

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



**E**

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 08/31/35**

**May 2008**

## **JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**

**CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION  
31<sup>st</sup> Session**

**Geneva, Switzerland, 30 June – 4 July 2008**

**REPORT OF THE 14<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE  
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

**Mexico City, Mexico, 12 - 17 May 2008**

**NOTE:** This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2008/14-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 2008/13-FFV  
May 2008

**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,  
Fax: +39 (06) 5705 4593  
E-mail: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org)  
Rome, Italy

**SUBJECT** : **REPORT OF THE 14<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE  
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (ALINORM 08/31/35)**

**PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 31<sup>ST</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

**Draft Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure**

1. **Draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes** (para. 43 and Appendix II).
2. **Draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava** (para. 60 and Appendix III).

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 15 June 2008.

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

3. **Proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples** (para. 88 and Appendix IV).

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 15 June 2008.

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

6. **Proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables** (para. 35 and Appendix V).
7. **Proposals for Amendments to the Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables** (para. 108 and Appendix VI).

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 30 June 2009.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 14<sup>th</sup> session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables reached the following conclusions:

### **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

#### **Adoption of Codex Standards**

The Committee agreed to:

- forward the *draft Codex Standards for Tomatoes* (para. 43 and Appendix II) and *Bitter Cassava* (para. 60 and Appendix III) to the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8.
- forward the *proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples* to the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5 (para. 88 and Appendix IV).

#### **Approval of new work and discontinuation of work**

The Committee agreed to:

- discontinue work on the *draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards* (para. 65).
- request the approval of the Commission for new work on *Codex Standards for Durian, Chilli Peppers*, and *Tree Tomatoes* and revision of the *Codex Standard for Avocado* (para. 106).

### **MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

The Committee agreed to:

- append the *proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*, with amendments agreed by this session, to the report for comments and consideration at its next session (para. 35 and Appendix V).
- continue to request comments on proposals for amendments the *Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* for consideration at its next session (para. 108 and Appendix VI).
- support the ongoing dialogue between the Codex and UNECE Secretariats to further enhance cooperation between the two Bodies (para. 17).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS -----	page iii
REPORT OF THE 14 <sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES -----	page 1
STATUS OF WORK -----	page 15
	<b><u>Paragraphs</u></b>
INTRODUCTION -----	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION -----	2 - 3
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1) -----	4 - 6
MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 2a) -----	7 - 8
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2b) -----	9 - 17
UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2c) -----	18
PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 2d) -----	19 - 35
<b>CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS AT STEP 7</b>	
DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES (Agenda item 3a) -----	36
DRAFT SECTION 3 - PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING (draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes) (Agenda item 3b) -----	37 - 43
DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA (Agenda item 3c) -----	44 - 61
DRAFT CODEX GUIDELINES FOR THE INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR CONFORMITY TO QUALITY STANDARDS (Agenda item 3d) -----	62 - 65
<b>CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARDS AT STEP 4</b>	
PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES (Agenda 4a) -----	66 - 92
PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda item 5) -----	93 - 108
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 6) -----	109
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda item 7) -----	110 - 111
<b>Appendices</b>	
<u>Appendix I</u> - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS -----	page 16
<u>Appendix II</u> - DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES -----	page 28
<u>Appendix III</u> - DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA -----	page 33
<u>Appendix IV</u> - PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES -----	page 37
<u>Appendix V</u> - PROPOSED LAYOUT FOR CODEX STANDARDS ON FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES -----	page 43
<u>Appendix VI</u> - PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES -----	page 51

## INTRODUCTION

1. The 14th Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was held in Mexico City from 12 to 17 May 2008 at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico. The Chairperson of the Committee, Dr Francisco Ramos Gómez, appointed Ms Ingrid Maciel, International Standardization Director, Ministry of Economy, to chair the Session on his behalf. The Session was attended by delegates from 46 Member countries, one Member Organization and observers from 2 international organizations. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Lic. Carlos Arce Macias, Undersecretary of Foreign Investment, Regulations and International Trade Practices, Ministry of Economy, opened the Session. Amb. Erendira Araceli Paz Campos, Director General of Multilateral and Regional Economic Agencies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, M.V.Z. Enrique Sanchez Cruz, Chief Director, National Service for Agro-Food, Quality, Health and Safety, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food, and Ms Marcela Madrazo Reynoso, General Coordinator, Federal Commission for the Protection against Health Risks also addressed the Committee.

## Division of Competence

3. The Committee noted 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<sup>1</sup>.

## ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)<sup>2</sup>

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

5. The Committee agreed to establish an in-session Working Group on Tomatoes (sizing), under the chairmanship of the European Community, open to all Members and Observers and working in English only, which would provide recommendations on provisions concerning sizing for consideration by the Plenary. In view of the possible amendment of the draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes arising from the recommendations on sizing, the Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of Agenda Items 3(a) and (b) pending the outcome of the discussion of the Working Group.

6. The Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of Agenda Item 2(d) - Proposed Layout for Codex Standards on 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 and related texts scheduled for consideration under Agenda Items 3 and 4.

## MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 2a)<sup>3</sup>

7. The Committee noted that the draft Codex Standard for Table Grapes, including provisions for maturity requirements and sizing, was adopted as final text by the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission. The Committee also noted that the working documents contained information relevant to a number of agenda items and therefore, it agreed to consider:

- Comments and recommendations on the draft Standard for Bitter Cassava arising from the Committees on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) and Food Labelling (CCFL) under Agenda Item 3(c);
- Comments and recommendations on the draft Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards arising from the Committees on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS) and Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) under Agenda Item 3(d);
- Decisions and recommendations on the elaboration of new standards and related texts arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the Executive Committee under Agenda Item 5; and
- Proposals 3 (interval of meetings) and 4 (duration of meetings) arising from the Codex Alimentarius Commission in relation to the *Review of Structure of Codex Committees and Mandates of Codex Committees and Task Forces* under Agenda Item 7.

---

<sup>1</sup> CRD 1.

<sup>2</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/1.

<sup>3</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/2; CX/FFV 08/14/2-Add.1.

8. With regard to the Strategic Plan 2008-2013 of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Committee noted that Activities 1.2 (Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality) and 4.1 (Track the activities of other international standard-setting bodies) were of particular relevance to its work and that they were part of its ongoing activities and did not require any specific action by the Committee. The Committee further noted that Activity 3.3 (Develop committee-specific decision-making and priority-setting criteria) could be discussed under Agenda Item 5 if delegates felt that the criteria and procedures as currently set out in the Procedural Manual were not sufficient for the effective work of the Committee.

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

9. The Committee noted that working document CX/FFV 08/14/3 contained main issues of interest to the Committee arising from sessions of the UNECE Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards and its Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables and the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables that were held subsequent to the last session of the Committee.

10. The Representative of the UNECE highlighted the major points in Part I of CX/FFV 08/14/3 that were relevant to the items scheduled for discussion at this Committee's session namely: adoption of revised UNECE Standards for Table Grapes and Apples. Further discussion on maturity requirements (table grapes) and colour groups, list of varieties and size uniformity (apples) will take place at the next session of the Specialized Section<sup>5</sup>; adoption of revised general texts on the Conformity Certificate and the Standard Layout, the latter on a one year trial period until November 2008; new work on standardization of various commodities including fresh chilli pepper (request of Mexico); and the recommendation of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Working Party (November 2007) on the need to align the UNECE and Codex standard layouts on quality standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as closely as possible following the joint work of the UNECE and Codex Secretariats on enhanced cooperation between the two Bodies.

11. In addition, the Representative of the UNECE informed the Committee about the ongoing consultation between the UNECE and the OECD on concentrating agricultural quality standards work from the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables into the UNECE. In order to facilitate this process, the UNECE Executive Committee adopted new Terms of Reference and Working Procedures of the Working Party to allow equal rights to all United Nations members willing to participate in the work of the Working Party and its Specialized Sections.

12. The Representative of the UNECE also explained that in 2008 the UNECE will start a worldwide promotion of agricultural quality standards to be financed from the UN Development Account. The promotional activities will be carried out jointly with other UN regional commissions, Codex Alimentarius Commission, and other partners from the public and private sectors.

13. The Committee further noted that document CX/FFV 08/14/3-Add.1 presented a summary of the discussions of an informal meeting between the Codex and UNECE Secretariats (October 2007) in which both Secretariats invited their respective Bodies to provide guidance on ways to increase cooperation between them in order to make better combined use of their resources.

14. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that, in order to ensure cooperation between Codex and the UNECE, both Secretariats regularly attend meetings of the Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables and the Working Party and its Specialized Section on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. Both Secretariats were also currently engaged in some activities aimed at improving information sharing between the two Bodies, for instance, a combined or cross-referenced list of Codex and UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables with publication dates, languages available, etc.; calendar of meetings, including meetings of working groups; status of work for both Bodies, etc.

---

<sup>4</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/3 and CX/FFV 08/14/3-Add.1.

<sup>5</sup> The 54th Session of the UNECE Specialized Section on the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables will take place in Geneva on 26-30 May 2008.

15. The Delegation of Australia noted that the Terms of Reference of the CCFFV encouraged the Committee to consider UNECE standards and any proposals from the UNECE for the elaboration of a Codex standard for a fresh fruit or vegetable. The Delegation therefore supported close collaboration between the respective Secretariats. However, the Delegation noted that, although the “theoretical ideal” of having a single international standard for a particular produce was desirable, the purpose and goals of Codex and the UNECE differed and thus deviations from the UNECE standards might occur to address the needs of Codex’s worldwide membership. In this regard, the Delegation noted that Codex was uniquely placed to elaborate standards that facilitate trade in fresh fruits and vegetables on a worldwide basis so that the development of international standards for these products could only be developed within the Codex framework. This view was shared by the Delegation of India.

16. The Delegation of the European Community expressed its support for close collaboration between the two Secretariats. The Delegation highlighted the cooperative work between Codex and UNECE as evidenced by the recently concluded work on the standardization of table grapes by which both Codex and UNECE standards have been harmonized and the request of Mexico to develop a UNECE Standard for Fresh Chilli Pepper in parallel with that of Codex. The Delegation further indicated that, although the mandate of Codex was broader by protecting the health of consumers, Codex and UNECE shared the same aim of ensuring fair trade practices in the food trade by developing international marketing standards for fresh fruits and vegetables as shown by the common format as per quality provisions in both Codex and UNECE standards. The Delegation drew the attention of the Committee to the revised Terms of Reference of the UNECE Working Party which allowed UN member countries to participate on an equal footing in the normative work of the Working Party and its Specialized Sections.

17. Based on the above, the Committee agreed to support the ongoing dialogue between the Codex and UNECE Secretariats to further enhance cooperation between the two Bodies.

#### **UNECE STANDARDS FOR FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 2c)<sup>6</sup>**

18. The Committee noted that UNECE standards, as contained in working document CX/FFV 08/14/4, were made available as references for the development of corresponding Codex standards as directed by the Executive Committee.<sup>7</sup> 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)<sup>8</sup>**

19. The Committee noted that the proposed Layout was a guidance document for use by the Committee to ensure consistency in the application of those general provisions applying across Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables whereas possible deviations from these provisions (e.g. additions to or deletions from the common provisions) due to the characteristics specific to the produce was provided for in the various footnotes referring to the nature of the produce.

20. The Committee also noted that the proposed Layout followed the format of the Standard Layout for UNECE Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for those provisions concerning quality and the Codex Format for Commodity Standards for those provisions not dealing exclusively with commercial quality e.g. additives, contaminants, hygiene, etc. as requested by the Codex Alimentarius Commission<sup>9</sup> and in compliance with the Terms of the Reference<sup>10</sup> of the Committee that Codex and UNECE standards for fresh fruits and vegetables should follow the same broad format.

#### **General considerations**

21. A Delegation indicated that, while acknowledging the Terms of Reference of the Committee in relation to cooperation with the UNECE, the mandate of Codex and UNECE differed and therefore required a different approach in terms of both format and provisions therein to meet the aims and goals of both Bodies and to address the needs of their membership. This view was supported by a number of delegations.

---

<sup>6</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/4.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 97/3, para. 15.

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35-Appendix VIII; CX/FFV 08/14/5 (comments of Kenya, Iran, Mexico, United States of America and European Community); CX/FFV 08/14/5-Add.1 (Alignment between the UNECE and Codex Layouts for standards on fresh fruits and vegetables); CRD 6 (comments of India); CRD 8 (comments of Cuba); CRD 9 (comments of Thailand); CRD 13 (comments of Indonesia) and CRD 18 (Definitions for quality classes submitted by the European Community).

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 89/40 para 380 and ALINORM 93/35 para 19.

<sup>10</sup> Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Section IV.

22. Other delegations drew the attention of the Committee to document CX/FFV 08/14/5-Add.1 and proposed that the Codex and UNECE Secretariats work together in the identification of common provisions and to present a harmonized version of the proposed Layout for consideration by the next session of the Committee. These delegations felt that harmonization of both Layouts would greatly assist food business operators and regulatory authorities in ensuring compliance with standards of both Codex and UNECE.

23. Several delegations did not support this proposal as they believed that a thorough revision of the proposed Layout for Codex standards on fresh fruits and vegetables be completed prior to harmonization to that of the UNECE Layout. They were of the view that the proposed Layout should continue to be discussed at the next session of the Committee.

### **Specific considerations**

24. The Committee considered the proposed Layout, section by section, and made the following amendments and conclusions:

#### **Introduction**

25. In the second indent, the Committee agreed to change the term “ensure” to “encourage” to provide for flexibility in the application of the general provisions of the proposed Layout when developing specific standards for a given fresh fruit or vegetable.

#### **Section 1 – Definition of Produce**

26. Several delegations questioned whether the provisions contained in this Section referred more to the scope than the actual product definition. Some delegations indicated that the provisions as currently written covered both the scope and product definition. Other delegations, while not opposing to rename Section 1 as “scope”, indicated that a section on definitions was required for clarity as per the identity of the produce.

27. The Committee noted that the Codex Format for Commodity Standards differentiates between the scope and description, the latter including the definition of the product, and agreed to align the proposed Layout by including sections on scope and description as in the Codex Format.

#### **Section 2.1 – Minimum Requirements**

28. The Committee noted several proposals for amendments to this Section, e.g. deletion of the term “practically” from the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> indents as it was difficult to define and might have different interpretations worldwide; inclusion of provisions for “firmness” as this was an important quality attribute for fresh fruits and vegetables; and inclusion of reference to “disease” in addition to “pests” as there might be situations where pests could be killed by providing treatment to the produce, but the sign of the disease could still remain on the produce.

29. The Committee noted that terms like “practically free” and “pests” would be better addressed in a broader discussion on definitions of selected terms used in the proposed Layout for Codex standards on fresh fruits and vegetables. The Committee further noted that the definition of “pests” already encompassed “disease” and “parasites” in the relevant phytosanitary specification developed by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). Some delegations noted that this issue had already been brought up under the discussion of specific standards and that the proposed Layout should be the right place to differentiate between the role of Codex and IPPC in regard to setting international quality and phytosanitary standards for fresh fruits and vegetables by clarifying the difference between “pests” and “quarantine pests” regulated under the IPPC.

#### **Section 3 – Provisions concerning Sizing**

30. A Delegation suggested the introduction of size codes as there might be situations where a small size produce might need to be classified under “Extra” Class or vice-versa, therefore, there was a need to ensure that the size of the product was not associated with the quality of the product.

#### **Section 4 – Quality Tolerances**

31. A Delegation proposed that a table giving maximum allowances for defects should be included in the proposed Layout to facilitate interpretation and implementation of Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.

**Other considerations – Need for a glossary on definition of terms used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables**

32. The Committee had an exchange of views on the need for a glossary of terms (terminology) used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables including the most appropriate place to incorporate this in the proposed Layout. Some delegations considered it premature to start work on definitions of terms without having first a thorough discussion on the format and provisions in the proposed Layout. Other delegations considered it important to work in parallel on these definitions in order to facilitate the interpretation and implementation of the provisions within Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. These delegations specifically referred to those definitions related to “Extra” Class, Class I and Class II which might vary across countries/regions and might create difficulties in the finalization of the standards by the Committee. In this regard, the Delegation of the European Community referred to its proposals for definitions of the 3 quality classes as contained in CRD 18 linking them to market share. A number of delegations indicated that it would be more appropriate to link the definition of the quality classes to the quality of the product and not to the market share.

33. A Delegation indicated that difficulties associated with interpretation of certain provisions in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables did not relate to the definition itself but to the implementation of a given provision in relation to the point of application of the Standard. In this regard, it was noted that certain provisions in the standards were closely linked to the point of application i.e. internal breakdown, while others were more related to the quality of product in relation to the product characteristics i.e. russeting and therefore, the need to start work on definitions of terms used in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables was reiterated.

**CONCLUSION**

34. In view of the above discussion, the Committee agreed to establish an electronic Working Group, lead by France, open to all Members and Observers and working in English only to prepare a glossary of terms used in the proposed Layout for Codex standards on fresh fruits and vegetables with particular regard to the definitions of “Extra” Class, Class I and Class II for comments and consideration by the next session of the Committee.

35. The Committee further agreed to append to the report of the Session the proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables with the amendments agreed to by this Session for comments and consideration at its next Session (Appendix V).

**DRAFT STANDARD FOR TOMATOES (Agenda Item 3a)<sup>11</sup>**

36. The Committee recalled that its 13<sup>th</sup> Session had retained the Draft Standard at Step 7 pending finalization of the sizing provisions in Section 3 on the understanding that no further comments would be requested on the document so that the next session of the Committee would restrict its discussion to the finalization of the remaining sizing provisions in order to forward a single document to the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (see Item 3b).<sup>12</sup>

**DRAFT SECTION 3 – PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING (Draft Standard for Tomatoes) (Agenda Item 3b)<sup>13</sup>**

37. The 13<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee considered the sizing provisions and could not reach an agreement on the approach to the sizing provisions in addition to other sizing related matters, and thus, it agreed to return the remaining sizing provisions in Section 3 to Step 6 for further comments, in particular those in square brackets, and consideration at its next session. The Committee agreed to first focus on these remaining sizing provisions and then to consider any necessary consequential amendments to the agreed provisions in the draft Standard for Tomatoes.

---

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35, Appendix II; CRD 2 (Comments of Kenya).

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35, paras 42-44.

<sup>13</sup> CL 2006/55-FFV; ALINORM 07/30/35, Appendix III; CX/FFV 08/14/6 (Comments of France, Kenya, United States of America and the European Community); CRD 4 (CRD 12 and CRD 13 of the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFFV on proposed provisions concerning sizing, reproduced at the request of the European Community); CRD 5 (Comments of Mexico); CRD 8 (Comments of Thailand); CRD 13 (Comments of Indonesia); CRD 15 (recommendation of the in-session Working Group on Tomatoes: sizing); CRD 16 (Modified draft Provision concerning Sizing).

38. The Delegation of the European Community, speaking as the Chair of the in-session Working Group on Tomatoes (sizing), introduced the recommendations of the Working Group on the sizing provisions as contained in CRD 15. The Committee noted that the Working Group had based its discussion on Appendix III of the Report of the 13<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee and had agreed to focus on the sizing table and to no longer consider the maximum size for “cherry” and “cocktail” tomatoes. The Committee further noted that, in view of various views expressed by members, the Working Group had agreed to recommend that this Section should allow, in addition to sizing according to the sizing table, sizing according to uniformity as well as sizing in accordance with legislation of the importing country either by count, diameter or weight.

39. The Committee unanimously supported the approach recommended by the Working Group, which accommodated various concerns of members and allowed for greater flexibility.

40. In CRD 15, the Committee agreed to modify the provisions for the sake of clarity, by placing the three alternative ways for sizing under different subparagraphs and adding a chapeau sentence to make sure tomatoes could only be sized by one of the three options given in the sizing section. With this modification, the Committee agreed to incorporate the sizing provisions into Section 3 of the Draft Standard.

41. In Section 3 of the Draft Standard, the Committee further agreed to make a consequential amendment to the first sentence of this Section as the provision was relevant only to sizing by diameter while the revised Section allowed other ways of sizing.

42. The Delegation of the European Community, while in full support of the revised provision concerning sizing, expressed their concern over the third option for sizing, because in their view, this provision, allowed importing countries to adopt unique sizing by count, diameter or weight that could be even more prescriptive than the first two options and failed to assist the harmonization of national requirements and facilitation of international trade, which was one of the general principles of the Codex Alimentarius. In this regard, the Delegation stressed that members should be encouraged to adopt one of the first two options for sizing indicated in this Section.

#### **STATUS OF THE DRAFT STANDARD FOR TOMATOES**

43. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Standard for Tomatoes to the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix II).

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA (Agenda Item 3c)<sup>14</sup>**

44. The Committee recalled that the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission at the adoption of the draft Standard for Bitter Cassava at Step 5 had recommended that as a separate issue, the CCCF consider the safe levels of hydrogen cyanide. The Committee further noted that the CCFL had not endorsed the labelling provisions as the preparation instructions (Section 6.1.2) did not appropriately address safety concerns.

45. The Committee agreed to focus discussion on those provisions which significantly differed from the Standard for Sweet Cassava (e.g. content of hydrogen cyanide in footnote 2 to the definition and the sizing provisions) as well as the provision on preparation instructions in view of the observations of the CCFL and to discuss this provision together with the content of hydrogen cyanide (footnote 2) since the two issues were interrelated and pertained to safety.

#### **Section 1 - Definition of Produce (Footnote 2)**

46. The Committee was informed that the CCCF had noted that the levels indicated in the footnote were not subject to endorsement by the CCCF since the objective of these levels were to differentiate bitter from sweet cassava and were not considered safety levels. The CCCF had however agreed to assess all available data on cyanogenic glycosides with a view for possible re-evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA).

47. Some delegations expressed the opinion that in view of lack of data on levels of hydrogen cyanide in bitter cassava, the fact that an upper level for cassava was considered a safety level and that establishment of an upper level was dependent on the outcome of the work of CCCF, the Committee was not in a position to determine the levels of hydrogen cyanide in bitter cassava and proposed to suspend discussion on the Draft Standard until the work of the CCCF and possible re-evaluation by JECFA was completed. Other delegations noted that the Standard was necessary especially since the lack of an international standard for bitter cassava had led to barriers in trade and proposed that the maximum level for hydrogen cyanide could be revisited once a safety assessment had been carried out by JECFA and/or a decision had been taken by CCCF and that the Committee should address the preparation instructions to ensure safety of the produce.

---

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35-Appendix VI; CL 2007/20-FFV; CX/FFV 08/14/7-Add.1 (comments of Kenya and Ghana); CRD 6 (comments of India); CRD 9 (comments of Thailand) and CRD 14 (proposal for labelling in Section 6.1.2).

48. The Delegation of India indicated that studies had revealed that varieties of bitter cassava showed a range of 40 to 200 mg/kg of cyanides expressed as hydrogen cyanide (fresh weight basis) and proposed that the lower level be set at 40 mg/kg and the upper level at 200 mg/kg. Some other delegations proposed an upper level of 100 mg/kg. The Committee noted that the level of hydrogen cyanide was to distinguish bitter varieties of cassava from sweet cassava and that lowering the level from 50 mg/kg to 40 mg/kg would cause overlap with sweet cassava varieties. Several delegations proposed that the upper level for hydrogen cyanide should be set according to the national legislation of the importing country.

49. In view of the discussion, the Committee agreed that a lower level of 50 mg/kg of cyanides expressed as hydrogen cyanide (fresh weight basis) was necessary to distinguish bitter cassava from sweet cassava and to address this in footnote 2 to the definition and that the upper level for hydrogen cyanide was a safety level and could more appropriately be addressed in the Section 7.2 on contaminants and to reflect that in the absence of a Codex maximum level for hydrogen cyanide, the acceptable level should be set on a safety basis by the national legislation of the importing country pending the outcome of the work in the CCCF.

50. Several delegations expressed their concern with this decision, since many countries' legislation did not have such levels and relied on Codex as a reference.

### **Section 6.1.2 - Preparation Instructions**

51. The Committee had an exchange of views on preparation instructions. It was noted that although bitter cassava could be used in a variety of ways and that traditional users of cassava were familiar with preparation practices to ensure safety, that in view of the increased trade in cassava, it might reach non-traditional consumers who were not necessarily familiar with preparation practices and that further instructions for safety purposes were necessary. It was indicated that the key practices to ensure safety was to ensure that cassava was fully cooked and that since hydrogen cyanide was soluble in water, cooking or rinsing water needed to be discarded. The Committee further noted that hydrogen cyanide was not soluble in oil and therefore no particular provisions for cooking oil needed to be considered.

52. A Delegation noted that the labelling requirements only covered packaged cassava or non-retail containers and pointed out that bitter cassava may also be sold unpackaged and proposed that each cassava root should be labelled to provide information to the consumer.

53. In view of the discussion, the Committee agreed to amend Section 6.1.2 to indicate that bitter cassava should be fully cooked and that the water used for rinsing and cooking should be discarded and should not be used for other purposes. In order to address the issue of preparation instructions for cassava sold unpackaged, the Committee agreed to include a footnote to indicate that in such cases information on preparation practices needed to be provided at point of retail sale.

### **Section 6.2.3 - Origin of Produce**

54. The Delegation of New Zealand noted that the section on labelling included mandatory country of origin labelling and expressed its opposition to this provision (Section 6.2.3) because it did not contribute to food safety, could create considerable compliance costs, had no effect on quality and could create barriers to trade. The Delegation further pointed out that the General Standard for Labelling of Prepackaged Foods should apply, where country of origin should be declared if its omission could mislead or deceive the consumer and that commercial interest or phytosanitary control were not sufficient reasons for a Codex requirement. The Committee however did not agree to this proposal.

### **Section 3 - Provisions concerning Sizing**

55. The Committee agreed to the proposed provisions in this Section and agreed to remove the square brackets.

### **Other Considerations**

#### **Section 2.1 - Minimum Requirements**

56. The Delegation of India, supported by Costa Rica, proposed to limit the diameter of the cut at the distal end of the cassava root to 1 cm since there were varieties of cassava which might have a smaller diameter and that the diameter should be as low as possible since exudation after cutting reduced the natural defence mechanisms of the produce. The Committee did not agree to this proposal with the understanding that the current requirement of a maximum diameter of 2 cm would include those smaller varieties. The Delegations of India and Costa Rica reiterated their proposal to limit the diameter to 1 cm.

57. The Committee noted the additional proposals by the Delegation of India as presented in CRD 6 for amendments to the Section 2.1 Minimum Requirements, Section 2.2 Classification and Section 4.1 Quality Tolerances. The Committee agreed that those proposals could be taken up in a broader discussion on the proposed Layout (Agenda Item 2d) or be examined in future when the Committee considered the development of a single standard for cassava. In view of this decision, the Committee decided to delete reference to “edible quality” in Sections 2.2.1 Class I and 2.2.3 Class II.

58. The Committee agreed to replace “pulp” with “flesh” throughout the document for consistency.

### **Section 7 - Contaminants**

59. The Delegation of Argentine indicated that the term “maximum” should be removed from Sections 7.1 and 7.2 so that cassava shall comply with pesticide residue limits and contaminant levels which shall not exceed the maximum residue limits for pesticides and maximum levels contaminants established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

### **STATUS OF THE DRAFT STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA**

60. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft Standard for Bitter Cassava to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix III).

61. In taking this decision, the Committee recalled the recommendation of the 28<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission<sup>15</sup> that the Committee might consider in future the possibility of having a single Standard applicable to both sweet and bitter cassava consistent with the Codex approach to develop more horizontal and inclusive standards when possible and agreed that this should be considered by the Committee at a later stage.

### **DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR CONFORMITY TO QUALITY STANDARDS (Agenda Item 3d)<sup>16</sup>**

62. The Committee recalled that when the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission adopted the proposed draft Guidelines at Step 5, it had agreed to forward the Guidelines to the CCFICS and CCMAS for their observations from a horizontal perspective on certification, inspection and sampling provisions in order to ensure consistency in the approach followed on these matters in Codex.

63. The delegation of Canada, as lead of the electronic Working Group<sup>17</sup>, introduced the document and drew the attention of the Committee to the observations of the CCFICS and CCMAS and noted that several concerns had been expressed on the Guidelines, amongst others, that there was duplication with existing Codex documents or documents of other international organizations, that some elements of the Guidelines were too prescriptive and could create technical barriers to trade, whether reference to quality management systems (QMS) should be included in the Guidelines or should be restricted to inspection and certification based on lot inspections and whether countries without government regulations to enforce quality inspection and certification of fresh fruits and vegetables would need to implement these Guidelines. The Delegation reminded the Committee that the intention of the Guidelines were to be complementary to CCFICS texts while specific for fresh fruits and vegetables from a quality perspective and that clarification of the need and scope of the Guidelines were required.

64. The Committee had a general discussion on the need and the scope of the Guidelines. Several delegations noted that the Guidelines duplicated existing Codex texts, in particular those of CCFICS, which already provided sufficient guidance on inspection and certification as well as other texts developed within the United Nations and other international organizations such as the OECD and questioned the need for the Guidelines. In this regard, a Delegation indicated the potential to develop conflicting requirements by developing separate Guidelines in view of the texts available within Codex and other international fora. Another Delegation drew the attention of the Committee to current work in CCFICS, in particular, the format of certificates and expressed the opinion that inspection and certification for quality should not be separated from inspection and certification for other purposes. Other observations made were that the scope went beyond product quality inspection by including, for instance, reference to quality management systems whose implementation, as well as other provisions in the Guidelines, might create technical barriers to trade and that the Guidelines should cover both export and import.

<sup>15</sup> ALINORM 05/28/41 para 101.

<sup>16</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/18; CX/FFV 08/14/8-Add.1 (comments of Argentina, Australia, Ghana, Iran, Morocco, Switzerland, United States of America and European Community); CX/FFV 08/14/8-Add.2 (Council Decision C(2006)95 revising the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables); CX/FFV 08/14/8-Add.3 (Alignment between Codex and UNECE Conformity Certificate), CRD 5 (comments of Mexico); CRD 6 (comments of India); CRD 7 (comments of Malaysia); CRD 8 (comments of Cuba); CRD 9 (comments of Thailand).

<sup>17</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35 para 93.

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

65. In view of the observations made, the Committee unanimously agreed that existing Codex texts were sufficient for the purposes of inspection and certification of fruits and vegetables and agreed to discontinue work on the draft Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards and to inform the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission through the Executive Committee of this decision.

### **PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR APPLES (Agenda Item 4b)<sup>18</sup>**

66. The 13<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee had a general discussion on the Standard and agreed to reconvene the electronic Working Group led by the United States of America to redraft the proposed draft Standard for Apples based on the comments made at that Session with the understanding that there might be a need for a physical meeting of the Working Group.

67. The delegation of the United States, as lead country of the Working Group on Apples, introduced document CX/FFV 07/14/9, highlighting the outcomes of the physical meeting of the Working Group held in Washington, DC, United States of America (September 2007). It was reported that several matters on which consensus could not be reached required further discussion in the Committee. These included the provisions for classification, sizing, quality tolerances, presentation and uniformity. The Delegation reported that two Annexes had been developed to provide guidance on classification by colour and allowances for defects, respectively, and would require further discussion. In addition, point of application and condition after storage or transit were not discussed by the Working Group and was deferred to the Committee.

68. The Delegation of the European Community, referring to its comments in CRD 3, noted that the report of the Working Group did not accurately reflect the outcome of its discussions and proposed that in future reports of working groups should be finalized at meetings of these working groups.

69. The Committee, in noting that several matters required discussion in plenary and that considerable opposing views existed, agreed to have an in-session Working Group on Apples, led by the United States of America, to provide proposals on the sections on minimum requirements, classification, sizing and presentation to facilitate discussion in plenary.

70. The Committee considered the proposed draft Standard section by section, focusing on issues referred to in paragraph 67 while taking into account the proposals of the in-session Working Group (CRD 19), and made the following amendments or comments:

#### **Section 2.1 – Minimum Requirements**

71. Several delegations proposed 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 storage or transit was for a long period. Other delegations opposed the inclusion of firmness as a minimum requirement and pointed out that without a numerical value for firmness it would be difficult to measure and that this requirement could result in some grades of firmness being excluded from the Standard because firmness was associated with maturity. The Delegation of the European Community, supported by some delegations, proposed to include firmness as a condition in Section 2.1.1 to take account of the loss of firmness during storage and transport. The Representative of the UNECE proposed that an approach similar to that in the UNECE Standard for Apples by which firmness was only associated with maturity be considered.

72. In view of a lack of consensus, the Committee agreed to include “firm” as a minimum requirement and to place this in square brackets for further consideration by the Committee.

#### **Section 2.3 – Classification (Colouring)**

73. The Committee had an exchange of views on this Section. A proposal was made to delete classification of apple varieties by colour since application of such classification would be difficult to implement and impractical, that significant amount of trade was taking place without reference to colour and that such classification could prevent new varieties of apples with varying colour ranges from entering the market. Several delegations expressed support for classification of apple varieties according to colour since this was an essential part of classification and that the colour chart in Annex I was useful and should be maintained.

---

<sup>18</sup> CX/FFV 08/14/9; CX/FFV 08/14/9-Add.1 (comments of Argentina, Australia, Iran and Switzerland); CRD 3 (comments of European Community); CRD 5 (comments of Mexico); CRD 6 (comments of India); CRD 7 (comments of Malaysia); CRD 9 (comments of Thailand); CRD 11 (comments of New Zealand) and CRD 19 (report of the in-session Working Group on Apples).

74. A Delegation expressed the view that the provision was not valid since Annex I did not have a standard character as it did not constitute groups related to names of varieties and proposed that a list of varieties limited to those most traded internationally be included in the Annex. The Delegation of the United States of America, as lead country of the Working Group, clarified that the Annex had initially included lists of varieties but that it had been agreed to simplify the Annex to facilitate inspection. The Delegation noted that it could be feasible to limit the list of varieties to 40 at a maximum. On this point, some delegations pointed out that according to geographic and climatic conditions as well as agricultural practices a single variety could fall into more than one colour group and that limiting the number of varieties would prevent the trade of certain varieties and limit innovation.

75. Other delegations pointed out that classification of apple varieties by colour was consistent with the UNECE Standard for Apples. The Representative of the UNECE proposed that the Committee await the decision on the UNECE Standard for Apples by the UNECE Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables at its meeting in May 2008 and supported the retention of the Annex in square brackets.

76. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that classification by colour had been removed from several Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables since inspection would be difficult to carry out without the aid of explanatory materials such as brochures which the Committee did not have a mandate to develop. In the case of the UNECE standards, they were adopted by the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruits and Vegetables and further interpreted in form of explanatory brochures to facilitate inspection for compliance. However, not all Codex members were members of the OECD Scheme to participate in this exercise.

77. The Committee noting the various views expressed, agreed to keep colour as a requirement for classification of the three quality classes and to place Annex I on colour classification in square brackets for further consideration at its next session.

### **Section 3 - Provisions Concerning Sizing**

78. The Committee agreed to Proposal A which provided a more flexible approach to sizing. A Delegation pointed out that maturity assessment involved a number of factors, but that Brix measurement was the easiest to achieve and pointed out that Section 6.2.4 introduced the option of labelling using size codes and that it would be appropriate for Section 3 to include a table of codes and the corresponding size ranges. The reference to size code in Section 6.2.4 was however deleted as a consequence of the decision on Proposal A.

79. The Committee could not come to an agreement on the Brix level for smaller sized fruits of less than 60 mm. Some delegations were of the opinion that a Brix level of 10.5° was too low and that for some varieties it would be within the range of unripe fruit and proposed a Brix level of 12°. Other delegations pointed out that a Brix level of 12° would be too high and was a dessert quality level, that research in some countries had shown that there was no direct correlation between size and maturity and supported a minimum Brix level of 10.5° which was also consistent with the UNECE Standard on Apples. In view of a lack of consensus, the Committee agreed to include both levels in square brackets for further consideration.

### **Section 4.1 - Quality Tolerances**

80. The Committee had an extensive discussion on the proposal of the Working Group to include provisions for tolerances for decay and internal breakdown for the three quality classes of apples. Several delegations supported the proposal and pointed out that this reflected current practices, that some degree of decay and internal breakdown could take place during transportation especially over long distances and that zero tolerance for decay and internal breakdown could result in large scale rejection of consignments. Several other delegations opposed the proposal and noted that this was not consistent with the provisions for quality tolerances that usually apply in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables. It was suggested that this proposal should be deleted from the Standard and could be more appropriately considered in the proposed Layout or could be considered in an Annex to the Standard. It was further noted that this provision was inconsistent with the UNECE Standard for Apples. A Delegation emphasized that the proposed Layout served as a guide and that deviations should be allowed in cases that were specific for a particular produce and supported the retention of the provision.

81. Some delegations pointed out that setting percentage values on an arbitrary basis was not acceptable, that there were several causes of decay and internal breakdown and that some could be considered a risk to human or plant health. It was clarified that the Standard only pertained to quality and that issues related to human or plant health were dealt with through hygiene requirements and phytosanitary requirements for plant quarantine, respectively. There were also proposals not to have this tolerance for “Extra” Class apples, but that it could be considered for Classes I and II. Some delegations expressed support for the higher percentage values by number or weight of apples affected by decay or internal breakdown at destination. Other delegations proposed to follow the same approach as in the UNECE Standard for Apples by recognizing a slight deterioration of freshness and turgidity due to the development and perishability of the produce.

82. The Committee could not reach consensus on this matter and agreed to leave the proposals of the Working Group for tolerances for decay and internal breakdown in all three quality classes unchanged and in square brackets for further consideration by the next session of the Committee.

83. It also became clear during discussion on the provisions of classification and quality tolerances that there are varying interpretations of the quality classes, especially “Extra” Class and it was proposed that consideration be given to the development of definitions for these classes when discussing the proposed Layout (see para 34).

84. The Committee noted the concern of several delegations with regard to inclusion of defects such as blemishing (e.g. bitter pit), damage to skin and presence of insects or pests for Class II apples. The Delegation of the United States of America, as leading country of the Working Group on Apples, pointed out that blemishing such as bitter pit was common in some varieties of apple and did not pose a risk to health and could be removed prior to consumption; that most apples healed naturally and that apples are normally treated with fungicides which would limit any risk posed by damage to the skin and re-emphasized that pests referred to in the Standard were those that were commonly found worldwide, not related to human or plant health and therefore did not pose a risk to human or plant health and that sanitary and phytosanitary concerns would be taken care of through quarantine measures at point of import.

85. The Committee noted the proposal of the Codex Secretariat to insert a footnote to the term “pests” indicating that such pests did not refer to quarantine pests regulated by the IPPC. The Committee further noted that provisions that might envisage phytosanitary risks in Codex standards for fresh fruits and vegetables e.g. table grapes had been already dealt with by the Committee without prejudice to the applicable plant protection rules.

#### **Sections 5.1 – Uniformity and 5.3 - Presentation**

86. The Committee agreed to the proposals of the in-session Working Group for uniformity and the deletion of presentation as presented in CRD 19.

#### **Other considerations**

87. The Committee noted the additional proposals by the Delegation of India (CRD 6), the proposals of Malaysia (CRD 7), the proposal of Iran (CX/FFV 08/14/9-Add.1), as well as the proposal by the Delegation of Mali to indicate that apples should be practically free of parasites in addition to pests (Section 2.1). However, the Committee did not discuss those proposals and agreed to give them further consideration at its next Session. Some delegations noted that issues related to pests and parasites were outside the scope of the Committee.

#### **STATUS OF THE PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD FOR APPLES**

88. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft Standard to the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 5 (Appendix IV).

89. The Committee further agreed to reconvene the electronic Working Group led by the United States of America working in English only and open to all Members and Observers. The Committee noted that there might be a need for a physical meeting of the Working Group both between sessions of the Committee as well as immediately prior to the next session of the Committee, 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 Commission. The Delegation of the United States informed the Committee that should a physical meeting between sessions be necessary every effort would be made to provide interpretation in all the official languages of the Commission. The Chairperson informed the Committee that Mexico, as host of the Committee, would provide interpretation into English, French and Spanish, should the Working Group meet immediately prior to the next Session of the Committee.

90. The Committee agreed to the earlier proposal by the Delegation of the European Community that reports of the Working Group should be finalized during its meetings.

91. The Delegation of Mexico proposed that in the event the Working Group decided to have a physical meeting, that the first day of the meeting be set aside for a workshop on the practical application of provisions especially with regard to inspection of defects and organoleptic tests to provide a better understanding of the practical application of some provisions in the Standard with a view to facilitate its discussion and finalization.

92. The Committee also made a commitment to make every effort and to work in a spirit of compromise to finalize the Standard by the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee for adoption by the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission in 2010. The Committee agreed that discussion at the next session would focus on the sections in square brackets in addition to other general proposals, especially those made at the current session but which the Committee did not have time to consider.

### **PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PRIORITY LIST FOR THE STANDARDIZATION OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES (Agenda Item 5)<sup>19</sup>**

93. The Committee was informed of the matters referred by the Commission and Executive Committee with regard to the preparation of project documents<sup>20</sup> for proposals for new work and noted that they should follow the format set out in the Procedural Manual<sup>21</sup> and provide sufficiently detailed, relevant information, also taking into account the *Guideline on the Application of the Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities Applicable to Commodities* agreed by the 60<sup>th</sup> Session<sup>22</sup> of the Executive Committee.

94. The Committee noted proposals for new work on chilli peppers, garlic, durian, passion fruit, tree tomato, table grapes (revision), lucuma, avocado (revision), pomegranate and black pepper as well as their justifications.

95. The Committee recalled that its 13<sup>th</sup> Session had agreed to give priority to the revision of the Codex Standard for Avocado and standardization of durian, for reconsideration by the current session based on the outcome of its deliberations on ongoing work.<sup>23</sup> The Committee noted that based on the progress made during the current session, its next session could take up three to four items as new work.

96. The Committee agreed not to consider proposals submitted as conference room documents, except for the proposal for the revision of the Codex Standard for Avocado, because they were made available only during the meeting and there was not enough time for members to consider them.

97. The Delegation of Mexico expressed their willingness to postpone the proposal for new work on garlic as a result of consultation with other interested members. The Delegation of the United States of America, recalling the decision of the last session of the Committee that future work on exceptions from minimum maturity requirements for table grapes should be undertaken, withdrew their proposal for the revision of the Codex Standard for Table Grapes since the criteria for exceptions were not yet determined.

98. A Delegation observed that some of the commodities proposed for new work appeared to be traded mainly within regions and proposed that these commodities should be standardized as regional standards in relevant FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees. Noting that procedures existed to convert regional standards into worldwide standards at a later stage, this proposal was supported by many delegations and the Delegation of Peru agreed to bring the proposals for new work on lucuma to the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean.

### **Durian**

99. In response to the proposal by the Delegation of the United States of America to refer this proposal for new work to the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Asia (CCASIA), the Delegation of Thailand explained that durian, though mainly produced in Southeast Asia, was also produced in other regions and traded internationally; that some Latin American countries had expressed interests in production; and that it was expected to become a more international product in the near future. The Delegation of the United States of America reiterated its preference for a regional standard for durian rather than an international one.

<sup>19</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35-Appendix IX; CX/FFV 08/14/10 (Proposals by Mexico); CX/FFV 08/14/10-Add.1 (Proposal by Thailand); CX/FFV 08/14/11-Add.2 (Proposals by Colombia); CX/FFV 08/14/11-Add.3 (Proposals by the United States of America and Peru); CRD 6 (comments of India); CRD 8 (Comments of Cuba); CRD 10 (Proposal by Cuba); CRD 12 (Proposal by Iran); CRD 13 (Comments and Proposal by Indonesia); CRD 17 (Revised proposal by Thailand). CX/FFV 08/14/2, paras 10 and 14.

<sup>20</sup> Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Section I, Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts, Part 2, Critical Review.

<sup>21</sup> ALINORM 08/31/3, Appendix II.

<sup>22</sup> ALINORM 07/30/35, paras 97 and 100.

<sup>23</sup>

### **Avocado**

100. The Committee noted that the Codex Standard for Avocado (CODEX/STAN 197-1995) did not cover new varieties currently marketed internationally and that relevant sections needed to be revised to cover these varieties taking into account the recently revised UNECE Standard for Avocados (FFV-42). Many delegations supported to take up this revision as new work as a matter of urgency because the existing Codex Standard could restrict the trade of new varieties in the market.

### **Chilli Pepper**

101. The Committee noted that chilli pepper was an international product in terms of production, trade and consumption and that it was sensible to initiate new work at this point of time because UNECE had also decided to initiate new work on chilli pepper and that cooperation between the two Bodies should be encouraged. The Committee noted that the CCASIA was developing a Regional Standard for Chilli Sauce, for which chilli pepper was an ingredient, and noted that there should be coordination between the work on fresh chilli pepper and chilli sauce, in particular on the definition of products, in order to avoid any confusion to the consumer.

### **Tree Tomato and Passion Fruit**

102. Some delegations requested clarification whether tree tomatoes was a variety of tomatoes. The Committee noted that though bearing “tomato” as part of its name, due to the similarity in appearance of its fruit with that of tomatoes, tree tomato was botanically an entirely different specie not associated with tomatoes and that its fruit was mainly consumed as dessert or processed into juices. The Committee was further informed that tree tomato was also called “tamarillo” and produced in a significant quantity in New Zealand. The Delegation of Colombia explained that standardization of tree tomato had higher priority than that for passion fruit.

### **Pomegranate**

103. Some delegations supported the proposals for new work on pomegranate noting that it was grown and traded internationally. However, in line with the decision not to consider proposals in late submissions, the Committee did not agree on new work on pomegranate. The Committee noted that this proposal could be brought to the FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Near East, though significant production of pomegranate also existed in other regions, and that once it was adopted as a regional standard, it could be proposed for conversion into a worldwide standard.

### **Chanterelle**

104. The Committee noted that conversion of the Codex Standard for Fresh Fungus “Chanterelle” (European Regional Standard CODEX STAN 40-1981) into a worldwide standard had been referred to the Committee as a result of an earlier recommendation of the Commission and included in the Priority List since its Eighth Session and that UNECE had recently decided to initiate work on chanterelle. The Committee agreed to keep chanterelle in the Priority List for the time being and to revisit this issue once UNECE finalized their Standard.

### **Other considerations**

105. The Delegation of New Zealand, in view of the number of proposals for new work made during the current session, suggested that it would be worthwhile to consider screening of proposals in a working group before discussion in the plenary, as practised in some Committees, and developing criteria specifically applicable to this Committee.

### **CONCLUSION**

106. In view of the support from many delegations, the Committee agreed to request the approval by the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Commission of new work on Codex Standards for Durian, Chilli Pepper and Tree Tomato and the revision of the Codex Standard for Avocado (CODEX STAN 197-1995) and, noting the requests from the Commission and the Executive Committee (see para 93), to request countries that had proposed new work to submit revised project documents through the Codex Secretariat to the Executive Committee.

107. The Committee agreed to establish the following electronic working groups open to all Members and Observers, which would develop proposed draft texts for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration at the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee:

- Electronic Working Group on Durian, led by Thailand and working in English only;
- Electronic Working Group on Avocado, led by Cuba and working in English and Spanish;
- Electronic Working Group on Chilli Pepper, led by Mexico and working in English and Spanish; and
- Electronic Working Group on Tree Tomato, led by Colombia and working in English and Spanish.

108. 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 VI).

**OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 6)**

109. The Committee noted that there were no other matters to discuss under this Agenda Item.

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

110. The Committee considered proposal 3 (interval between meetings) and proposal 4 (duration of meetings) and agreed that the current interval of 18 months and a duration of 5 days were appropriate taking into account the need for sufficient time to prepare and consider documents and that working groups had been established that would work between sessions as well as immediately prior to the next Session of the Committee to facilitate the work of the Committee. A Delegation noted that a five-day session was sufficient for the workload of the Committee only if the inter-session mechanism was fully utilized and delegations participated in working groups and the plenary sessions of the Committee in a spirit of compromise.

111. The Committee was informed that the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables was tentatively scheduled to be held in Mexico in approximately 18 months. The exact time and venue would be decided between the Codex and the Mexican Secretariats.

**STATUS OF WORK**

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>STEP</b>	<b>FOR ACTION BY :</b>	<b>DOCUMENT REFERENCE ALINORM 08/31/35</b>
Draft Codex Standard for Tomatoes	8	31 <sup>st</sup> CAC	para. 43 and Appendix II
Draft Codex Standard for Bitter Cassava	8		para. 60 and Appendix II
Proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples	5	31 <sup>st</sup> CAC Working Group 15 <sup>th</sup> CCFV	para. 88 and Appendix IV
Proposed draft Codex Standards for: – Avocado (revision) – Chilli Peppers – Durian – Tree Tomatoes	1/2/3	31 <sup>st</sup> CAC Working Groups 15 <sup>th</sup> CCFV	para. 106
Draft Codex Guidelines for the Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for Conformity to Quality Standards	discontinued	31 <sup>st</sup> CAC	para. 65
Proposed Layout for Codex Standards on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	-----	15 <sup>th</sup> CCFV	para. 35 and Appendix V
Proposals for Amendments to the Priority List for the Standardization of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	-----		para. 108 and Appendix VI

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

**Chairperson:** Dr. FRANCISCO RAMOS GÓMEZ  
**Président:** Director General de Normas  
**Presidente:** Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
Estado de México  
C.P. 53950  
Tel: 57 29 93 00  
Fax: 55 20 97 15  
E-mail: [framos@economia.gob.mx](mailto:framos@economia.gob.mx)

**Assistant to the Chairperson:** INGRID MACIEL PEDROTE  
**Assistant du Président:** Director de Normalización Internacional  
**Asistente del Presidente:** Dirección General de Normas  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
Estado de México  
C.P. 53950  
Tel: 57 29 94 80  
Fax: 55 20 97 15  
E-mail: [imaciel@economia.gob.mx](mailto:imaciel@economia.gob.mx)

**ANGOLA**

**DE MELO** *María de Fátima Da Conceição*  
Coordinadora Do sub- Comité Técnico de Hortalizas e  
Frutas Frescas  
Ministerio da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural,  
Rua. Comandante Gika  
C.P.N 527 Luanda- Angola  
Tel: 244-2-321196, 912229321  
Fax: 244-2-323724  
E-mail: [secretariadocodex@yahoo.com.br](mailto:secretariadocodex@yahoo.com.br)

**GARCIA JÚNIOR MORAIS** *Lídia*  
2ª Secretaria Executiva Adjunta  
Comité Nacional Para Codigo Alimentar em Angola  
Codex- Angola  
Ministerio da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural  
7º andar  
Rua Comandante Gika  
Tel: 244 492 3316678  
Fax: 244 222 323724  
E-mail: [lidiamorais43@hotmail.com](mailto:lidiamorais43@hotmail.com)

**SANAZENGE** *Maria Antónia*  
2ª Vice-Presidente do Codex-Angola  
Ministerio da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural  
7º andar  
Rua Comandante Gika  
Tel: 244 4912503868  
244 923653695  
Fax: 244 222 323724  
E-mail: [sanazenge@hotmail.com](mailto:sanazenge@hotmail.com)

**DE FREITAS CRUZ** *Teresa*

Coordinadora do Sub-Comité de óleos  
Gorduras, Frutas e Hortalizas Elaboradas  
Do Codex Angola  
Ministério do Comércio  
Largo 4 de Fevereiro R/Chão  
Tel: 244 927965925  
Fax: 244 222 323724  
E-mail: [tetearsenio@yahoo.com.br](mailto:tetearsenio@yahoo.com.br)

**ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE**

**SANTOS** *Silvia Elda*  
Coordinadora de Frutas y Hortalizas  
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad  
Agroalimentaria  
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y  
Alimentos  
Avenida Paseo Colón 367(1063)  
3º Piso, frente  
Tel: 541141215293  
Fax: 541141215299  
E- Mail: [ssantos@senasa.gov.ar](mailto:ssantos@senasa.gov.ar)

## AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

### **SOLOMON Robert**

Manager (Acting), International Foods Standards  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
GPO Box 858  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
Tel: 61 2 6272 5945  
Fax: 61 2 6272 4367  
E-mail: rob.solomon@daff.gov.au

### **BENNETT Richard**

Product Integrity Manager  
Horticulture Australia Limited  
PO Box 1968 Shepparton Victoria 3632  
Australia  
Tel: 61358253753  
Fax: 61358255031  
E-mail: richard.bennett@horticulture.com.au

## BHUTAN/BHOUTAN/BUTÁN

### **PENJORE Ugyen**

Chief Postproduction Officer  
National Post-Harvest Centre, Department of  
Agriculture, P.O. 1201, Paro, Bhutan  
Tel: 9758271493  
Fax: 9758271494  
E-mail: ugyenp@druknet.bt

## BRAZIL/BRÉSIL/BRASIL

### **KARINA Fontes Coelho Leandro**

Fiscal Federal Agropecuario  
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento  
Esplanada Dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo B,  
Sala 352 CEP 70043-900, Brasília-D.F.  
Tel: 556132182706  
Fax: 556132244322  
E-mail: karina.leandro@agricultura.gov.br

### **OSMARIO Zan Matias**

Fiscal Federal Agropecuario  
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento  
Praça Cívica 100, 3°. Andar CX. Postal 149  
CEP 74003-010 Goiânia-GO  
Tel: 556232217262  
Fax: 556232217254  
E-mail: osmario.zan@agricultura.gov.br

## CANADA/CANADÁ

### **REDDICK Ronna**

Regulatory Officer  
Agrifood Division  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
159 Cleopatra Dr.  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9  
Tel: (613) 221-7179  
Fax: (613) 221-7294  
E-mail: reddickr@inspection.gc.ca

## CHILE/CHILI

### **PANIAGUA Ramírez Karla**

Asistente de la Consejera Agrícola de la Embajada de  
Chile  
Melchor Ocampo 18, Col. Barrio de Santa Catarina.  
C.P. 04100. Del. Coyoacán México  
Tel: (5255) 55540258  
Fax: (5255) 56599803  
E-mail: karla.paniagua@consejagri.org

### **ESCUADERO Mira Paulina**

Asociación de Exportadores de Chile A.G.  
Cruz del Sur 133, Piso 2, Las Condes, Santiago de  
Chile  
Tel: (562) 4724720  
Fax: (562) 2064163  
E-mail: pescudero@asoex.cl

## CHINA/CHINE

### **CHAN Yiu Keung Edward**

Chief Health Inspector  
Centre for food Safety  
43 F Queensway Government Offices  
Queensway, Hong Kong  
Tel.: 852-28675693  
Fax: 852-25214784  
E-mail: yiukschan@feh.gov.hk

## COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

### **MUNAR León Ricardo Enrique**

Profesional de Normalización  
Instituto Colombiano de Normas Técnicas y  
Certificación ICONTEC  
Carrera 37 No 32-95, Bogotá D.C.  
Tel: (571) 6078888 Ext. 1442  
Fax: (571) 3150613  
E-mail: rmunar@icontec.org

## COSTA RICA

### **MONTEVERDE Gina**

Supervisora Fitosanitaria  
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado  
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
Apartado Postal: 70-3006 Costa Rica  
Tel: (506) 2260-6721  
Fax: (506) 2260-6721  
Email: gmonteverde@proteconet.go.cr

## CUBA

### **SÁNCHEZ García Cira Margarita**

Jefe Área Gestión de la Calidad, Bioseguridad y Medio  
Ambiente  
IIFT.PDTE ONN/CTN 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: (53-7) 209-3401  
Fax: (53-7) 204-6794  
E-mail: calidad@iift.cu

**OLIVÉ Matamoros Borja Inocencia**

Especialista Principal en Tecnología y Desarrollo  
Ministerio Industria Alimenticia  
Unión de Conservas  
Calle E No. 152 esquina Calzada Vedado Plaza de la  
Revolución, Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba  
Tel: 5367952  
Fax: 5327636  
E-mail: tecnico@consva.com.cu

tecnología@ consva.com.cu

**PEREZ Periche María Ana**

Sudirectora de Desarrollo, Unión de Acopio  
Ministerio de la Agricultura  
Calzada de Bejucal 20310 y calle 100 Municipio  
Bolleros, Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba  
Tel: (53-7) 6432809  
Fax: (53-7) 443018  
E-mail: desarrollo@una.sih.cu

**ALCALDE Nuñez Yolanda María**

Especialista  
Ministerio de Comercio Exterior  
Infanta #16 entre Humbolt y  
23 Plaza de la Revolución  
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba  
Tel: (53-7) 8380438  
Fax: (53-7) 8357427  
E-mail: yolanda.alcalde@mincex.cu

**RODRIGUEZ Martínez Alicia**

Especialista Principal Gestión de la Calidad  
Inst. Inv. Hortícolas "Liliana Dimitrova"  
Ministerio de la Agricultura  
Miembro Comité Nacional Frutas y Hortalizas Frescas  
Carretera Bejucal-Quivicán Km. 33. Municipio  
Quivicán, Habana, Cuba.  
Tel: (53-7) 682600-01  
Fax: (53-7)  
E-mail: aliciar@liliana.co.cu

**CZECH REPUBLIC****TCHÈQUE, RÉPUBLIQUE****CHECA, REPÚBLICA****KOSKOVA Alena**

ING CAFIA  
Kvetná 15  
603 00 BRNO  
Tel: + 420 543 540 215  
Fax: +420 543 540 210  
E-mail: alena.koskova@szpi.gov.cz

**DOMINICA****PACQUETTE-ANSELM Nadia**

Technical Officer/Standards  
Dominica Bureau of Standards  
9 Great Marlborough Street  
Roseau  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Tel: (767) 448-1685  
Fax: (767) 449-9217  
E-mail: npanselm@dominicastandards.org

**EGYPT/ ÉGYPTE/EGIPTO****MANSOUR Hussein**

Agricultural Minister Plenipotentiary  
And Head of the Agricultural Office  
3521 International Court, NW  
Washington D. C. 20008, USA  
Tel: +2029662080  
Fax: +2028955493  
E-mail: hmkmansour@aol.com

**SAYED Mohamed Elsayed**

General Manager of Imported Food Control  
General Organization for Export and Import Control  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel: +2022669351/+20123329821  
Fax: +2022669364  
E-mail: sayed2422003@yahoo.com

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY  
COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE  
COMUNIDAD EUROPEA****DE FROIDMONT Denis**

Administrateur  
Rue de la loi 130  
1049 Bruxelles, Belgique  
Tel: 3222956438  
Fax : 3222953709  
E-mail : denis.de-froidmont@ec.europa.eu

**XIRAKI Stella Maria**

Assistant  
Rue de la loi 130, C.P. 1049  
Bruxelles, Belgique  
Tel: 3222981380  
Fax: 3222953709  
E-mail: stella-maria.xiraki@ec.europa.eu

**FIJI ISLANDS/ÎLES FIJI/ISLAS FIJI****BEYER Richard**

Acting Permanent Secretary for Agriculture  
Ministry of Primary Industries  
Private Mail Bag Suva Fiji  
Tel: 6793301611/6793315638  
Fax: 6793300435  
E-mail: beyer@connect.com.fj

**FRANCE/FRANCIA****MUCKENSTURM Claudine**

Direction Generale de la Concurrence, de la  
Consommation et de la Repression des Fraudes  
Adjointe au Chef de Bureau  
59 Boulevard Vincent Auriol  
Teledoc 251-75703  
Paris Cedex 13  
Tel: 144972437  
Fax: 144970527  
E-mail:  
claudine.muckensturm@dgccrf.finances.gouv.fr

**GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE/ALEMANIA**

**GRAF Johannes**

Administrator  
Federal Ministry of Food,  
Agriculture and Consumer Protection  
Tel: 49 228 995293253  
Fax: 49 228 995293429  
E-mail: johannes.graf@bmelv.bund.de

**FUNKE Kerstin**

Deputy of Section Standards and Inspection  
Federal Office for Agriculture and Food  
Tel: 49 228 9968453429  
Fax: 49 228 996845345  
E-mail: kerstin.funke@ble.de

**GREECE/GRÈCE/GRECIA**

**VASILEIOS Kontolaimos**

Legal Advisor  
Acharnon 29, 10439 Athens Greece  
Tel: 302108250307  
Fax: 302108254621  
E-mail: cohalka@otenet.gr

**HAITI/HAÏTI/HAITI**

**CHARLES Pierre Charlemagne**

Ministry of Agriculture Deputy Director  
Plant Protection and Vegetables Unit  
Roile Natimoe No. 1 Domien Haití  
Tel: (509) 7801321  
E-mail: priecharlie1055@yahoo.com.mx

**INDIA/INDE**

**CHOUDHARY M.L**

Horticulture Commissioner  
Room No. 238 Ministry of Agriculture  
Government of India Krishi Bhavan,  
New Delhi -110001, India  
Tel: 91-11-23381012  
Fax: 91-11-233849778  
E-mail: mlchoudhary.krishi@nic.in

**PRASAD Amit Mohan**

Director, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare  
201 D Nirman Bhavan, Maullana Azad Road  
New Delhi  
Tel: 911123062288  
Fax: 911123062288  
E-mail: am.prasad@nic.in

**DAVE S.**

Director  
APEDA Ministry of Commerce  
NCUI Building  
SIRI Institutional Area  
August Kranti Marg  
New Delhi 110016  
Tel: 911126513162  
Fax: 911126519259  
E-mail: director@apeda.com

**MK VERMA**

Senior Scientist (Pomology)  
INDIA, ICAR  
Central Institute of Temperate Horticulture, Old Air  
Field  
P.O. Rangreth-190007  
Srinagar, J&K, India  
Tel: + 91-194-2305044  
Fax: + 91-194-2305045  
E-mail: mahenicar@yahoo.com

**INDONESIA/INDONÉSIE**

**PASARIBU Panahatan Charles**

Funcionario de la Embajada de la República de  
Indonesia  
Julio Verne No. 27 Col. Polanco 11560 México  
Tel: 52803449 / 52806863  
Fax: 52807062  
E-mail: charlespasaribu@yahoo.com.mx

**HENDRA Halim**

Funcionario de la Embajada de la República de  
Indonesia  
Primer Secretario / Encargado de Comercio  
Julio Verne No. 27 Col. Polanco 11560 México  
Tel: 52803449 / 52806863  
Fax: 52807062  
E-mail: halimyc@yahoo.com.mx

economics3@hotmail.com

**NYOMAN Oka Tridjaja**

D.G. of processing & marketing of Agro Products,  
Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Indonesia  
Director, Directorate of QA and Standarisation  
Building D, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Jin, Harisono RM No. 3  
Ragunan, Jakarta 12550  
Tel: (021) 7815881  
Fax: (021) 7811468  
E-mail: ntridjaja@yahoo.com

**IRAN/IRÁN**

**NADIA AHMADI**

Expert in fruits and Vegetables  
Institute of Standrads and Industrial Research of Iran  
PO. BOX 31585-163 Karaj-Iran  
Tel: 00989121938143  
Fax: 00982612803889  
E-mail: [n\\_ahmadi@isiri.org.ir](mailto:n_ahmadi@isiri.org.ir)  
nady\_2000ca@yahoo.com

**ITALY/ITALIE/ITALIA**

**IMPAGNATIELLO Ciro**

Ministero delle Politiche Agricole, Alimentari e  
Forestali  
Via XX Settembre, 20  
00187 Roma – Italia  
Tel: +39 06 46656046  
Fax: +39 06 4880273  
E-mail: c.impagnatiello@politicheagricole.gov.it

**MAGISTRELLI Andrea**

Assomela - Italian Apple  
Growers Associations  
Via Brennero 322 – 38100 Trento  
Tel: 0039-0461829323  
E-mail: assomela@cr-surfing.net

**JAMAICA/JAMAÏQUE****DENZVILLE Williams**

Senior Plant Quarentine/Produce Inspector  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Hope Gardents Kingston 6  
Tel: (876) 977-00637, 977-6692  
Fax: (876) 927-1904  
E-mail: denwil2000@yahoo.com

**JAPAN/JAPON/JAPÓN****OGAWA Ryosuke**

International Affairs Division, food Safety and  
Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Forestry and Fisheries  
Director  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  
100-8950 Tokyo  
Tel: +81-33-5028732  
Fax: +81-33-5074232  
E-mail: ryosuke\_ogawa@nm.maff.go.jp

**SANO Fumiaki**

Vegetables, Fruit and Flowers Division,  
Agricultural Production Bureau Ministry of  
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  
100-8950 Tokyo  
Tel: +81-33-5025958  
Fax: +81-33-5024133  
E-mail: fumiaki\_sano@nm.maff.go.jp

**YOSHIO Ayako**

International Affairs Division, food Safety and  
Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Forestry and Fisheries  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  
100-8950 Tokyo  
Tel: +81-33-5028732  
Fax: +81-33-5074232  
E-mail: ayako\_yoshio@nm.maff.go.jp

**KENYA/KENIA****KIMETO Paul**

Kenya Bureau of Standards  
Seniour Satnadard Officer  
P.O. BOX 54974-00200 Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 25402605490  
Fax: 254020609660  
E-mail: info@kebs.org

kimelsp@kebs.org

**KILONZO Robert Musyoka**

Senior Public Health Officer  
National Focal Point for food Safety  
Ministry of Public Health & Sanitation  
P.O. BOX 30016-00100 Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 2542717077  
Fax: 2542710055  
E-mail: rmkilonso@yahoo.co.uk

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

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

**NORMA Othman**

Director  
Crop Quality Control Division  
Department of Agriculture  
Wisma Tani, Block 492, Precint 4  
62632 Putrajaya,  
Malaysia  
Tel: + 603 8870 3448  
Fax: +603 8888 7639  
E-mail: norma@doa.gov.my

**ISHAK Abbas**

Division Director  
Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority  
Lot 17304, Jalan Persiaran Satu,  
Bandar Baru Selayang  
68100 Batu Caves,  
Selangor Darul Ehsan  
Tel:+603 6126 2020  
Fax: + 603 6138 3650  
E-mail: ishak@fama.net.my

**MALI/MALÍ****SAKO Mahamadou**

Directeur General Adjoint  
Ministère de la Santé  
Agence Nationale de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments  
Centre Commercial, Rue 305 BPE 2362 Bamako/Mali  
Tel: + 223 2220 754  
Fax:+ 223 2220 747  
E-mail: mahamadousako@yahoo.fr

**MEXICO/MEXIQUE/MÉXICO**

**GARCÍA Perera Mauricio**

Subdirector de Instrumentos Técnicos  
Dirección General de Fomento a la Agricultura  
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural,  
Pesca y Alimentación  
(SAGARPA)  
Municipio Libre 377 Piso 2 Ala B  
Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac  
Delegación Benito Juárez  
03100 México, D.F.  
Tel: + 0155 3871 1000 Ext. 33350  
Fax: + 1553 8711 000 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) 38 71 100 Ext. 28313  
Fax: 801 55) 38 71 1000 Ext. 33359  
E-mail: gjimenez.dgvd@agarpa.gob.mx

**VALENZUELA Fabris Lissette**

Gerente de Asuntos Internacionales en Inocuidad  
Alimentaria  
Coordinación General del Sistema Federal Sanitaria  
Comisión Federal para la Protección contra riesgos  
Sanitarios (COFEPRIS) Secretaría de Salud  
Av. Monterrey No. 33 Piso: 1  
Delegación Cuauhtémoc  
Tel: +55111032  
E-mail: valenzuelafabris@gmail.com

**FABIAN Canales Alejandro**

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

**GONZÁLEZ Ferrusca Mónica Gabriela**

Técnico Verificador de Distintivo H.  
Instituto Mexicano de normalización y Certificación  
A.C.  
Manuel María Contreras No. 133, Piso 6  
Col. Cuauhtémoc, Del. Cuauhtémoc,  
CP. 06500, México, D.F.  
Tel: +52(55) 55464546  
Fax: 52(55) 57053686  
E-mail: mggonzalez@imnc.org.mx

**GALLARDO Barrón Lizbeth Mayra**

Técnico Verificador de Distintivo H.  
Instituto Mexicano de normalización y Certificación  
A.C  
Manuel María Contreras No. 133, Piso 6  
Col. Cuauhtémoc, Del. Cuauhtémoc,  
CP. 06500, México, D.F.  
Tel: +52(55) 55464546  
Fax: 52(55) 57053686  
E-mail: lmgallardo@imnc.org.mx

**CHÁVEZ Gozález Carlos**

Representante no Gubernamental del Sistema Producto  
Manzana  
UNIFRUT  
División del Norte No. 2906  
Col. Altavista CP. 31320  
Chihuahua, Chihuahua.  
Tel: (614) 413 77 26  
Fax: (614) 413 18 33  
E-mail: carlos.chavez@unifrut.org.mx

**ELIZALDE G. J. Raymundo**

Jefe de Departamento de Investigación y Defensa  
Institucional  
Comisión para la Investigación y Defensa de las  
Hortalizas  
Edificio Caades Juan Carrasco 787 Norte  
Apartado postal No. 56 (8000)  
Culiacán, Sinaloa, México.  
Tel: + 66 77 160 785  
Fax: + 166 77 16 23 80  
E-mail: raymundo@cidh.org.mx

**GOCHICOA José Manuel**

Presidente del  
Consejo Nacional de Productores de Chile  
Guadalajara 818 Col Guadalupe  
Tampico, Tamaulipas. C.P. 89120 México.  
Tel. + 83 32 17 83 08  
Fax: + 83 32 13 46 39  
E-mail: josegochicoa@conaproch.org

**LEDÓN Vadillo Juan Carlos**

Representante no Gubernamental del Sistema Producto  
Chile del Estado de Yucatán  
Km. 1 Carretera Conkal a Chablekal,  
Conkal, Yucatán, México. C.P. 97345  
Tel: + 9999 12 42 22  
Fax: + 9999 12 42 21  
E-mail: sales@habanero-yucatan.com

**CANCHE Canche Eduardo**

Gerente  
Promotora Agroindustrial de Yucatán,  
S.A. de C.V.  
Km.1 Carretera Conkal a Chablekal,  
Conkal, Yucatán, México. C.P. 97345  
Tel: + 9999 12 42 22  
Fax: + 9999 12 42 21  
E-mail: ecanche@habanero-yucatan.com

**POZO Campodonico Octavio**

Secretario Técnico  
CEPROCH,-Tamaulipas  
Prolongación Faja de Oro 320-3  
Fraccionamiento las Villas,  
Tampico, Tamaulipas.  
Tel: + 83 32 186 921  
Fax: + 83 32 272 068  
E-mail: octaviopozo@hotmail.com

**RAMÍREZ Meraz Moisés**

Investigador  
INIFAP  
Carretera Tampico-Mante Km. 55,  
Villa Cuauhtémoc, C.P.89610  
Tamaulipas, México.  
Tel: 83 62 760 168  
Fax: 83 62 760. 023  
E-mail: mramirezmx@yahoo.com.mx

**HERNÁNDEZ Arrese Laura**

Facilitador del Sistema Producto Chile  
Consejo Nacional de Productores de Chile  
Guadalajara No. 818  
Col. Guadalupe  
Tampico Tamaulipas  
Tel: 8332178308  
E-mail: laurahernandez@conaproch.org

**DELGADO Herrera María América**

Profesor Investigador  
Calle 41 No. 421 Entre 26 y 28  
Col. Industrial  
C.P. 97150  
Tel: +9999 225 711  
Fax: + 9999 225 708  
E-mail: dherrera@uady.mx

**GONZÁLEZ Estrada Tomás**

Director General  
Consejo de Ciencia y Tecnología del Estado de  
Yucatán  
Calle21 No. 163 Deptos. 1 y 2 X10, Col. México  
Oriente,  
C.P. 97137, Mérida Yucatán  
Tel: + (999) 9380451  
Fax: + (999) 9380400  
E-mail: tomas.gonzalez@yucatan.gob.mx

**NIGERIA/NIGÉRIA****OLANIRAN, Yaya**

Permanent Representative of Nigeria to UN Agencies:  
FAO/IFAD/WFP  
c/o Embassy of Nigeria  
Via Cassiodoro 2c  
00193 Rome, Italy  
Tel: +39 06 6896093  
Fax: +39 06 6877840  
E-mail: nigeriapermrep@email.com

**NEW ZEALAND**  
**NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE**  
**NUEVA ZELANDA.**

**FAWCET Phillip**

Senior Programme Manager (International Standards)  
New Zealand Food Safety Authority  
P O Box: 2835, 68 Jervois Quay  
Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel: + 644 894 2656  
Fax: +6448 94 2675  
E-mail: phil.fawcet@nzfsa.govt.nz

**JONES Gary**

Services Manager  
Pipfruit New Zealand Inc  
207 St Aubyns St West  
P O Box: 11094  
Hastings  
Tel: +6468 7370 80  
Fax: + 6468 7370 89  
E- mail: gary.jones@pipfruitnz.co.nz

**NETHERLANDS****PAYS-BAS****PAÍSES BAJOS****LEONORA Hammer**

Agricultural Advisor – Netherlands Embassy in  
Mexico  
Netherlands Embassy (Mexico)  
Av. Vasco de Quiroga 3000 – 7  
Col. Santa Fe  
C.P. 01210 México, D.F.  
Tel: (55) 52-58-99-21 ext. 215  
Fax: (55) 52-58-81-39  
E-mail: leonora.hammer@minbuza.nl

**PANAMA/PANAMÁ****CARDENAS Naranjo, Fernando**

Sub- Jefe de Cuarentena Agropecuaria en el Puerto de  
Balboa  
Panamá, República de Panamá  
Tel: (507) 232-6075  
E-mail: fcardenas5707@hotmail.com

**MONTENEGRO Rojas, Crispiliano**

Médico Veterinario Inspector  
Ministerio de Salud  
Apartado 172, Santiago,  
Provincia de Veraguas  
República de Panamá  
Tel: (507) 998-3477  
Cel: (507) 66 773 800  
Fax: (507) 998-3477  
E-mail: montevan\_sa@yahoo.com

**ABREGO Ruiz, Federico**

Jefe del Departamento de Agroquímicos de la  
Dirección Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal  
Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario  
0816-01611, Panamá No. 5, Panamá.  
República de Panamá  
Tel: (507) 220-0733  
Fax: (507) 290-6710  
E-mail: [fedabreg@mida.gob.pa](mailto:fedabreg@mida.gob.pa)

**PAKISTAN/PAKISTÁN****Dr. IJAZ HUSSAIN Syed**

Director Horticulture,  
Plant Sciences Division,  
Pakistan Agricultural Research Council  
Plot No. 20, G-5/1, Islamabad,  
Pakistan  
Tel: +92-51-9207402  
Fax: +92-51-9202968  
E-mail: [ihussainsyed@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:ihussainsyed@yahoo.co.uk)

**PERU/PÉROU/PERÚ****PINEDA Cornel, Oscar José**

Director de Inocuidad Agroalimentaria  
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria SENASA  
Av. Molina No. 1406  
Lima 12 La Molina,  
Lima Perú  
Tel: + 0511 3133 300 Ext. 1406-1405  
Fax: +0511 34014 86 Ext. 1405-1406  
E-mail: [opinada@senasa.gob.pe](mailto:opinada@senasa.gob.pe)

**ROMANIA/ROUMANIE/RUMANIA****DAVID Ana Maria**

Counselor for European Affairs  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
Bvd. Carol No. 2-4  
Sector 3  
Bucharest  
Tel: +4021 3078 570  
Fax: + 4021 3072 627  
E-mail: [ana.david@madr.ro](mailto:ana.david@madr.ro)

**DICU Cornel**

Director for Technical Inspection for Vegetal Crops  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
Bvd. Carol No. 2-4  
Sector 3  
Bucharest  
Tel: +4021 3072 340  
Fax: + 4021 3072 330  
E-mail: [inspectii@madr.ro](mailto:inspectii@madr.ro)

**SIERRA LEONE****SIERRA LEONA****SCOTT Sylvetta Gloria**

Programme Manager Food and Nutrition  
Ministry of Health and Sanitation  
Room E403  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Youyi Building  
Brookfields  
Freetown  
Tel: +076622705  
E-mail: [omoscott@hotmail.com](mailto:omoscott@hotmail.com)

**SLOVENIA REPUBLIC OF  
SLOVÉNIE, RÉPUBLIQUE DE  
ESLOVENIA, REPUBLICA DE****BELAJ SASKA**

Adviser to the Minister  
Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of agriculture,  
Forestry and Food  
Dunajska 58  
1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
Tel: 38614789041  
Fax: 38614789035  
E-mail: [sasa.belaj@gov.si](mailto:sasa.belaj@gov.si)

**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](mailto:BillyM@nda.agric.za)

**MOTLANA MADIBA Willem**

Chief Food Safety and Quality Assurance Officer  
National Department of Agriculture  
Private Bag X343  
Pretoria  
0001  
RSA  
Tel: +27123 196051  
Fax: +27123 196055  
E-mail: [MadibaW@nda.agric.za](mailto:MadibaW@nda.agric.za)

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

Jefe de Inspección  
Subdirección General, Inspección, Certificación y  
Asistencia Técnica Comex  
Secretaría General de Comercio Exterior  
Ministerio Industria, Turismo y Comercio  
Paseo de la Castellana, N° 162, planta 6ª  
28045, Madrid España  
Tel: 34913493669  
Fax: 34913493740  
E-mail: [jcamps@mcx.es](mailto:jcamps@mcx.es)

**CABALLERO Hierro Francisco. Javier**

Consejero Técnico  
Subdirección General de Productos  
Hortofrutícolas  
Dirección General de Agricultura  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y  
Marino  
C/Alfonso XII, 62-28701  
Madrid España  
Tel: (+34)91 347 66 60  
Fax: (+34) 91 347 67 20  
E- Mail: jcaballe@mapya.es

**SUDAN/SOUDAN/SUDÁN****TAMADOR Mohamed Abdalla Yousif**

Agricultural Inspector  
(SSMO) Building-Albaldia-Street  
BO. Box 13573. Khartoum, Sudán  
Tel: 249183775247  
Fax: 249183774852  
E-mail: samiaelzibair@yahoo.com

**TAHA Elzibair Samia Elzibair**

Inspector  
(SSMO) Building-Albaldia-Street  
BO. Box 13573. Khartoum, Sudán  
Tel: 249183775247  
Fax: 249183774852  
E-mail: samiaelzibair@yahoo.com

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

Chef de Section Produits végétaux  
Office Fédéral de L'Agriculture  
Mattenhofstrasse 5  
CH-3003 Berne  
Tel: +4131 3248421  
Fax: +4131 3222634  
E-mail: pierre.schaubenberg@blw.admin.ch

**SWEDEN/SUÈDE/SUECIA****JANSSON Kerstin**

Deputy Director  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Fredsgatan 8  
SE-103 33 Stockholm  
Tel: + 4684 05 1168  
Fax: +4682 06 496  
E-mail: kerstin.jansson@agriculture.ministry.se

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

**MAGOMA Fabian J.**

Assistant Director Environmental Health Services  
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare  
P O B OX: 9083  
Dar Es Salaam  
Tel: + 255 754 277 341  
Fax: +255 222 136803  
E-mail: fmagoma2001@yahoo.co.uk

**SARIMBO Colleta Patrick**

Food Inspector  
Tanzania Food and Drugs Authority (TFDA)  
P O Box: 77150  
Dar Es Saalam  
Tel: + 255 222 450 751  
Fax: + 255 222 450 793  
E-mail: colletas@hotmail.com

**THAILAND/THAÏLANDE/TAIANDIA****KOSIYACHINDA Suraphong**

Chairman of Subcommittee on Fresh Fruits and  
Vegetables  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food  
Standards  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao,  
Chatuehak, Bangkok 10900  
Tel: + 66 2 5612 277  
Fax: + 66 2 5613 357  
E-mail: codex@acfs.go.th

**RATANACHINAKORN Benjamas**

Senior Agricultural Scientist  
Postharvest and Processing Research and Development  
Office, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of  
Agriculture and Cooperatives  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900  
Tel: +662 5795582  
Fax: +662 5795582  
E-mail: benjamas@cscs.com

**PHONKLIANG Korwadee**

Standard Officer  
National Bureau of Agricultural  
Commodity and Food Standards  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900  
Tel: +662 5612277  
Fax: +662 5613357  
E- mail: korwadeep@hotmail.com

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE  
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

**DORIAN A. LaFond**

International Standards Coordinator  
Office of the Deputy Administrator  
AMS Fruit and Vegetable Programs Stop 0235  
1400 Independence Ave. SW  
Washington DC 20250  
Tel: 202-690- 4944  
Cell: 202-577-5583  
Fax: 202-720-0016  
E-mail: dorian.lafond@usda.gov

**FUSARO J. Vincent**

Head, Standardization Section  
ASQ Certified Quality Auditor  
USDA, AMS, FVP, FPB  
1400 Independence Ave. SW  
Room 1661-S, Stop 0240  
Washington DC 20250-0240  
Tel: 202-720-0298  
FAX: 202-720-8871  
E-mail: vinny.fusaro@usda.gov

**LOWERY Kenneth**

International Trade Specialist  
1400 Independence Ave. SW  
Stop 1014  
Washington DC 20250-0240  
Tel: 202-720-5461  
FAX: 202-720-0133  
E-mail: Kenneth.lowery@fas.usda.gov

**BROWN L. Reginald**

Executive Vicepresident  
800 Trafalgar Ct. Suite 300  
Maitland, FL 32751 Florida, 32814-0155  
Tel: 407-660-1949  
Fax: 407-660-1656  
E-mail: reggie@floridatomatoes.org

**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

**SMITH Michelle A**

Interdisciplinary Scientist  
U.S. Food and Drug Administration  
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition  
5100 Paintbranch Pkwy  
College Park, MD 20740  
Tel: 301-436-2024  
Fax: 301-436-2651  
E-mail: michelle.samith@fda.hhs.gov

**CASTILLO Alejandro**

Associate Professor of Food Safety  
Texas A&M University  
2471 TAMU  
Kleberg Center Room 314 A  
College Station Tx 77843  
Tel: 979-845-3565  
Fax: 979-862-3475  
E-mail: a-castillo@tamu.edu

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES  
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES**

**UNECE****MALANITCHEV Serguei**

Agricultural Quality Standards Team Leader  
United Nations Palais des Nations, Office 440  
CH-1211 Geneva 10  
Tel : +41 22 917 41 46  
Fax : +41 22 917 06 29  
E- mail: serguei.malanitchev@unece.org

**CROSQ CARICOM****SIRJU Anne Marie**

Technical Officer  
35 Pine Rd, Belleville, St. Michael  
Barbados  
Tel: 246437-8146  
Fax: 246437-4569  
E-mail: annemarie.sirju@crosq.org

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

**BRISCO López Gracia Teresa**

Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Tel: 39 06 5705 2700  
Fax: 39 06 5705 4539  
E-mail: [gracia.brisco@fao.org](mailto:gracia.brisco@fao.org)

**CAROLISSEN Verna**

Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Tel: 39 06 5705 5629  
Fax: 39 06 5705 4539  
E-mail: [verna.carolissen@fao.org](mailto:verna.carolissen@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](mailto:masashi.kusukawa@fao.org)

**SECRETARÍA TÉCNICA  
TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT  
SECRÉTARIAT TECHNIQUE**

**LÓPEZ Zárate Jorge Antonio**

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 Chávez Michelle**

Jefa 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

**VAZQUEZ Morales Mateo**

Secretariado del Comité Mexicano para la Atención del Codex sobre Frutas y Hortalizas Frescas  
José Antonio Torres 804, Departamento 8, Col. Viaducto-Piedad, C.P. 08200, México, D.F.  
Tel: (55) 3640-9094  
E-mail: mateo36@att.net.mx

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT  
SUPPORT TECHNIQUE  
SOPORTE TÉCNICO**

**MELGAR Rivera Yessika Nayelli**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**MARTÍNEZ Calvario Nadia Danusia**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**CERVANTES Archundia Irasema Samara**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**GONZÁLEZ Huerta Kimberly Lizette**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**STEVENS Villalvazo María del Rocío**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**GÓMEZ Echeverría Lourdes**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**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

**CALDERÓN Ortega Víctor Iván**

Dirección Internacional de Normas  
Secretaría de Economía  
Av. Puente de Tecamachalco No. 6  
Sección Fuentes  
Naucalpan de Juárez  
CP. 53950  
Estado de México  
Tel: (5255) 5729 9480

**ALCOCER Guzmán Hermilo**

Director 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. 43205  
E-mail: halcocer@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

**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

**GALINDO Hernández 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

**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: 3686-5247  
Fax: 3686-5264  
E-mail: sperezp@sre.gob.mx

**GONZÁLEZ Alcántara Pedro Eleuterio**

Subdirector de Operación de Conferencias  
Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores  
Plaza Juárez No. 20, Piso 1  
Col. Centro, Deleg. Cuauhtémoc,  
C.P. 06010, México, D.F.  
Tel: 3686-5249  
Fax: 3686-5264  
E-mail: [pgonzaleza@sre.gob.mx](mailto:pgonzaleza@sre.gob.mx)

## DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR TOMATOES

### (AT STEP 8)

#### 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 cm<sup>2</sup>;
- 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 cm<sup>2</sup>;
- fine blossom scar in elongated form (like a seam).

## 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

When sized by diameter, size is determined by the maximum diameter of the equatorial section.

Sizing does not apply to trusses of tomatoes.

Sizing is not compulsory for Class II.

Tomatoes are sized with one of the following options:

(a) Tomatoes may be sized according to the following table:

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

**or**

(b) Tomatoes may be sized according to the following uniformity provision:

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

- 10 mm, if the diameter of the smallest fruit (as indicated on the package) is under 50 mm,
- 15 mm, if the diameter of the smallest fruit (as indicated on the package) is 50 mm and over but under 70 mm,
- 20 mm, if the diameter of the smallest fruit (as indicated on the package) is 70 mm and over but under 100 mm,
- There is no limitation of difference in diameter for fruit equal or over 100 mm.

**or**

(c) Tomatoes may be sized by count, diameter or weight, according to the provisions of the legislation of the importing country.

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

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).

##### 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).

### 6. MARKING OR LABELLING

#### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

##### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to 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)<sup>2</sup>.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference “packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)” has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

### 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), 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).

## DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR BITTER CASSAVA<sup>1</sup>

### (AT STEP 8)

#### 1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE

This Standard applies to commercial bitter<sup>2</sup> 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 substances<sup>3</sup> 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 taste<sup>4</sup>;
- 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:

###### 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.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Bitter varieties of cassava are those containing more than 50 mg/kg of cyanides expressed as hydrogen cyanide (fresh weight basis).

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

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

### 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 flesh 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 flesh 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 new<sup>5</sup>, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

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).

#### 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), 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<sup>6</sup>

A statement indicating the following is required:

- cassava shall be peeled and fully cooked before consumption; and
- cooking or rinsing water must not be consumed or used for other food preparation purposes.

### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

#### 6.2.1 Identification

Name and address of exporter, packer and/or dispatcher. Identification code (optional)<sup>7</sup>.

---

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

<sup>6</sup> In the case of unpackaged bitter cassava, information on safe handling and preparation shall be made available to the consumer at the point of sale.

<sup>7</sup> The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference “packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)” has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

Name of the produce 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. In the absence of a Codex maximum level for hydrogen cyanide, an acceptable maximum level shall be set on a safety basis by the national legislation of the importing country pending the outcome of the work of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods on cyanogenic glycosides.

## 8. HYGIENE

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

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

**PROPOSED DRAFT CODEX STANDARD FOR APPLES**  
**(AT STEP 5)**

**1. DEFINITION OF PRODUCE**

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

**2. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY**

**2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

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

- whole, the stalk (stem) may be missing, provided the break is clean and the adjacent skin is not damaged;
- 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;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperatures;
- practically free of signs of dehydration;
- [firm].

**2.1.1** The apples must have colour that is characteristic of the variety and the area in which they are grown.

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

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

**2.2 MATURITY REQUIREMENTS**

Apples must be at a stage of development that enables them to continue the ripening process and to reach a stage of ripeness required in relation to the varietal characteristics.

In order to verify the minimum maturity requirements some parameters such as: morphological aspects, firmness and refractometric index can be considered.

**2.3 CLASSIFICATION**

In accordance with [the colouring requirements outlined in Annex I- Colour Classification of Apples, and with] the defects allowed in Annex II- Maximum Allowance for Defects, apples are classified in three classes defined below<sup>1</sup>:

**2.3.1 “Extra” Class**

Apples in this class must be of superior quality. The flesh must be [perfectly] sound. They must be characteristic of the variety. They must be free of defects, with the exception of very slight superficial defects, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package<sup>2</sup>.

**2.3.2 Class I**

Apples in this class must be of good quality. The flesh must be sound. They must be characteristic of the variety. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed, provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package<sup>2</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> [These classifications do not preclude mixed class consignment.]

<sup>2</sup> Skin and other defects must not exceed the limits as defined in Annex[es I and] II.

- a slight defect in shape and development;
- a slight defect in colouring [(see Annex I)];
- slight skin or other defects (see Annex II).

### 2.3.3 Class II

This class includes apples which do not qualify for inclusion in the higher classes, but satisfy the minimum requirements specified in Section 2.1 above. The following defects, however, may be allowed, provided the apples retain their essential characteristics as regards the quality, the keeping quality and presentation<sup>2</sup>:

- defects in shape and development;
- defects in colouring [(see Annex I)];
- skin or other defects (see Annex II).

## 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING

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

For all varieties and all classes the minimum size is 60 mm if measured by diameter or 90 g if measured by weight. Fruit of smaller sizes may be accepted provided the Brix level of the produce meets or exceeds [10.5 / 12]°Brix and the size is not smaller than 50 mm or 70 g.

## 4. PROVISIONS CONCERNING TOLERANCES

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

### 4.1 QUALITY TOLERANCES

#### 4.1.1 "Extra" Class

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

[Included therein shall be allowed not more than [0% none] [0.5 / 1.0%] for apples affected by decay or internal breakdown at destination.]

#### 4.1.2 Class I

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

[Included therein shall be allowed not more than [1 / 2%] for apples affected by decay or internal breakdown at destination.]

#### 4.1.3 Class II

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

[Included therein shall be allowed not more than [2 / 3%] by number or weight is allowed for apples affected by decay or internal breakdown at destination.]

Included therein shall be allowed, a maximum of 2% by number or weight of fruit which may show the following defects:

- cork like blemishing (bitter pit);
- slight damage or unhealed broken skin /cracks;
- presence of internal feeding insects/pests or damage to the flesh caused by pests.

### 4.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes of fruit subjected to rules of uniformity, 10% by number or weight of apples not meeting the size indicated on the package.

This tolerance may not be extended to include produce with a size below 50 mm or 70 g if the refractometric index is below [10.5 / 12]°Brix

## 5. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

### [5.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package must be uniform and contain only apples of the same origin, quality, size and variety. For “Extra” Class, colour should be uniform. Sales packages (of a net weight not exceeding 5 kg) may contain mixtures of varieties and sizes provided they are uniform in quality, and for each variety concerned, its origin. The visible part of the contents of the package must be representative of the entire contents except for mixed sizes and varieties.

The maximum difference in diameter or weight between apples in the same package shall be limited to:

- 5 mm or 15 g, if the diameter / weight of the smallest apple is under 60 mm / 90 g.
- [5 / 7] mm or 20 g, if the diameter / weight of the smallest apple is 60 mm / 90 g and over but under 70 mm / 135 g.
- [5 / 10] mm or 30 g, if the diameter / weight of the smallest apple is 70 mm / 135 g and over but under 78 mm / 200 g
- [5 / 13] mm or 40 g, if the diameter / weight of the smallest apple is 78 mm / 200 g and over but under 85 mm / 300 g
- [5 / 15] mm or 50 g, if the diameter / weight of the smallest apple is over 85 mm / 300 g]

### 5.2 PACKAGING

Apples must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly. The materials used inside the package must be new<sup>3</sup>, clean, and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed, provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

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

#### 5.2.1 Description of Containers

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

## 6. MARKING OR LABELLING

### 6.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

#### 6.1.1 Nature of Produce

If the produce is not visible from the outside, each package shall be labelled as to the name of the produce and may be labelled as to name of the variety, class and size/weight or the number of pieces presented in rows and layers.

### 6.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

#### 6.2.1 Identification

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference “packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)” has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.

### 6.2.2 Nature of Produce

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

### 6.2.3 Origin of Produce

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

### 6.2.4 Commercial Identification

- Class;
- Size (if sized).

### 6.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)<sup>4</sup>

## 7. CONTAMINANTS

### 7.1 PESTICIDE RESIDUES

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

### 7.2 OTHER CONTAMINANTS

Apples 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), 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).

**[ANNEX I**

**COLOUR CLASSIFICATION OF APPLES**

This Annex describes four broadly accepted colour classification of apples. Included are percentages/fractions of surface colour requirement for red apple varieties.

<b>GROUP A - VARIETIES WITH RED COLOURING</b>	
<b>“Extra” Class</b>	At least 2/3 [3/4] of the surface of the fruit is red in colour
<b>Class I</b>	At least ½ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour
<b>Class II</b>	At least ¼ of the surface of the fruit is red in colour

<b>GROUP B - VARIETIES WITH SEMI-RED OR MIXED COLOURING</b>	
<b>“Extra” Class</b>	At least ½ of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring
<b>Class I</b>	At least 1/3 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring
<b>Class II</b>	At least 1/10 of the surface of the fruit has semi-red colouring

<b>GROUP C - VARIETIES WITH STRIPES AND SLIGHT RED COLOURING</b>	
<b>“Extra” Class</b>	Blush cheek
<b>Class I</b>	Tinge of colour
<b>Class II</b>	Tinge of colour

<b>GROUP D - GREEN AND YELLOW VARIETIES</b>	

**[ANNEX II**

**MAXIMUM ALLOWANCE FOR DEFECTS**

Defects Allowed		“Extra” Class	Class I	Class II
Russetting outside Calyx/stem cavity	• smooth net-like	[5/0]% of surface area	[15/20]% of surface area	[25/50]% of surface area
	• smooth solid	[1/0]%	5% of surface area	[20/33]% of surface area
accumulation for both types of russetting should not exceed the following		[5/0] %	20 %	[40/50] %
Accumulated Blemishes & Bruising:				
- with slight discoloration;		.75 cm <sup>2</sup>	2.0 cm <sup>2</sup>	3 cm <sup>2.5</sup>
- which Scabs ( <i>Venturia inaequalis</i> );		-----	0.25 cm <sup>2</sup>	1 cm <sup>2</sup>
- and/or of which healed hail marks /or other similar indentations.			0.5 cm <sup>2</sup>	1 cm <sup>2</sup>
Stem or Calyx cracks (healed or well cured)		----	0.5 cm	1 cm
Maximum length of elongated shaped defects		----	2 cm	4 cm

Russetting can be simply described as a “brownish roughened area or streaks on the skin of the apple”. In some apple varieties russetting is a characteristic of the variety and for others a quality defect. Allowances for russetting will be applied to apple varieties that russetting is not a characteristic of.]

<sup>5</sup> Bruising with discoloration and dark blemishes not blending with skin color are accepted in this Class.

## 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 encourage a consistent format, consistent terminology, and where appropriate, consistent provisions;
- When drafting standards, the Committee should consult this format, as well as UN/ECE standards according to the Committee's Terms of Reference;
- The Committee may omit or add text from the Layout as appropriate for the produce concerned for Codex purposes.

#### 1. SCOPE

This Standard applies to [part of the produce being standardized of]<sup>1</sup> commercial varieties [and/or commercial types]<sup>1</sup> 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.

.....<sup>2</sup>

#### 2. DESCRIPTION

(To be developed)

#### 3. PROVISIONS CONCERNING QUALITY

##### 3.1 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;<sup>3</sup>
- 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;<sup>4</sup>
- 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;<sup>5</sup>
- fresh in appearance;
- free of damage caused by low and/or high temperature;
- .....<sup>2</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

.....<sup>2</sup>

3.1.1 The [common name of the produce or part of the produce being standardized] must have been carefully [harvested/picked/etc.]<sup>6</sup> and have reached an appropriate degree of development and ripeness in accordance with criteria proper to the variety [and/or commercial type]<sup>1</sup>, the time of [harvesting/picking/etc.]<sup>6</sup>, 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.
- .....<sup>2</sup>

3.1.2 **MATURITY REQUIREMENTS**

.....<sup>7</sup>

3.2 **CLASSIFICATION**

.....<sup>8</sup>

{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]<sup>6</sup> classes defined below:

3.2.1 **"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]<sup>1</sup>. 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:<sup>2</sup>

- .....
- .....

3.2.2 **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]<sup>1</sup>. The following slight defects, however, may be allowed provided these do not affect the general appearance of the produce, the quality, the keeping quality and presentation in the package:

- .....<sup>9</sup>
- .....

(In addition,) they must be:<sup>2</sup>

- .....
- .....

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

---

<sup>6</sup> {depending on the nature of produce one of these words or another more appropriate word may be used}  
<sup>7</sup> {to be elaborated depending on the nature of produce}  
<sup>8</sup> {for special standards where it does not appear necessary to establish a classification, only the minimum requirements apply}  
<sup>9</sup> {Defects allowed, depending on the nature of produce}

3.2.3 **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:

- .....<sup>9</sup>
- .....

(In addition,) they must be:<sup>2</sup>

- .....
- .....

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

4. **PROVISIONS CONCERNING SIZING**

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

.....<sup>10</sup>

5. **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]<sup>1</sup> for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

5.1 **QUALITY TOLERANCES**

5.1.1 **"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.

- .....<sup>11</sup>
- .....
- .....<sup>2</sup>

5.1.2 **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.

- .....<sup>11</sup>
- .....
- .....<sup>2</sup>

<sup>10</sup> {Provisions on minimum and maximum sizes, size range depending on the nature of produce, the variety, the commercial type and possibly the individual classes }

<sup>11</sup> {Possible tolerances for individual defects depending on the nature of produce }.

### 5.1.3 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.

- .....<sup>11</sup>
- .....
- .....<sup>2</sup>

### 5.2 SIZE TOLERANCES

For all classes:<sup>12</sup> 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.

.....<sup>13</sup>

## 6. PROVISIONS CONCERNING PRESENTATION

### 6.1 UNIFORMITY

The contents of each package [or lot for produce presented in bulk]<sup>1</sup> 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)<sup>14</sup>.

.....<sup>2</sup>

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

### 6.2 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 new<sup>15</sup>, clean and of a quality such as to avoid causing any external or internal damage to the produce. The use of materials, particularly of paper or stamps bearing trade specifications is allowed provided the printing or labelling has been done with non-toxic ink or glue.

[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).

#### 6.2.1 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]<sup>1</sup> must be free of all foreign matter and smell.

### 6.3 PRESENTATION

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

6.3.1 .....

6.3.2 .....

---

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

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

<sup>14</sup> {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}.

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

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

7. PROVISIONS CONCERNING MARKING OR LABELLING

7.1 CONSUMER PACKAGES

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

7.1.1 Nature of Produce

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

7.2 NON-RETAIL CONTAINERS

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

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

7.2.1 Identification

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

7.2.2 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).]<sup>6</sup>

.....<sup>2</sup>

7.2.3 Origin of produce

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

7.2.4 Commercial specifications

- Class;
- Size (if sized);
- .....

7.2.5 Official Inspection Mark (optional)

[8. FOOD ADDITIVES

Untreated fresh fruits and vegetables

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

Treated fresh fruits and vegetables

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

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

<sup>18</sup> **The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the reference "packer and/or dispatcher (or equivalent abbreviations)" has to be indicated in close connection with the code mark.**

or

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

] <sup>1, 2, 3, 6</sup>

9. **CONTAMINANTS**

9.1 **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.

9.2 **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.

10. **HYGIENE**

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

10.2 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).

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

.....<sup>7</sup>]

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

**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 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.<sup>19</sup>

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

<sup>19</sup>

**Disclaimer:**

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

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

{In the case of lists of varieties where only very few 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.<sup>20</sup>

Varieties	Synonyms	{ Other information depending on the produce }
Variety “xyz” <sup>21</sup>		

<sup>20</sup> **Disclaimer:**

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

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

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

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

<b>FRUITS</b>	<b>VEGETABLES</b>
Kiwi	Chanterelle
Passion Fruit	Garlic
Pears	Onion
Pineapple (revision)	Peppers
Strawberry	