

18 September 2015

**Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables
19th Session
Ixtapa, Mexico, 5-9 October 2015**

FINAL

European Union comments on

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

Agenda Item 8, CX/FFV 15/19/5

**Mixed Competence
Member States Vote**

The European Union and its Member States (EUMS) would like to thank all the participants in the electronic working group and in particular the USA and Germany for leading this work and for the good progress made.

The EUMS believe that the proposed layout for Codex standards is well harmonized with the UNECE one and it provides clear options to be applied as the case may be. The EUMS believe that there are only a few points that may need to be further discussed and hope to finalise the work on this agenda item at the 19th session of CCFFV.

The EUMS would like to submit to the Committee the following specific comments:

Proposed change	Justification
2.2 Classification	
<p>[[In accordance with <sizing requirements in Section “3 – Provision Concerning Sizing” (when applicable) and> Section “4 – Provisions concerning Tolerances and with the, (name of produce) are classified into the following class(es)”]</p>	<p>The distinction between Extra Class, Class I and Class II has been working well in international trade for fresh fruit and vegetables. The EUMS therefore support the deletion of the text in the square brackets.</p>
3. Provisions concerning sizing	
<p>(In case a minimum size has been set for a product add the following sentence:</p> <p>The size requirements shall not apply to miniature produce1):</p> <p>1) Miniature product means a variety or cultivar of vegetable, obtained by plant breeding and/or special cultivation techniques. All other requirements of the standard must be met.)</p>	<p>The EU notes that for certain commodities the definition of minimum sizes is still under discussion. Depending on the outcome of the decision-making process the proposed sentence on miniature produce might be helpful.</p>
4.1.1 Quality Tolerances – Extra Class	
<p>Included therein, is 4% 0% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.</p>	<p>A tolerance for decay should be harmonized with existing international standards to facilitate international trade. In UNECE standards 0% of decay is allowed for Extra Class.</p>
4.1.2 Quality Tolerances – Class I	
<p>Included therein, is 3% 1% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.</p>	<p>A tolerance for decay should be harmonized with existing international standards to facilitate international trade. In UNECE standards 1% of decay are allowed for Class I.</p>
4.1.3 Quality Tolerances – Class II	
<p>Included therein, is 3% 2% tolerance for decay, soft rot and/or internal breakdown.</p>	<p>A tolerance for decay should be harmonized with existing international standards to facilitate international trade. In UNECE standards 2% of decay are allowed for Class II.</p>

5.2 Packaging	
<p>{Common Name of produce} must be packed in such a way as to protect the produce properly.</p> <p>The materials used inside the package must be new⁹, clean and of a quality such as to avoid ... -</p> <p>⁹For the purposes of this Standard, this includes recycled material of food-grade quality.</p>	<p>On the background of resource scarcity and public awareness on this issue, re-using of appropriately cleaned packing material should be allowed.</p>
6.1.1 Nature of Produce	
<p>6.1.1 Each consumer sales package <(or lot for produce presented in bulk in the transport vehicle)>...</p>	<p>The option of produce being presented in bulk in the transport vehicle is not an alternative to the presentation in consumer packages and should be deleted.</p>
6.1.2 Origin of Produce	
<p>Country of origin¹⁴ and, optionally,</p>	<p>The footnote 14 should be added here too.</p>
6.2 Non-retail Containers	
<p>Each package must bear the following particulars, in letters grouped on the same side, legibly and indelibly marked, and visible from the outside, or in the documents accompanying the shipment.</p>	<p>The EUMS would prefer to have the necessary particulars on each package because, without this, control will be difficult.</p>
6.2.2 Nature of Produce	
<p>6.2.2 Name of the produce <name of the variety [and/or commercial type] (optional, <u>depending on produce</u>) ></p>	<p>Drafting proposal to make it clearer that when developing a standard for a particular product it has to be decided whether labelling of the variety should be made obligatory or optional.</p>

7 Food Additives

Table listing the food additives allowed

This option is not supported. The reference to CODEX STAN 192-1995 would be more appropriate and allows access to the latest edition of the standard. The word "or" and the table that follows should therefore be deleted from this section.