

Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables

Fifty-fifth session

Geneva, 4 - 8 May 2009

Items 3 and 4(a) of the provisional agenda

## REVISION OF UNECE STANDARDS

### Proposal by the United Kingdom on Quality Tolerances

This document presents proposals by the United Kingdom to amend the quality tolerances in the UNECE Standard Layout and in the standard for apples:

Two options are put forward for consideration (modified text is in *italics*):

#### **The first:**

#### **IV. 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.

Quality tolerances

- (i) “Extra” Class

A total tolerance of 5 per cent, by number or weight, of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class I is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 0.5 per cent in total may consist of produce satisfying the requirements of Class II quality.

- (ii) Class I

A total tolerance of 10 per cent, by number or weight, of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class II is allowed. *Within this tolerance:*

*- At export/packing not more than 1 per cent in total may consist of produce satisfying neither the requirements of Class II quality nor the minimum requirements. Produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption is excluded.*

*- At stages following export/packing not more than 1 per cent in total may consist of fruit affected by rotting or any other serious flesh defects.*

(ii) Class II

A total tolerance of 10 per cent, by number or weight, of apples satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements is allowed. *Within this tolerance*

*- At export/packing produce affected by rotting or any other deterioration rendering it unfit for consumption is excluded.*

*- At stages following export/packing not more than 2 per cent in total may consist of fruit affected by rotting or any other serious flesh defects.*

**The second:**

**IV. Provisions concerning tolerances**

*At all marketing stages* tolerances in respect of quality and size shall be allowed in each package for produce not satisfying the requirements of the class indicated.

A. Quality tolerances

(i) "Extra" Class

A total tolerance of 5 per cent, by number or weight, of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class I is allowed. Within this tolerance not more than 0.5 per cent in total may consist of produce satisfying the requirements of Class II quality.

(ii) Class I

A total tolerance of 10 per cent, by number or weight, of apples not satisfying the requirements of the class but meeting those of Class II is allowed. *Within this tolerance not more than 1 per cent in total may consist of fruits satisfying neither the requirements of Class II quality*

*nor the minimum requirements or of fruit affected by rotting or any other serious flesh defects.*

(ii) Class II

A total tolerance of 10 per cent, by number or weight, of apples satisfying neither the requirements of the class nor the minimum requirements is allowed. *Within this tolerance not more than 2 per cent in total may consist of fruit affected by rotting or any other serious flesh defects.*

-----

The purpose of these proposals is to simplify the text by removing the additional tolerances in the apple standard of 2% for serious pit, slight rot, unhealed cracks and worm eaten fruit in Class II.

Further if this text is used in the standard layout it would allow for the removal of similar additional tolerances in standards such as pears, cherries, plums, etc. These additional tolerances in some cases do not make sense when read with the quality tolerances in the standard layout.

In addition, this proposal introduces the concept of allowing a small quantity of rots in Class I and Class II. This improves the transparency of the standards, as at present all inspection services have an unwritten allowance for rots. I am in favour of the second option above as this is simpler. It is not in a packers interest to pack fruit with serious flesh defects, but this decision will depend on the time from packing to consumption, and need not be dictated in a standard.

Ian Hewett RPA United Kingdom – February 2009