055
 E-mail: Madibaw@nda.agric.za

SPAIN

ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

CLIMENT Guimerá Matilde

Consejera Comercial
 Oficina Económico Comercial de España en México
 Av. Presidente Masarik, 473 Col. Polanco 11530,
 México, D.F.
 Tel: (00-52-55) 91386040
 Fax: (00-52-55) 91386050
 E-mail: mcliment@mcx.es

CABALLERO Hierro Francisco Javier

Consejero Técnico
 Dirección General de Agricultura
 Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación
 Alfonso XII, 62
 Tel: +34913476660
 Fax: +34913476720
 E-mail: jcaballe@mapya.es

ESPIÑA Tritiño Estrella

Analista de Mercado
 Oficina Económico Comercial de España en México
 Ave. Presidente Masarik, 473. Col. Polanco 11530,
 México, D.F.
 Tel : (00-52-55) 91-38-60-40
 Fax : (00-52-55) 91-38-60-50
 E-mail : eespina@mcx.es

SWITZERLAND**SUISSE****SUIZA****PIERRE SCHAUBENBERG**

Chef de Vinicole Section Cultures Spéciales et
Economie

Office Fédéral de L'Agriculture

Mattenhofstrasse 5

CH-3003 Berne

Tel: +41313248421

Fax: +41313222634

E-mail: pierre.schaubenberg@blw.admin.ch

FRANCHINI-WEHRLI Franziska R.

Scientific Employee

Federal Office of Public Health FOPH

Dipl. Food Engineer ETH

Schwarzenburgstrasse 165 CH 3097 Liebefeld

Switzerland

Tel: +41313249371

Fax: +41313229574

E-mail: franziska.franchini-wehrli@bag.admin.ch

THAILAND**THAÏLANDE****TAILANDIA****SURAPHONG Kosiyachinda**

Chairman of Subcommittee on Fresh Fruits and
Vegetables

National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and
Food Standards

4th Floor, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

Rajadamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok 10200

Tel: 66 2 280 3887

Fax: 66 2 280 3899

66 2 283 1669

VICHITRANANDA Suchat

Director

Horticulture Research Institute, Department of
Agriculture

50 Paholythin Road Chatuchak Bangkok, 10900

Tel: 66 2 5614669

Fax: 66 2 5615024

66 2 5614667

KITSUKCHIT Voranuch

Standards Officer

National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and
Food Standards

4th Floor, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

Rajadamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok 10200

Tel: 66 2 280 3887

Fax: 66 2 280 3899

66 2 283 1669

E-mail: kvoranuch@yahoo.com

TONGA**MELE T. 'Amanaki**

Principal Food Technologist &

Codex Contact Point For Tonga

Ministry of Agriculture & Food, Forest and
Fisheries

P.O. BOX 14

NUKU'ALOFA

TONGA

Tel: (676) 25-355 OR 28-759

Fax: (676) 23-093

E-mail: amanakim@kalianet.to

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO****TRINIDAD Y TABAGO****GANGAPERSAD Ganesh**

Quality Assurance Officer

National Agricultural Marketing and Development
Corporation

S.S. Erin Road

Debe, Trinidad and Tobago

Tel: 1-868-647-3866

Fax: 1-868-647-6087

E-mail: ggangapersad@namdevco.com

TURKEY**TURQUIE****TURQUÍA****Ömer Faruk DOĞAN**

Deputy Undersecretary of Foreign Trade

Undersecretary of the Prime Ministry Foreign Trade

İnönü Bulvarı No.36 DIŞTİCARET Müsteşarlığı

06510 Emek / Ankara Turkey

Tel: +90 (312) 212 87 31

Fax: +90 (312) 212 87 38

E-mail: doganof@dtm.gov.tr

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

International Standards Coordinator

Agricultural Marketing Service

Office of the Deputy Administrator Fruit and
Vegetables Programs, AMS

Stop 0235-1400 Independence Ave. SW

Washington DC 20250

Tel: 202-690-4944

Fax: 202-720-0016

E-mail: dorian.lafond@usda.gov

MATTEN Y. Ellen

International Issues Analyst
 U.S. Codex Office
 Food Safety and Inspection Service
 U.S. Dep. of Agriculture
 Room 4861 South Building
 1400 Independence Av., SW
 Washington D.C. 20250
 Tel: 202-205-7760
 Fax: 202-720-3157
 E-mail: ellen.matten@fsis.usda.gov

ARCHER Jim

Manager
 North West Fruit Exporters
 105 South 18th St
 Yakima, WA 98901
 Tel: 509-576-8004
 Fax: 509-576-3646
 E-mail: jarcher@goodfruit.com

BROWN Reginald L.

Florida Tomato Exchange
 800 Trafalgar Court, Suite 300
 Maitland, FL 32751 Florida, 32814-0155
 Tel: (407)-660 1949
 Fax: (407)-660 1656
 E-mail: reggie@floridatomatoes.org

BANE Terry

Branch Chief
 Agricultural Marketing Service
 Processed Products Branch
 Fruits and Vegetables Programs, AMS
 Room 0709 outh Building, Stop 9247
 1400 Independence Ave. SW
 Washington DC 20250-0247
 Tel: 202-720-4693
 Fax: 202-690-1087
 E-mail: terry.bane@usda.gov

MARCE Martin

Director, Trade Service
 California Trade & Tree Fruit League
 1500 East Shaw
 Suite 120 Fresno, CA 93710 USA
 Tel: 559-226-6330
 Fax: 559-222-8326
 E-mail: martin@cgftl.com

GUERRERO Raúl

Consultor
 Delegación USA
 793 North, Santa Barbara, California 93105
 E-mail: guerrero_raul_j@yahoo.com

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
 ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
 ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES**

**FEDERACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE
 PRODUCTORES AGRICOLAS (IFAP)**

ZANESCO Fabio

IFAP Delegate
 International Federation of Agricultural Producers
 60 Rue Saint Lazare
 75009-Paris France
 Tel: +33145260553
 Fax: +33148747212
 E-mail: ifap@ifap.org; assomela@cr-surfing.net

**ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
 COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT
 (OECD)**

BARICICOVA Viera

Chair of OECD Fruit & Vegetable Scheme
 Head of Market Organisation Department State
 Veterinary & Food Administration of the Slovak
 Republic
 Botanicka 17
 Bratislava 84213, Slovak Republic
 Tel: 421260257428
 E-mail: baricicova@svssr.sk

**ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE LA
 VIGNE ET DU VIN (OIV)**

SANCHEZ Recarte Ignacio

Head of Unit Vitiviniculture
 International Organisation of Vine and Wine- OIV
 18 Rue D'Aguesseau
 75008-Paris France
 Tel: 0033(0)144948082
 Fax: 0033(0)142669063
 E-mail: isanchez@oiv.int

**COMISIÓN ECONÓMICA PARA EUROPA DE
 LAS NACIONES UNIDAS (CEPE)**

MEZA Claudio

Economic Affairs Officer
 Av. De la Paix, S/N
 Palais des Nations
 1211 Genève 10 Suisse
 Tel: +41 22 917 13 66
 E-mail: claudio.meza@unece.org

**FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT
SECRÉTARIAT FAO/OMS
SECRETARIADO FAO/OMS**

BRISCO LÓPEZ Gracia Teresa

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153
Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 5705 6254
Fax: 39 06 5705 4593
E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

MASKELIUNAS Jeronimas

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153
Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 5705 3967
Fax: 39 06 5705 4593
E-mail: jeronimas.maskeliunas@fao.org

KUSUKAWA Masashi

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153
Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 5705 4796
Fax: 39 06 5705 4593
E-mail: masashi.kusukawa@fao.org

**TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT
SECRÉTARIAT TECHNIQUE
SECRETARÍA TÉCNICA**

Jorge Antonio López Zárate

Subdirector para la Atención del Codex
Alimentarius y otros Organismos
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes, Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43218
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: jalopez@economia.gob.mx

VIZUETH Chavez Michelle

**Jefe de Oficina para la Atención del Codex
Alimentarius**
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43220
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: codexmex@economia.gob.mx

GONZÁLEZ LOERA Patricia

Jefe de Oficina para la Atención de la ISO

Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43216
Fax: 5520 9715
E-mail: iso-mex2@economia.gob.mx

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT
SUPPORT TECHNIQUE
SOPORTE TÉCNICO**

SHONT AVENEL Danielle

Directora de Promoción
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez, CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43243
E-mail: dschont@economia.gob.mx

ANAYA GONZALEZ Armando

Subdirector de Promoción
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez,
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43244
E-mail: anaya@economia.gob.mx

GÓMEZ Piña Oscar

Jefe de Departamento de Sistemas
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez,
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43206
E-mail: oscarg@economia.gob.mx

GALINDO Hernandez Alejandro

Técnico Especializado
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez,
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43205
E-mail: agalindo@economia.gob.mx

MARTÍNEZ Maya Eduardo

Técnico Especializado
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez,
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43205
E-mail: emmaya@economia.gob.mx

CENTENO Bocanegra Gerardo

Técnico Especializado
Dirección General de Normas
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez,
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43205
E-mail: gcenteno@economia.gob.mx

QUIROZ Sánchez Juan Fernando

Técnico Especializado
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43217
Fax: 5520 9715

MONROY Correa Ofelia

Técnico Especializado
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43238
E-mail: omonroy@economia.gob.mx

GUAZO Gutiérrez Guillermo

Técnico Especializado
Secretaría de Economía
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6
Sección Fuentes
Naucalpan de Juárez
CP. 53950
Estado de México
Tel: (5255) 5729 9100 Ext. 43238

PÉREZ Pensado Sergio

Director de Conferencias y Eventos Sociales
Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores
Plaza Juárez No. 20, Piso 4
Col. Centro, Deleg. Cuauhtémoc,
C.P. 06010, México, D.F.
Tel: 9159-5247
Fax: 9159-5264
E-mail: sperezp@sre.gob.mx

GONZÁLEZ Pedro

Subdirector de Operación de Conferencias
Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores
Plaza Juárez No. 20, Piso 4
Col. Centro, Deleg. Cuauhtémoc,
C.P. 06010, México, D.F.
Tel: 9159-5247
E-mail: pgonzaleza@sre.gob.mx

DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES
(AT STEP 7)

1 DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties of tomatoes grown from *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill, of the *Solanaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Tomatoes for industrial processing are excluded.

Tomatoes may be classified into four commercial types:

- “Round”;
- “Ribbed”;
- “Oblong” or “Elongated”;
- “Cherry” tomatoes and “Cocktail” tomatoes.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

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

In the case of trusses of tomatoes, the stalks must be fresh, healthy, clean and free of all leaves and any visible foreign matter.

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

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

2.1.2 Maturity Requirements

The tomatoes must be sufficiently developed and display satisfactory ripeness.

The development and state of maturity of the tomatoes must be such as to enable them to continue their ripening process and to reach the appropriate degree of ripeness.

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Tomatoes are classified in three classes defined below:

2.2.1 “Extra” Class

Tomatoes in this class must be of superior quality. They must have firm flesh and must be characteristic of the variety as regards shape, appearance and development.

They must be uniform in terms of size. Their colouring, according to their state of ripeness, must be such as to satisfy the requirements set out in Section 2.1.1 above.

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

2.2.2 Class I

Tomatoes in this class must be of good quality. They must have reasonably firm flesh and must be characteristic of the variety as regards shape, appearance and development.

They must be uniform in terms of size. They must be free of cracks and visible greenback.

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

- a slight defect in shape and development;
- a slight defect in colouring;
- slight skin defects;
- very slight bruises.

Furthermore, “ribbed” tomatoes may show:

- shallow healed cracks not more than 1 cm long;
- no excessive protuberances;
- small umbilicus but not suberization;
- suberization of the stigma up to 1 cm²;
- a linear scar no longer than two thirds of the greatest diameter of the fruit.

2.2.3 Class II

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

They must have reasonably firm flesh (but may be slightly less firm than in Class I) and must not show unhealed cracks.

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

- defects in shape, development and colouring;
- skin defects or bruises, provided the fruit is not seriously affected;
- shallow healed cracks not more than 3 cm in length for round, ribbed or oblong tomatoes.

Furthermore, “ribbed” tomatoes may show:

- more pronounced protuberances than allowed under Class I, but without being misshapen;
- one umbilicus;
- suberization of the stigma up to 2 cm²;
- fine blossom scar in elongated form (like a seam).

3 PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section.

[Maximum size for “Cherry” and “Cocktail” tomatoes - under consideration]

Sizing does not apply to trusses of tomatoes.

Sizing is not compulsory for Class II.

[Sizing table and related provisions - under development]

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 “Extra” Class

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

In the case of trusses of tomatoes, 5% by number or weight of tomatoes detached from the stalk.

4.1.3 Class II

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

In the case of trusses of tomatoes, 10% by number or weight of tomatoes detached from the stalk.

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes, 10 % by number or weight of tomatoes not satisfying the requirements as regards sizing but have a diameter greater or less than 10 mm of the size marked.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only tomatoes of the same origin, variety or commercial type, quality and size (if sized).

The ripeness and colouring of tomatoes in “Extra” Class and Class I must be practically uniform. In addition, the length of “oblong” tomatoes must be sufficiently uniform.

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

5.2 PACKAGING

Tomatoes must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new¹, 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.

Tomatoes shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995, Amd. 1-2004).

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 tomatoes. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

5.3 PRESENTATION

The tomatoes may be presented as follows:

- (i) as individual tomatoes, with or without calyx and short stalk;
- (ii) as trusses of tomatoes, in other words, in entire inflorescence or part of inflorescence, where each inflorescence or part of each inflorescence should comprise at least the following number of tomatoes.
 - 3 (2 if prepackaged) or
 - in the case of trusses of “cherry” tomatoes, 6 (4 if prepackaged).

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

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

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

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

6.2.1 Identification

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

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

- Name of the produce “tomatoes” or “trusses of tomatoes” and the commercial type if the contents are not visible from the outside. These details must always be provided for “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes, whether in trusses or not;
- Name of the variety (optional).

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size expressed as minimum and maximum diameters (if sized).

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

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

7.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

Tomatoes shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

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

² 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.

DRAFT SECTION 3 - PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING
(draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes)
(AT STEP 6)

3 PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

[The maximum diameter for “Cherry” and “Cocktail” tomatoes is [30] / [40] mm.]

Tomatoes are sized either according to the following table:

Size code	Diameter (mm)
0	– 20
1	>20 – 25
2	>25 – 30
3	>30 – 35
4	>35 – 40
5	>40 – 47
6	>47 – 57
7	>57 – 67
8	>67 – 82
9	>82 – 102
10	>102

or by the following provisions:

The maximum difference in diameter between tomatoes in the same package shall be limited to:

- [10] / [15] mm, if the diameter of the smallest fruit is under 70 mm,
- 20 mm, if the diameter of the smallest fruit is 70 and over but under 100 mm,
- there is no limitation of difference in diameter for fruit equal or over 100 mm.

[Tomatoes may be classified by other methods such as count or weight] [provided that they comply with the provisions stated above.]

**DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TABLE GRAPES
(AT STEP 8)**

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial varieties (cultivars) of table grapes grown from *Vitis vinifera L.*, of the *Vitaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Grapes for industrial processing are excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

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

In addition, the berries must be:

- whole;
- well formed;
- normally developed.

Pigmentation due to sun is not a defect so long as this only affects the skin of the berries.

2.1.1 The bunches must have been carefully picked.

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

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

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Table grapes are classified in three classes defined below:

2.2.1 “Extra” Class

Table grapes in this class must be of superior quality.

The bunches must be characteristic of the variety in shape, development and colouring, allowing for the district in which they are grown.

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

The berries must be firm, firmly attached to the stalk, evenly spaced along the stalk and have their bloom virtually intact.

2.2.2 Class I

Table grapes in this class must be of good quality.

The bunches must be characteristic of the variety in shape, development and colouring, allowing for the district in which they are grown.

The berries must be firm, firmly attached to the stalk and, as far as possible, have their bloom intact. They may, however, be less evenly spaced along the stalk than in the "Extra" Class.

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

- a slight defect in shape;
- a slight defect in colouring;
- very slight sun scorch affecting the skin only.

2.2.3 Class II

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

The bunches may show slight defects in shape, development and colouring, provided these do not impair the essential characteristics of the variety, allowing for the district in which they are grown.

The berries must be sufficiently firm and sufficiently attached to the stalk. They may be less evenly spaced along the stalk than in Class I.

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

- defects in shape;
- defects in colouring;
- slight sun scorch affecting the skin only;
- slight bruising;
- slight skin defects.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the weight of the bunch.

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

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

4.1.3 Class II

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

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

Ten percent by weight of bunches not satisfying the size requirements as specified in Section 3.

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only bunches of the same origin, variety, quality and degree of ripeness. In the "Extra" Class, the bunches must be of more or less identical size and colouring. In the case of Class I, the bunches may have slight variation in size.

However, consumer packages of a net weight not exceeding 1 kg may contain mixtures of table grapes of different varieties, provided they are uniform in quality, degree of ripeness and, for each variety concerned, in origin.

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

5.2 PACKAGING

Table grapes must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new¹, 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.

Table grapes shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995, Amd.1-2004).

In the case of the "Extra" Class, the bunches must be packed in a single layer.

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 table grapes. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell².

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

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

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

6.2.1 Identification

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

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce "Table grapes" if the contents are not visible from the outside. Name of the variety or, where applicable, names of varieties.

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

² A fragment of vine shoot no more than 5 cm in length may be left on the stem of the bunch as a form of special presentation without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules.

³ 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 of origin or, where applicable, countries of origin and, optionally, district where grown or national, regional or local place name.

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Net weight (optional);
- “Bunches below 75 gr. intended for single servings”, if appropriate.

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

Table grapes shall comply with those maximum pesticide residue limits established by Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

7.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

Table grapes shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

8.2 The 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).

**PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 2.1.2 - MATURITY REQUIREMENTS
AND PROPOSED DRAFT SECTION 3.1 - MINIMUM BUNCH WEIGHT**

(draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes)

(AT STEP 5/8)

2.1.2 Maturity Requirements

Table grapes must be sufficiently developed and display satisfactory ripeness.

In order to satisfy this requirement, the fruit must have obtained a refractometric index of at least 16° Brix.

Fruit with a lower refractometric index are accepted provided the sugar/acid ratio is at least equal to:

- (a) 20:1 if the Brix level is greater than or equal to 12.5° and less than 14° Brix,
- (b) 18:1 if the Brix level is greater than or equal to 14° and less than 16° Brix.

3.1 Minimum Bunch Weight

The minimum bunch weight shall be 75 gr. This provision does not apply to packages intended for single servings.

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA¹

(AT STEP 5)

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial bitter² varieties of cassava roots grown from *Manihot esculenta* Crantz, of the *Euphorbiaceae* family, to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. Cassava for industrial processing is excluded.

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

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

- whole;
- sound, produce affected by rotting, mould or deterioration such as to make it unfit for consumption is excluded;
- clean, practically free of any visible foreign matter, except permitted substances³ used to prolong its shelf life;
- practically free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste⁴;
- firm;
- practically free of mechanical damage and bruising;
- free of loss of colour in the flesh.

The cut at the distal (narrow) end of the cassava should not exceed 2 cm in diameter.

The stalk end of the root should have a clean cut between 1 cm and 2.5 cm in length in case of varieties that have distinct stalk.

2.1.1 The cassava must have been carefully harvested and have reached an appropriate degree of physiological development account being taken of the characteristics of the variety and the area in which they are grown.

The development and condition of the cassava must be such as to enable it:

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

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

Cassava is classified in three classes defined below:

¹ Commonly known in certain regions by: manioc, mandioca, tapioca, aipim, yucca, etc.

² [Bitter varieties of cassava are those that contain more than 50 mg/kg but less than 200 mg/kg hydrogen cyanide (fresh weight basis). In any case, cassava must be peeled and fully cooked before being consumed.]

³ In accordance with the latest edition of the Codex General Standard for Food Additives (CODEX STAN 192-1995).

⁴ This provision allows for smell caused by conservation agents used in compliance with corresponding regulations.

2.2.1 “Extra” Class

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

2.2.2 Class I

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

- slight defects in shape;
- scarring or healed damage, not exceeding 5% of the surface area;
- scraped areas, not exceeding 10% of the surface area.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the **edible quality of the** pulp of the produce.

2.2.3 Class II

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

- defects in shape;
- scarring or healed damage, not exceeding 10% of the surface area;
- scraped areas, not exceeding 20% of the surface area.

The defects must not, in any case, affect the **edible quality of the** pulp of the produce.

3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

Size is determined by the diameter at thickest cross-section of the produce, in accordance with the following table:

Size Code	Diameter (in centimeter)
A	3.5 – 7.5
B	7.6 – 10.0
C	> 10.0]

In all cases, cassava must not be less than 300 g in weight nor less than 20 cm in length.

4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

4.1.1 "Extra" Class

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

4.1.3 Class II

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

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

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

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform in shape and contain only cassava of the same origin, variety and/or commercial type, quality and size. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

Cassava must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new⁵, 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.

Cassava shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995, Amd. 1-2004).

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 cassava. Packages must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

6. MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

Each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and type (bitter) and may be labelled as to the name of the variety.

6.1.2 Preparation Instructions

A statement indicating that cassava should be peeled and fully cooked before being consumed is required.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)⁶.

⁵ For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.

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.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (size code or minimum and maximum diameter in centimetres);
- Net weight;
- Preparation instructions (see Section 6.1.2).

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

7. CONTAMINANTS

7.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

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

7.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

Cassava shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

8. HYGIENE

8.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003), and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

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

PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR THE INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR CONFORMITY TO QUALITY STANDARDS

(AT STEP 5)

The purpose of these Guidelines is to establish procedures to ascertain, through inspection of product, whether fresh fruits and vegetables conform to established quality standards. This document provides a framework for inspecting and certifying fruits and vegetables for conformity to quality standards to ensure that the produce meet requirements in order to protect consumers from deceptive marketing practices and to facilitate trade on the basis of accurate product description. Quality standards should not be substituted for the implementation of a food safety system and should not replace hygiene provisions/requirements that may be specific to the commodity in question.

These Guidelines should be used in conjunction with *Codex Principles for Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification* (CAC/GL 20-1995) and the *Codex Guidelines for the Exchange of Information between Countries on Rejections of Imported Food* (CAC/GL 25-1997).

The scope of these Guidelines does not include procedures for the acceptance, certification, verification or inspection/auditing of Quality Management Systems (QMS). Certification of produce however, may be based on QMS and therefore these Guidelines would apply in that regard.

The Certificate of Inspection is the control document which an Official/Officially Recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body uses to attest that the fresh fruits and vegetables have been verified for conformity to quality standards and according to the procedures set out in these Guidelines.

1. DEFINITIONS

OFFICIAL INSPECTION BODY AND OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION BODY¹

Official inspection bodies and official certification bodies are bodies administered by a government agency having jurisdiction empowered to perform a regulatory or enforcement function or both for conformity to quality standards.

OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZED INSPECTION BODY AND OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZED CERTIFICATION BODY¹

Officially recognized inspection bodies and officially recognized certification bodies are bodies which have enforcement functions and have been formally approved or recognized by a government agency having jurisdiction.

INSPECTOR

Person, officially recognized and authorized by an Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body, who has appropriate and regular training and has been proven competent under a competency scheme, enabling them to undertake inspection and/or certification.

CERTIFICATION¹

Certification is the procedure by which Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Bodies provide written or equivalent assurance that graded and packed fresh fruit and vegetables conform to the quality standards. The certification of fresh fruit and vegetables may be, as appropriate, based on a range of inspection activities which may include continuous online inspection, auditing of quality management systems, and examination of graded and packed produce.

INSPECTION¹

Inspection is the examination of fresh fruits and vegetables, outlined in Section 2, including the grading and packing of fresh produce, in order to verify that they conform to the standards.

AUDIT

Audit is a systemic and functionally independent examination to determine whether activities and related results comply with the planned objectives.

¹ Definition taken from the *Codex Principles for Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification* (CAC/GL 20-1995) and adapted for the inspection and certification of fresh fruits and vegetables.

STANDARDS²

A Standard is a Quality Standard which sets out quality criteria, including provisions concerning the presentation and marking or labelling, set down by the competent authorities, against which fresh fruits and vegetables will be evaluated.

TRADER

A trader is anyone (buyer, broker, dealer, grower, packer, shipper, exporter, importer, wholesaler, distributor, etc.) who markets fresh fruits and vegetables.

CONSIGNMENT³

The quantity of produce dispatched or received at one time, and covered by a particular contract or shipping document. The consignment may consist of one or several types of produce; it may be composed of one or several lots of fresh fruit and vegetables.

LOT³

A stated quantity of fresh fruits and/or vegetables which has, at the time of inspection, uniform characteristics.

SAMPLING³

Sampling is the act of taking a series of primary samples, of approximately equal size, from different positions in a lot during an inspection.

PRIMARY SAMPLE³

An individual unit or package taken from the lot, or in the case of loose or bulk produce, a stated quantity taken from a single position in the lot.

BULK SAMPLE³

Several representative primary samples taken from the lot, whose quantity is sufficient to allow the assessment of the lot with regard to all criteria.

REDUCED SAMPLE³

A representative quantity of produce obtained from the bulk sample and whose size is sufficient to allow the assessment of certain individual criteria. Several reduced samples may be taken from a bulk sample.

PACKAGE

Container or receptacle, (e.g., box, bag, clam shell, etc) which is used to hold fresh fruits and vegetables with the intent to preserve and protect its contents.

APPLICANT

Anyone who has a financial interest in the consignment or lot and requests an inspection.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF INSPECTION PROCEDURES

2.1 GENERAL REMARKS

The inspection should commence by assessing primary samples taken at random from a lot to be inspected. It is based on the principle of presumption that the overall quality of the bulk sample (all primary samples) should be representative of the overall quality of the entire lot.

However, in some cases, for example, for ascertaining the presence of a particular disorder of any kind, selective sampling shall be carried out. Sampling cannot then be carried out at random. Hence, before starting sampling, its purpose should be defined, i.e., the characteristics to be tested should be specified.

² Adapted from the definition of “requirements” in the Codex *Principles of Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification*.

³ Definition taken from the International Standardization Organization (ISO) 874, *Fresh Fruit and Vegetables – Sampling*, and adapted for these Guidelines.

2.2 PLACE OF INSPECTION

The inspection of the produce may be carried out during the grading and packing operation, at the point of dispatch, during transport, at the import point, at the wholesale market, distribution centre, etc.

2.3 PREPARATION OF PRODUCE FOR SAMPLING

The trader or their representative shall inform the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body whenever a consignment is available for inspection. The applicant or their representative shall supply all information necessary for the identification of the consignment or lot to be inspected. Lots in a consignment may be treated as one if they are similar in regard to the nature of the fresh produce, packer and /or dispatcher, country of origin, class of produce, size (if the product is graded according to size), variety or commercial type (according to the relevant provisions of the quality standard) and type of packaging and presentation.

The consignment or lot shall be prepared for sampling in such a way that primary samples can be taken at random without hindrance or delay. This means that the applicant of an inspection should place the consignment or lot in such a manner that it is completely and readily accessible for inspection and the quality and condition of the fresh fruits and vegetables are fully disclosed. A vehicle fully loaded or partially loaded is not considered accessible. The applicant of an inspection must either completely unload the vehicle or channel a passage through the vehicle in order that an Inspector can reach every primary sample randomly.

The primary samples shall be identified by the Inspector and taken personally or under the supervision of the Inspector. If reduced samples are required, these are identified and personally selected by the Inspector from the bulk sample.

Each lot shall be sampled separately, however if the lot is not uniform or shows damages, it shall be divided into uniform lots and each lot shall be sampled and inspected separately.

All samples are taken for the sole purpose of inspecting the produce for conformity to the standards. Following the inspection all samples will be returned to the applicant.

2.4 IDENTIFICATION OF LOTS AND/OR GETTING A GENERAL IMPRESSION OF THE CONSIGNMENT

The identification of lots should be carried out on the basis of their marking or other criteria. In the case of a consignment which is made up of several lots, it is necessary for the Inspector to get a general impression of the consignment with the aid of accompanying documents or declarations concerning the consignment. The Inspector then determines how far the lots presented comply with the information in these documents.

If the fresh fruits and vegetables are to be or have been loaded onto a means of transport, the registration number of the latter should be used for identification of the consignment.

2.5 ASSISTANCE TO THE INSPECTOR

The applicant for the inspection should provide:

- suitable facilities, free from vehicular traffic or other hazards, where the inspection can be done;
- suitable grading table where produce may be inspected;
- a suitable and adequately lighted facility where produce may be inspected. The intensity of lighting is either from natural or artificial sources and the illumination is at least 540 lux at the grading table level; and
- physical assistance to the Inspector as may be required.

2.6 INSPECTION OF THE LOT

2.6.1 Assessment of Packaging and Presentation on the Basis of Primary Samples

The packaging and the material used within the package should be verified for suitability and cleanliness according to the provisions of the standards. If only certain types of packaging are permitted, the Inspector will check whether these are being used. If the individual Standard includes provisions concerning presentation, their conformity is also verified.

2.6.2 Verification of Marking on the Basis of Primary Samples

The Inspector should ascertain whether the produce is marked according to the Standard. The accuracy of the marking should also be verified.

2.6.3 Verification of the Number of Packages or Volume of Produce in the Lot

Inspections and sampling is based on the number of packages or volume of produce within the lot, in order to obtain the correct sample size. Therefore verification of the count/volume is important to the credibility of the inspection and certification.

The sample size should not be solely based on the information provided by the applicant, but the actual count/volume present for inspection. In instances, such as in loose or bulk loads when it is more difficult to verify actual count/volume, the Inspector should make a notation on the Certificate of Inspection under Observations: “sample size based on applicant’s count/volume”.

2.6.4 Sampling

The Inspector determines the size of the bulk sample in such a way as to be able to assess the lot to be inspected. The Inspector selects, at random, the packages (primary samples) to be inspected or, in the case of loose or bulk produce, the points of the lot from which primary samples will be taken.

Damaged packages shall not be selected as part of the bulk sample; they should be set aside and may, if necessary, be subject to a separate inspection.

If after the inspection, the Inspector discovers that a decision cannot be reached, the Inspector may take more primary samples and express the overall results as an average of the total number of primary samples.

Certain criteria, such as the stage of development and/or ripeness or the presence or absence of internal defects, may be verified on the basis of reduced samples. This procedure may be applicable when the produce is cut or destroyed. The size of the reduced samples should be restricted to the absolute minimum quantity necessary for the assessment of the lot; if, however, defects are ascertained or suspected, the size of the reduced sample should not exceed 10% of the size of the bulk sample initially taken for the inspection.

The criteria on the degree of development and/or ripeness can be verified using an instrument, such as a refractometer and/or penetrometer, and methods laid out in the Standard or in accordance with acceptable practices.

2.6.3.1 Packed produce

In the case of packed produce (wooden packages, cardboard packages, bags, etc.); the primary samples shall be taken at random throughout the lot, in accordance with Table 1, to ensure that they are representative of the entire lot. Whenever a lot is declared unsatisfactory, it is important that the minimum number of primary samples is taken.

Table 1 – Minimum Number of packages to be taken⁴

Number of packages in the lot	Minimum number of packages (primary samples) to be taken
up to 100	5
101 to 300	7
301 to 500	9
501 to 1,000	10
Over 1,000	15 (minimum)

⁴ Table 1 and 2 are taken from the ISO 874, Fresh Fruit and Vegetables - Sampling. A participating country may experiment with another sampling method than the one provided, if it has previously notified its intention to the Inspection and Certification Body concerned.

2.6.3.2 Bulk produce

Bulk produce refers to loose fruits and vegetables that are loaded directly into a transporting vehicle. It may also include loose produce transported in large bins or totes, which are open at the top.

Samples shall be taken at random at different points throughout the lot and in accordance with the total weight or total number of units as outlined in Table 2. At least 5 primary samples must be taken from the lot. In the case of large fruits and vegetables (over 2 kg per unit) the primary samples shall consist of at least five units. Whenever a lot is declared as not meeting the Standard, it is important that the minimum quantity of primary samples specified in this table is taken.

Table 2 – Minimum Size of primary samples⁴

Weight of lot (in kilograms) or total number of units in the lot	Minimum Total weight of primary samples (in kilograms) or Minimum total number of units to be taken
up to 200	10
201 to 500	20
501 to 1,000	30
1,001 to 5,000	60
Over 5,000	100 (minimum)

Example:

Minimum sampling for lot 5,200 kg in weight: Five (5) primary samples of 20 kg each for a total of 100 kg or 10 primary samples of 10 kg each.

Minimum sample for lot of 1000 melons (larger than 2kg each): Six (6) primary samples of 5 melons each

2.7 INSPECTION OF PRODUCE

The produce must be entirely removed from its package for the inspection; the Inspector may only dispense with this requirement if the type of packaging and the form of presentation allow an inspection of the contents without unpacking the produce. The inspection of uniformity, minimum requirements, quality classes and size should be carried out on the basis of the bulk sample. In the case when defects are detected, the Inspector should ascertain the respective percentage of the produce not in conformity with the Standard by number or weight. The results of each primary sample examined and the overall results of the bulk sample should be recorded on an official note sheet that will be attached to a copy of the Certificate of Inspection and kept on file at an office of the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body.

In the case where an Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification body is responsible for the auditing of QMS rather than the direct examination of graded and packed produce, the certification should reflect this on the certificate (Annex II). A copy of note sheets is not required to be attached to the Certificate of Inspection, however the following notation must be identified on the Certificate of Inspection “Certification based on applicant’s self evaluation of conformity and audit of Quality Management System.”

2.8 REPORT OF INSPECTION RESULTS

Where the Inspector finds that the fresh fruits or vegetables conform to the Class outlined in the Standard, the Inspector may issue a Certificate of Inspection confirming these findings.

If defects are found in excess of those allowed in the Standard, the Inspector must indicate the percentage found not to be in conformity with the Standard on the inspection note sheet(s) and Certificate of Inspection. The Inspector should also inform the applicant or their representative of the reasons for this non-conformity. This information should be made according to the legal provisions of the individual countries. This is not necessary if it is possible to achieve compliance with the Standard by a change in the marking of the produce.

Produce for which a finding of non-conformity has been issued may not be moved without the authorisation of the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body which issued the finding. This authorization can be subject to the conditions laid down by the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body. If the compliance of produce with the Standard is possible by a change in marking, the applicant or their representative may be informed of this possibility.

It is understood, that the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body must maintain a system of recording their inspection results as an official Certificate of Inspection should be completed for each inspection performed.

2.9 NON-CONFORMING PRODUCE

A lot of produce that is found not to be in conformity with the Class outlined in the Standard may be reconditioned or re-labelled in order to comply with the requirements of the Standard. When the applicant has chosen to bring the lot into conformity through reconditioning, the applicant shall present the reconditioned lot, or part thereof, for inspection. The Inspector shall issue, where applicable, a Certificate of Inspection for the lot or part thereof, confirming conformity to the Standard.

A trader may not market non-conforming produce before the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body has ensured that the produce has actually been brought into conformity.

2.10 Appeal Inspection

If dissatisfied with the results of an inspection, the applicant or their representative may request an appeal inspection. An appeal inspection will be granted only if:

- (a) the Inspector is able to confirm that the lot is the lot originally inspected;
- (b) 100%* of the lot is available for inspection; and
- (c) the lot is fully accessible for a complete inspection.

If these criteria are not met, no appeal inspection will be granted.

* 100% of the product is required when inspections are done for the purpose of meeting regulatory requirements set out by the respective country. However, if inspections are performed for other reasons, such as resolution of commercial disputes, 75% of the lot available for inspection is acceptable.

An appeal inspection could be done on permanent (i.e., not progressive) defects or on condition (i.e., progressive) defects if done within a reasonable time after the first inspection. Otherwise the appeal inspection should be performed on permanent defects as condition defects would always be different.

An appeal inspection may not be carried out by the original Inspector. The Inspector of an appeal inspection should be of equal grade level or higher. The original Inspector's role should be limited to lot identification or verification.

If the appeal inspection does not confirm the results of the original inspection, the original inspection certificate may be rendered null and void.

2.11 DECLINE IN COMMERCIAL VALUE OF PRODUCE AS A RESULT OF AN INSPECTION

After the inspection, the bulk sample is to be returned to the applicant and put at their disposal. Unless legal provisions so specify, the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body is not bound to hand back any elements of the bulk sample that may be destroyed during the inspection.

ANNEX I

CERTIFICATE FOR THE CONFORMITY OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

The Inspection Certificate for the Conformity of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables should be issued in accordance with the *Codex Guidelines for Generic Official Certificate Formats and the Production and Issuance of Certificates* (CAC/GL 38-2001).

The following Inspection Certificate is a proposed format; the width of the different boxes may be adjusted to suit the needs of the different inspection conditions or country's requirements and in particular its suitability/adaptability for use in providing electronic certification.

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE USE OF THE CERTIFICATE OF CONFORMITY

The following notes are intended to help inspectors to use the certificate.

Box N° 1 Name and address of the applicant/trader. It could be an importer, an exporter, a wholesaler, a distributor, a dispatcher, etc. An approved identification code issued by the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body may also be used.

Box N° 2 Unique number assigned to the Certificate of Inspection

Box N° 3 Title or acronym of the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body.

Box N° 4 This is a unique reference assigned to the consignment, also known as UCR. This may also include details of the licensing details of production processing and/or packaging establishment in the exporting/producing country.

Box N° 5 Name and address of the packer or production establishment, as indicated on the package. If it is identical to the applicant/trader, make a check in the box provided. An approved identification code issued by the Official/Officially Recognized Inspection and Certification Body may also be used. This information should include details of the licensing details of the production, processing and/or packaging establishment in the exporting/producing country. When there are several packers, "various" may be used.

Box N° 6 This area may be used to provide any other address details that may be relevant to the certificate. Example, name and address of importer or consignee; or exporter or consignor.

Box N° 7 Used to provide transport details relating to identification of the wagon, lorry, sea container, etc, number of containers(s) or any other information that may be relevant to the control document.

Box N° 8 Free text area that may be used to include any other information that may be relevant to the control document.

Box N° 9 Name of country or place where the inspection is taken place.

Box N° 10 In all cases the name of the country to which the produce is being sent is to be reported. However, if the exact final destination is not yet known at the time of inspection, particularly in the case of transport by sea or air, this entry may be replaced by the indication "exact location unknown". Cross this box out, when the inspection is taking place at destination.

Box N° 11 Specify any national regulations related to the export and import of the produce in question. This should include where possible, reference to the title or number of the applicable Standard or requirements against which inspection is being carried out.

Box N° 12 Text field for specifying the voyage number for sea, flight number for air or trip number for road.

Box N° 13 Name of a seaport, airport, freight terminal, rail station or other place at which goods are loaded onto the means of transport.

Box N° 14 Name of a seaport, airport, freight terminal, rail station or other place at which goods are unloaded onto the means of transport.

Box N° 15 Name of the place where the produce is finally delivered. If unknown, mark "unknown".

Box N° 16

No. and Kind of Packages

Number and kind of packages (boxes, trays, cartons, etc.). Specification of the kind of package is optional.

Nature or name of Produce (variety when specified by the Standard)

Nature or type of produce (apples, peaches, etc.), the name of the variety or commercial type of produce (Golden Delicious, Dixired, etc.) when specified by the Standard.

Country of Origin

Country of where the produce was produced.

Batch or lot N°

A reference number, assigned by the manufacturer, to designate grouping of a produce within the same production batch or lot. May also include date coding.

Class

Specify the class: Extra, Class I, Class II.

Total gross /net wt

Specify the total net or gross weight of the consignment as indicated on the weighing slip or consignment note.

Box N° 17 Record defects which are found in excess of those allowed in the Standard and the percentage found not to be in conformity with the Standard. If the lot meets the classification declared on the package, then check the box provided.

Box N° 18 Customs office of entry or departure: specify the place where the consignment must be cleared.

Box N° 19 Place and date of issue: place where the fresh fruit and vegetables are inspected and the date on which the certificate is issued.

Box N° 20 Duration of the inspection certificate's validity: specify the number of days for which the Inspection Certificate is valid (including the day of inspection). The number of days is fixed by the national Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body on the basis of criteria specific to each country (nature of produce, season, place of production, etc.).

Box N° 21 Reserved for any additional observations. The Inspector should cross the box out when no observations are entered.

Box N° 22 Inspector: full name of the person who inspected the fresh fruit and vegetables.

Box N° 23 Signature: signature of the person who inspected the fresh fruit and vegetables. Space for the official stamp or seal for the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body.

ANNEX II
CERTIFICATE FOR THE CONFORMITY OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

1. Applicant/Trader		2. INSPECTION CERTIFICATE N°: _____ This certificate is for the exclusive use of the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body			
		3. Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body		4. Unique Consignment Reference	
5. Packer (Establishment) as indicated on packages (if other than applicant/trader)		6. Other address details			
7. Identification of Transport and Details (e.g. N° of wagon, registration N°, etc)		8. (Free space)			
		9. Country and Place of Inspection*		10. Country of Destination	
12. Vessel/flight N°	13. Port/Airport of loading	11. Space reserved for National Regulations			
14. Port/Airport of discharge	15. Final Place of Delivery				
16. <u>N° and Kind of Packages**</u>	<u>Nature of Produce</u> (variety when specified by the Standard)	<u>Country of Origin</u>	<u>Batch or Lot N°</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Total gross/net wt (kg)***</u>
17. Condition of the Lot:		Lot meets classification declared on package			
<p>The above-mentioned Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body certifies that the consignment described above conforms with the standards in force;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - on the basis of examination of the samples taken, at the time of inspection - on the basis of the packers self evaluation and audit of their Quality Management System 					
18. Customs office of departure **	19. Place and date of issue		20. Duration of Inspection Certificate's validity **** _____ days		
21. Observations					
22. Inspector Name (in block letters) _____					
23. Signature _____			Stamp/Seal of Inspection and Certification Body		
<p>* When the produce is re-exported, indicate its origin after the "Nature of Produce" Box 16 ** Optional *** Delete as necessary **** Duration of validity to point of exit of the exporting country (including days of inspection)</p>					

ANNEX II (Cont'd)

CERTIFICATE FOR THE CONFORMITY OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

(Supplementary Page)

1. Applicant/Trader		2. INSPECTION CERTIFICATE N°: _____ This certificate is for the exclusive use of the Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body			
		3. Official/Officially recognized Inspection and/or Certification Body		4. Unique Consignment Reference	
<u>16. N° and Kind of Packages**</u>	<u>Nature of Produce</u> variety when specified by the Standard	<u>Country of Origin</u>	<u>Batch or Lot N°</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Total gross/net wt (kg)***</u>
21. Observations					
21. Inspector Name (in block letters) _____					
22. Signature _____			Stamp/Seal of Inspection and Certification Body		

PROPOSED STANDARD LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Secretariat Note: In the text the following conventions are used:

[text]: For optional texts or text for which several alternatives exist depending on the produce.

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

INTRODUCTION

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

1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to [part of the produce being standardized of]¹ commercial varieties [and/or commercial types]¹ of [common name of the produce] grown from [Latin Botanical reference *in italics* followed where necessary by the author's name] to be supplied fresh to the consumer, after preparation and packaging. [Common name of the produce] for industrial processing are/is excluded.

.....²

2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

In all classes, subject to the special provisions for each class and the tolerances allowed, the [common name of produce or part of the produce being standardized] must be:

- whole;³
- 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;⁴
- practically free of pests and damage caused by them affecting the general appearance of the produce;
- free of abnormal external moisture, excluding condensation following removal from cold storage;
- free of any foreign smell and/or taste;⁵
- fresh in appearance;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature;

.....²

.....²

¹ {depending on the nature of produce the provision(s) in brackets may be removed as not applicable/necessary}

² {Additional provisions may be made for specific standards depending on the nature of produce}

³ {depending on the nature of produce, a deviation from this provision or additional provisions are allowed}

⁴ {with regard to traces of soil, a deviation from this provision is allowed depending on the nature of produce}

⁵ **This provision allows for smell caused by conservation agents used in compliance with corresponding regulations.**

2.1.1 The [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] must have been carefully [harvested/picked/etc.]⁶ and have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the variety [and/or commercial type]¹, the time of [harvesting/picking/etc.]⁶, and to the area in which they are grown.

The development and condition of the [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] must be such as to enable them:

- to withstand transport and handling, and
- to arrive in satisfactory condition at the place of destination.
-²

2.1.2 **MATURITY REQUIREMENTS**

.....⁷

2.2 **CLASSIFICATION**

.....⁸

{or in case the produce is classified into category classes}

[Common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] are/is classified in [two/three]⁶ classes defined below:

2.2.1 **"Extra" Class**

[Common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] in this class must be of superior quality. They must be characteristic of the variety [and/or commercial type]¹. They must be free of defects with the exception of very slight superficial defects provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package.

(In addition,) they must be:²

-
-

2.2.2 **Class I**

[Common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] in this class must be of good quality. They must be characteristic of the variety [and/or commercial type]¹. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

-⁹
-

(In addition,) they must be:²

-
-

[The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/pulp/etc.]⁶ of the [fruit; produce; part of the produce being standardized or common name of the produce.]⁶.

⁶ {depending on the nature of produce one of these words or another more appropriate word may be used}

⁷ {to be elaborated depending on the nature of produce}

⁸ {for special standards where it does not appear necessary to establish a classification, only the minimum requirements apply}

⁹ {Defects allowed, depending on the nature of produce}

2.2.3 **Class II**

This class includes [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed provided the [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] retain se their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation:

-⁹
-
- (In addition,) they must be:²
-
-

[The defects must not, in any case, affect the [flesh/pulp/etc.]⁶ of the [fruit; produce; part of the produce being standardized or common name of the produce.]⁶.

3. **PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING**

Size is determined by the [average]¹ [weight/length/circumference/(maximum) diameter of the equatorial section/etc.]⁶ of the [fruit; produce; part of the produce being standardized or common name of the produce]⁶ [with a minimum weight/length/circumference/diameter of ...]^{1,6}, in accordance with the following table:

.....¹⁰

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]¹ for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

4.1 **QUALITY TOLERANCES**

4.1.1 **"Extra" Class**

Five percent by number or weight of [common name of produce or part of the produce being standardized] not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

-¹¹
-
-²

4.1.2 **Class I**

Ten percent by number or weight of [common name of produce or part of the produce being standardized] not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II, or exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.

-¹¹
-
-²

¹⁰ {Provisions on minimum and maximum sizes, size range depending on the nature of produce, the variety, the commercial type and possibly the individual classes}
¹¹ {Possible tolerances for individual defects depending on the nature of produce}.

4.1.3 Class II

Ten percent by number or weight of [common name of produce or part of the produce being standardized] 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.

-¹¹
-
-²

4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes:¹² 10% by number or weight of [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] corresponding to the size immediately above and/or below that indicated on the package.

.....¹³

5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package [or lot for produce presented in bulk]¹ must be uniform and contain only [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] of the same origin, quality and size (if sized)¹⁴.

.....²

The visible part of the contents of the package [or lot for produce presented in bulk]¹ must be representative of the entire contents.

5.2 PACKAGING

[Common name of the product or part of the produce being standardized] must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new¹⁵, 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.

[Common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] shall be packed in each container in compliance with the Recommended International Code of Practice for Packaging and Transport of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 44-1995, Amd. 1-2004).

5.2.1 Description of Containers

The container shall meet the quality, hygiene, ventilation and resistance characteristics to ensure suitable handling, shipping and preserving of the [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized].

Packages [or lot for produce presented in bulk]¹ must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

5.3 PRESENTATION

The [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] must/may be presented under one of the following forms:¹⁶

5.3.1

5.3.2

.....¹⁷

¹² {for individual standards, however, different provisions according to the individual classes may be laid down}

¹³ {Possible provisions concerning admissible limits of deviations for sized or unsized produce}.

¹⁴ {In addition for individual standards uniformity concerning variety and/or commercial type, colouring, type of presentation, etc. may be laid down depending on the nature of produce}.

¹⁵ **For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.**

¹⁶ {Specific provisions relating to the presentation of the produce may be included at this point.}

6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING

6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package [or lot for produce presented in bulk]¹ shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety [and/or commercial type]¹.

6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

[For produce transported in bulk these particulars must appear on a document accompanying the goods.]¹

6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)¹⁸.

6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce if the contents are not visible from the outside. [Name of the variety and/or commercial type (optional).]⁶

.....²

6.2.3 Origin of produce

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

6.2.4 Commercial specifications

- Class;
- Size (if sized);
-

6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

[7. FOOD ADDITIVES

Untreated fresh fruits and vegetables

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

Treated fresh fruits and vegetables

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

or

¹⁷ {For individual standards more stringent provisions concerning the presentation in the "Extra" Class may be laid down.}

¹⁸ **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.**

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

] ^{1, 2, 3, 6}

8. **CONTAMINANTS**

8.1 **PESTICIDE RESIDUES**

[Common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] shall comply with those maximum residue limits established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

8.2 **OTHER CONTAMINANTS**

[Common name of the produce or common name of the produce being standardized] shall comply with those maximum levels for contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for this commodity.

9. **HYGIENE**

9.1 It is recommended that the produce covered by the provisions of this Standard be prepared and handled in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Recommended International Code of Practice - General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003), Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP 53-2003) and other relevant Codex texts such as Codes of Hygienic Practice and Codes of Practice.

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

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

.....⁷¹

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

Annex

<Non-Exhaustive><Exhaustive> List ofVarieties

Some of the varieties listed in the following may be marketed under names for which trademark protection has been sought or obtained in one or more countries. Names believed by the FAO and WHO to be varietal names are listed in the first column. Other names by which the FAO and WHO believe the variety may be known are listed in the second column. Neither of these two lists are intended to include trademarks. References to known trademarks have been included in the third column for information only. The presence of any trademarks in the third column does not constitute any license or permission to use that trademark – such license must come directly from the trademark owner. In addition, the absence of a trademark in the third column does not constitute any indication that there is no registered/ pending trademark for such a variety.¹⁹

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

¹⁹

Disclaimer:

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

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

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

Annex

<Non-Exhaustive><Exhaustive> List of Varieties

Some of the varieties listed in the following may be marketed under names for which trademark protection has been sought or obtained in one or more countries. Names believed by the FAO and WHO to be varietal names are listed in the first column. Other names by which the FAO and WHO believe the variety may be known are listed in the second column. Neither of these two lists are intended to include trademarks. References to known trademarks have been included in footnotes for information only. The absence of a trademark in the footnotes does not constitute any indication that there is no registered/ pending trademark for such a variety.²⁰

Varieties	Synonyms	{Other information depending on the produce}
Variety “xyz” ²¹		

²⁰

Disclaimer:

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

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

²¹ The proprietary trademark {include the trade name here followed by the appropriate superscript TM or ®} may only be used for the marketing of fruit from this variety with the express authorization of the trademark owner.

**PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF
FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

FRUITS	VEGETABLES
Avocados (revision)	Chanterelle
Durian	Chili Peppers
Kiwi	Garlic
Passion Fruit	Onion
Pears	Peppers
Pineapple (revision)	
Strawberry	
Tree tomatoes	