



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRADE/C/WP.7/GE.1/2007/8
19 March 2007

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE ON TRADE

Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards

Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables

Fifty-third session

Geneva, 21-25 May 2007

Items 5(a) and 6 of the provisional agenda

AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL TEXTS

Proposals to amend Provisions Concerning Tolerances and Marking

Submitted by the United Kingdom

This document proposes amendments to the Standard Layout for UNECE Standards for Fresh Fruit and Vegetables with regard to Provisions Concerning Tolerances and Marking.

1. Proposal to amend the text for the quality tolerances for each Class.

At Part IV. Provisions Concerning Tolerances

A. Quality tolerances

To amend the current wording of this section, as follows: (underlined text shows changes).

(i) "Extra" Class

5 per cent by number or weight of not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class I. Within this tolerance not more than 0.5 per cent in total may consist of product of Class II quality. ~~or, exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.~~

.....{Possible tolerances for individual defects depending on the nature of produce}.

(ii) Class I

10 per cent by number or weight of not satisfying the requirements of the class, but meeting those of Class II. Within this tolerance not more than 1 per cent in total may consist of product not satisfying the requirements of Class II nor the minimum requirements, with the exclusion of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption. ~~or exceptionally, coming within the tolerances of that class.~~

.....{Possible tolerances for individual defects depending on the nature of produce}.

(iii) Class II

10 per cent by number or weight of satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements, with the exclusion ~~exception~~ of produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption.

.....{Possible tolerances for individual defects depending on the nature of produce}.

The reasons for this proposal are as follows:

- The current wording is not clear.
- The new wording is, we believe, clear in exactly what is allowed in the tolerances in each Class.
- From discussions at various harmonisation meetings this is the way most official bodies interpret the current text.

2. Proposal to amend the Marking requirements regarding the identification of packer and/or dispatcher.

At Part VI. Provisions Concerning Marking

A. Identification

Change the current wording:

“Packer and/or Dispatcher – Name and address or officially issued or accepted code mark.”

To read:

Packer and/or Dispatcher – Name and address or officially recognised code mark.

And amend footnote 3 as follows: (underlined text is new)

“³ The national legislation of a number of countries requires the explicit declaration of the name and address. However, in the case where a code mark is used, the format used for this code will follow the internationally recognised United Nations coding for the place of origin (e.g. UN/LOCODE). 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.”

The reasons for this proposal are as follows:

- It is not clear exactly how much information is the minimum required for a name and address. (We allow as a minimum: the company name, the town and a country). Is a web address acceptable? Is an e-mail address acceptable? (We believe that a web or e-mail address alone is not acceptable).
- Is it acceptable for a packer address to be in another country? It may be for example that the company’s head office is in another country. (We believe this is acceptable).
- The United Kingdom issues code marks to packers to use in place of their name and address. However these codes are not used across borders even within the European Union.
- The Standards allow packers to use codes marks. So we believe that a common format (the United Nations already uses these in other areas) for international trade should be agreed on.

This clarification of the labelling requirements will make application at import more consistent.