



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19  
9 July 2001

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND  
ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

Working Party on Standardization of  
Perishable Produce and Quality Development

Specialized Section on Coordination of  
Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables

Forty-seventh session, Geneva, 15 to 18 May 2001

REPORT OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

**Executive summary:**

**Participation:** The session was attended by 23 national delegations, the European Community and several organizations.

**Annonas:** The proposed modifications to the standard were discussed and a number of comments made.

**Apples and Pears:** The drafts for separated standards for apples and pears were discussed. The proposed standards for apples contains weight sizing as an option. A new list of varieties was presented for comments. The proposals will be revised according to the comments made and published as addenda to this report (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.1 and Add.2) for further comments. The working group will submit new proposals to the next session.

**Avocados:** It was agreed to include maturity requirements in the standard. The modifications will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as a UNECE recommendation for a one-year trial period. (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.3)

**Beans:** Modifications to the standard were agreed and the text will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as a revised UNECE standard (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.3).

**Kiwifruit:** Maturity requirements and methods to measure them were discussed and welcomed in principle. The working group will prepare a proposal for the next session on the basis of the outcome of further discussions by IKO on this matter and on sizing.

**Lettuce, Onions, Peas and Peppers:** Modifications to these standards were agreed and the texts will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as revised UNECE standards (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.4, Add.5, Add.6 and Add.7).

**Executive summary (cont'd)**

**Lettuce, Onions, Peas and Peppers:** Modifications to these standards were agreed and the texts will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as revised UNECE standards (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.4, Add.5, Add.6 and Add.7).

**Peaches and nectarines:** The working group will submit a proposal on maturity requirements and size "D" at the next session.

**Table Grapes:** Modifications concerning maturity requirements and bunch weight were agreed. They will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as a UNECE recommendation for a two-year trial period. (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.3)

**Strawberries:** A number of amendments were agreed provisionally. If no objections are received by the secretariat before 30 September 2001, the text will be proposed to the Working Party for adoption as a revised UNECE standard. (see TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/19/Add.3)

**Pineapples:** A new draft standard was discussed. It was decided that the text should be redrafted based on the existing Codex standard and include technical justifications for all differences.

**Definition of trade descriptions and classification codes for fruits and vegetables:** Following a presentation from EAN International it was decided to form a working group (Chile, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Slovakia, United Kingdom, United States, European Community) which would meet for the first time from 15-16 November in Geneva.

**Use of trademarks:** The issue was discussed extensively. It was decided to await further advice from the legal services of the United Nations before amending the standards in question.

**Use of code marks:** Delegations were invited to submit the appropriate information to the secretariat.

**Exchange of information on non-conformity cases:** Delegations were invited to submit the addresses of contact points for quality control to the secretariat.

**Review of the Guide on Implementation of Quality Control:** The actual document will be made available on the internet and the subject will be discussed again at the next session.

**Acceptances:** Delegations took note of a document listing by standard the acceptances of UNECE Standards. The document is also available on the internet. Delegations were invited to send any comment or corrections to the secretariat

**Opening of the session**

1. The meeting was held in Geneva from 15 to 18 May 2001. It was chaired by Mr. David Priester (United States). The session was opened by the Director of the UNECE Trade Division, Ms. Carol Cosgrove-Sacks who welcomed the delegations to Geneva on behalf of the new UNECE Executive Secretary, Ms. Danuta Hübner (Poland).
2. The Director said that the Secretariat had been contacted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office concerning the mention of the trademark Superior Seedless in the UNECE Standard for Table Grapes. They were of the opinion that the mention should be removed in order to avoid legal action from the Californian company Sun World who is the trade mark holder (see also agenda item 6).
3. The Director informed that the Secretariat had held extensive informal discussions with the Senior Legal advisor in Geneva and the Legal Counsel in New York. Until conclusive advice was available the lawyers had advised the Secretariat to proceed with great caution before taking any action on this matter. The lawyers had assured the secretariat that because of the legal immunity of the United Nations and its employees any lawsuit because of this matter was impossible. She hoped that further advice would be available during the course of the meeting. In any case the final decision would be taken by the Working Party based on the advice from the Legal Counsel.
4. The Director said that she was very pleased with the present cooperation between the different international bodies dealing with agricultural quality standards which was very effective providing countries with a broad international framework.
5. The Director informed delegations on the outcome of the annual session of the UNECE where the emphasis had been on policy coherence and special measures for less developed countries in the ECE region who are great producers of fresh fruit and vegetables but are for different reasons not able to participate in international trade. She said that the Secretariat would look into developing programmes to assist these countries and to find extra budgetary funding for this assistance.
6. Finally the Director informed delegations that the Trade Division will be more involved in cross sectoral issues like trade and environment or trade and transport, e.g. border crossing.
7. The Chairman said that the United States was developing computerized training courses for quality inspectors. If similar courses could be developed on an international basis they could be used to train inspectors in less developed countries so that they could put a quality programme in place which in turn would help the countries to participate in international trade.

**Participation**

8. The session was attended by delegations of the following countries: Austria; Belgium; Chile<sup>1</sup>; Côte d'Ivoire<sup>1</sup>; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Hungary; Netherlands; New

---

<sup>1</sup>Participating under Article 11 of the Commission's terms of reference. This article regulates participation of non-UNECE member States and is mentioned here for administrative reasons only. According to the working procedures of WP.7 and its specialized sections any member State of the United Nations can participate in their work with the same rights as UNECE member States.

Zealand<sup>1</sup>; Poland; Portugal; Russian Federation; Slovakia; South Africa<sup>1</sup>; Sweden; Switzerland; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and United States of America.

9. The European Community was also represented.

10. The following specialized agency of the United Nations was represented: Food and Agriculture Organization, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme.

11. At the invitation of the secretariat, a representative of the OECD Scheme for the Application of International Standards for Fruit and Vegetables participated in the session.

12. Representatives of the following non-governmental organization participated in the session: COLEACP (Comité de Liaison - Europe - Africa - Caraïbes - Pacifique - pour la promotion des fruits tropicaux, légumes de contre-saison, fleurs, plantes ornementales et épices), EAN International.

### **Adoption of the agenda**

Documents: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/1

13. The provisional agenda as contained in TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2000/1 was adopted with the following changes:

14. The following documents were deleted from the agenda:

- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/7 (Citrus fruit)
- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/11 (Peaches and Nectarines)
- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/16 (Trade descriptions)

15. The following documents were added to the agenda:

- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.1 (Apples)
- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.2 (Apples and Pears Working Group)
- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.3 (Pears)
- TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/15/Add.2 (Revised Draft Standard for Pineapples)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.1 (Strawberries)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.1/Rev.1 (Strawberries)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.2 (Apples and Pears, list of varieties)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.3 (Table grapes, bunch weight, brix value)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.4 (EAN International, presentation)
- TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.5 (Use of trademarks, information from the legal services of the United Nations)

16. Following a request from the OECD Scheme it was agreed to add an item 3(m) concerning strawberries.

### **Item 2 Matters of interest arising since the forty-sixth session**

17. Delegations took note of document TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/2 summing up the relevant outcome of the fourth session of the Committee for Trade, Industry and Enterprise Development and the fifty-sixth session of the Working Party on Standardization of Perishable Produce and Quality Development.

### Item 3 Proposals to revise UNECE standards

#### Item 3 (a) Annonas

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/3 (Spain)

18. A proposal for the revision of this standard was prepared by Spain. As the Spanish delegation was not present at the session the Secretariat introduced the document. The changes proposed concern the following areas:

- sizing: simplification of the sizing provisions by replacing the existing size codes for Cherimoyas, Sugar Apples and Atemoyas with weight ranges;
- marking: consequential amendments;

19. The proposal was welcomed by the Specialized Section because it consisted of a simplification of the standard. The following comments were made which should be discussed before adopting the text:

- the column "weight per fruit" might be renamed "weight of the smallest fruit in the package";
- there is no Max. Variation indicated for weight > 825;
- in the size tolerances "(100/125 g)" should be changed to "(100/225 g)";
- it was suggested including provisions for Class II;

#### Item 3 (b) Apples and Pears

Standard in force: TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.1

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/4 (Belgium, South Africa)  
TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.1 (Apples)  
TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.2 (Apples and Pears Working Group)  
TRADE/GE.1/WP.7/2001/4/Add.3 (Pears)

20. The revised UNECE Standard for Apples and Pears was adopted at the last session of the Working Party. The list of varieties was attached to the standard in the new format with the existing contents. For this session Belgium and South Africa propose additions to the list of varieties (-/2001/4) and New Zealand proposes drafts for splitting the standard in to one for apples (-/2001/4/Add.1) and one for pears (-/2001/4/Add.3).

21. The Chairman of the working group, Mr. Tim Knox (New Zealand) reported on the results of an informal meeting which was held on 14 May 2001 in Geneva.

#### *Proposed UNECE Standard for Apples*

22. It was discussed whether the provision "carefully picked" in the minimum requirements was useful. Some delegations felt that it should be deleted and could be part of the provisions for the OECD explanatory brochure, others felt that it might serve as a tool to communicate the importance of careful picking of fruit to the producers. It was decided to leave the text in square brackets.

23. The indents concerning slight skin defects in Class I were discussed at length because delegations differed in their interpretation: whether all three defects mentioned could be present at once (2cm defect of elongated shape, 1cm<sup>2</sup> of other defects and 1cm<sup>2</sup> of slight bruising) or only one or two of these.

24. It was pointed out that the indentation in the English version of the adopted UNECE Standard for Apples and Pears was clearer and should also be used in the proposed text. It was decided to leave the text in square brackets for the moment and to try to find a clearer wording in the future.

25. The proposal of the Working Group contains, in addition to sizing by diameter, the option for weight sizing which is used in many producing countries. This is a major change as compared to the existing standard.

26. The delegation of the European Community said that it would be interesting to include weight sizing in the standard but that the values for minimum weight and tolerances still needed to be discussed. He said that it might be confusing to include two different methods of sizing in the standard.

27. Other delegations felt that diameter sizing was still widely used and should be maintained in the standard. Confusion could be avoided by making clear through marking which sizing method had been used.

28. The Specialized Section agreed to continue the work on the inclusion of weight sizing especially concerning minimum weights and tolerances. Delegations were invited to make proposals for tolerances and minimum weight and transmit these to the delegation of New Zealand before 31 January 2002.

29. Several other changes to the proposal were mentioned which were mainly editorial:

- The term pre-packages was changed to consumer packages.
- The provision concerning uniformity for consumer packages (V. A. Last paragraph) was changed to read:  
“Uniformity of variety and origin are not required for apples in consumer packages of a net weight not exceeding [2 kg].”
- It was mentioned that the marking requirements need to contain provisions for the marking of the min/ max weight.

30. The text of the proposed Standard will be revised by the rapporteur to include the comments made and published as Addendum 1 to this report.

#### *Proposed draft Codex Standard for Apples*

31. The delegation of the United States reported that they were acting as rapporteur for the drafting group for the development of a proposed draft Codex standard for Apples at Step 3. He had prepared a document based on the proposal made by Uruguay at the last CCFFV and included all comments made into one lengthy document. He felt that the proposals discussed at UNECE should also be transmitted to the Codex Committee in order to ensure harmonization.

32. Several delegations said that it would be premature to transmit proposals to the Codex Committee group that had not been conclusively discussed in UNECE.

33. The delegation of the European Community said that they had opposed the decision of the Codex Committee to create a standard for apples because the work was not finished at UNECE. He further said that at the last CCFFV they had proposed that the Specialized Section should be given the task of developing the proposed draft Codex standard for Apples. This method of cooperation is included as an option in the Codex procedural manual. The proposal had not been agreed by the CCFFV.

34. The delegate of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme said that the CCFFV was automatically informed of all work done by the Specialized Section and the Working Party as this was a fixed item on the agenda of the CCFFV. She said further that according to the terms of reference of the CCFFV, the Specialized Section may prepare proposed draft standards for fresh produce at the request of the CCFFV but the final decision rested with the Committee. However, the CCFFV had decided not to apply the option to give the task of developing a proposed draft standard for apples, table grapes and tomatoes to the Specialized Section but it was noted that many countries participating in the Specialized Section were also members of the Codex drafting groups.

35. The Specialized Section agreed that it was necessary to come to a harmonized standard but recognized that this would take time. The Codex Committee will be informed of the work at UNECE through cooperation of the secretariats, participation of the same delegations in working/drafting groups as well as the presentation of the report of this session at the next session of the CCFFV. It was also agreed that no formal proposals would be transmitted to the Codex Committee before the items in question had been conclusively discussed in UNECE.

36. The working group pointed out a number of editorial amendments which will be included in the revised version of the draft by the rapporteur and published in Addendum 2 to this report.

37. The delegation of Chile will prepare a proposal on weight sizing for pears. It was pointed out that for pears the correlation between sizing by weight and by diameter is difficult to determine.

#### *List of Varieties for Apples and Pears*

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.2 (Working Group)

38. The working group prepared a new version of the list of varieties based on the list contained in the standard in force. All additions and deletions made by the working group have been marked. The working group did not ask for any decision on this list at the present meeting. Delegations were invited to send comments to the delegation from Germany up to 31 January 2002.

39. The Specialized Section thanked the Working Group for the excellent work done.

#### *Proposals from the Ukraine*

40. The working group considered the proposals made by the Ukraine at the last session (contained in TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2000/INF.6).

41. To further define abnormal external moisture in the minimum requirements: the group felt that this item was adequately covered in the OECD explanatory brochure.

42. To reword the sentence about development in the minimum requirements: the group clarified that the terminology came from the standard layout and that appropriate provisions for shape were included in later sections.

43. To delete or reword the phrase about “grittiness” (in the classification for Extra Class and Class I): it was clarified that grittiness was a physiological defect (calcium deficiency) and not a maturity issue. It was not related to pears of late ripeness and also should be avoided in all stages of trade.

44. To include different tolerances for different stages of marketing: the group clarified that this subject had already been considered by Codex but not included in the standard for practical reasons. It was also mentioned that UNECE standards were meant for application at the export control stage.

**Item 3 (c) Avocados (maturity requirements)**

Recommendation in trial period: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.15*

Document for this session: *TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/5* (European Community)

45. The recommendation for Avocados was adopted by the Working Party for a two-year trial period. At the last session it was stressed by several delegations that a minimum level of dry matter content achieved at harvest should be defined in the standard to ensure acceptable ripening. Maturity requirements should not be used to distinguish quality classes.

46. The delegation of the European Community presented their proposal which had been prepared in cooperation with Spain. The figures contained in it were the same that had been presented by Spain at the last session. The value for the variety “Nabal” was left open for discussion.

47. The delegation of COLEACP asked whether Avocados coming from the Caribbean region had been considered when preparing the proposal because their characteristics were quite different.

48. It was replied that the proposal would be adopted for a trial period during which comments could be made and additional data supplied to the Specialized Section.

49. The delegation of Belgium said that 15% dry matter content were sufficient for “Nabal”.

50. The proposal from the European Community was adopted with the following changes:

- the indent concerning “Nabal” was deleted;
- in the last indent the references to varieties contained in brackets were deleted.

51. The Specialized Section agreed to propose to the Working Party the integration of amendments (as contained in Addendum 3 to this report) into the existing UNECE Recommendation for Avocados and test them for the remaining year of the trial period.

**Item 3 (d) Beans**

Standard in force: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.2*

Discussion at the Working Party: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11*, para. 18

Document for this session: *TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/6* (European Community)

52. At the last session of the Working Party the delegation of the Netherlands said that their industry had indicated problems with the provisions concerning rust spots in Class II. They felt that “practically free” was open to interpretations and it could happen that the Netherlands would not be able to deliver Beans at certain periods because of the rust spots caused by unfavourable weather conditions. A proposal on this question was received by the European Community.



53. The Specialized Section agreed the proposal. The amendments will be reproduced in Addendum 3 to this report and transmitted to the Working Party for adoption and inclusion in the UNECE Standard for Beans.

**Item 3 (e) Citrus Fruit**

54. The item was not discussed because no document was received. It will be put on the agenda for the next session.

**Item 3(f) Kiwifruit**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/8 (New Zealand)

55. A session of the IKO was held in August 2000, where the questions raised during the last session of the Specialized Section (definition of maturity indicators, sizing methods, list of varieties) were discussed. The results are summarized in document -/2001/8. The Chairman of the working group, Mr. Tim Knox (New Zealand) reported on the results of the informal meeting which was held on 14 May 2001 in Geneva.

*Maturity requirements*

56. The delegation of New Zealand said that experience had shown that the existing requirement prescribing a brix value of 6.2 at harvest (also contained in the UNECE standard) was at present not a reliable maturity indicator.

57. He said that they had revised their national standard on a trial basis using dry matter content as a minimum maturity indicator. This parameter can be measured at any stage of marketing and does not change after harvest. It gives a secure indication that the fruit will develop a sufficient brix value when ripened. The value is measured by drying the fruit over at least 24 h at 65°C to constant weight. As additional criteria it was proposed that all seeds should be black as white or brown seeds indicate immature fruit.

58. The trials had shown good results but during the IKO session some delegations felt that the change of criteria would be difficult to implement and the issue was not discussed conclusively.

59. The working group welcomed the maturity requirements proposed by New Zealand and suggested that they should be further explored by IKO. To facilitate their implementation it was further suggested including two methods for determining the dry matter content in the standard:

- a quick method e.g. by using a microwave, and
- a reference method.

60. The delegation of the United States said that to ensure uniform application, the methods to be used should be included in the standard. He also asked whether it was possible to see some data on the correlation between dry matter content and brix value.

61. The delegation of Belgium said that account should be taken of the wishes of the consumer when defining maturity requirements. The delegation of New Zealand replied that this was the reason for defining the new indicators because the brix value at harvest did not predict acceptance by the consumer.

62. The delegation of Chile said that parameters did not have the same behaviour in different parts of the world and that in Chile the correlation between dry matter content and brix value was not clear.

63. The delegation of Sweden said that maturity requirements should be as simple as possible and that the seller or dispatcher should be responsible for the good quality and state of development of the fruit.

#### *Sizing*

64. The IKO did not find an agreement concerning sizing. The working group felt that the existing size ranges should be defined more realistically to ensure uniformity. They felt that it was not necessary to define categories.

#### *List of varieties*

65. A draft has been prepared by New Zealand which will be further completed before circulating it.

#### *Other items discussed*

66. The working group discussed the following additional items for inclusion in the standard:
- The definition of produce will be extended to include "Actinidia arguta".
  - The standard should include provisions for flat fruit as contained in the OECD Kiwifruit brochure.
  - In the classification of Class II, severe bruising should be included.
  - In the marking requirements, one country proposed that the number of fruit should be optional and the size range mandatory.

#### **Item 3(g) Lettuce**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/9 (European Community)

67. The delegation of the European Community introduced the document. He said that a substantive revision was proposed because it had been recognized that there were more types of lettuce marketed than presently contained in the EC marketing standard which was harmonized with the UNECE Standard. It was decided to discuss the amendments first in the Specialized Section before changing the EC standard. They also proposed some simplifications and the inclusion of the present gentlemen's agreement concerning mixed packaging of various types of produce.

68. The proposal was agreed by the Specialized Section with a number of modifications:
- Definition of produce:
    - The french text should be aligned to the English version;
    - "cabbage (head) lettuces" should be replaced by "head (cabbage) lettuces"
    - in the last indent "latifolia" should be replaced by "latifolium";
  - Throughout the standard "cabbage lettuce" should be replaced by "head lettuce"
  - Several editorial changes were pointed out.
  - The use of the word "produce" or "product" should be harmonized in accordance with other standards and the standard layout.

69. The revised version will be published in Addendum 4 to this report. It will be transmitted for adoption by the Working Party as a revised UNECE Standard for Lettuce and endives.

**Item 3(h): Onions**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/10 (European Community)

70. The delegation of the European Community introduced their document. During a discussion with member states it had become apparent that a number of amendments were deemed necessary and it was decided to discuss these in the Specialized Section first. The amendments concerned the following areas:

- move the requirements on small cracks from the minimum requirements to classification;
- move the requirement on hollow or tough stems from classification to minimum requirements (meaning that in Class II, 10% of the onions may still have hollow or tough stems);
- alignment with the standard layout concerning pests;
- extending allowed length of the stems from 4cm to 6cm (because this decreases risk of infections);
- clarifications concerning presentation in bulk and for stringed onions;
- alignment with the standard layout for marking of onions dispatched in bulk.

71. The proposal from the European Community was adopted with minor editorial changes. The complete text of the proposed revision will be published in Addendum 5 to this report. The text will be transmitted to the Working Party for adoption as the revised UNECE Standard for Onions.

**Item 3 (i): Peaches and Nectarines (maturity requirements)**

72. At the last session it was decided to align the standard with the standard layout but to integrate this change into a more comprehensive proposal including maturity requirements and size "D". A working group (Chile, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, South Africa and Sweden) was formed.

73. The working group held a limited discussion on 14 May 2001 as no new document was available:

- The working group felt that quality and maturity were not exclusively linked to the size of the fruit. Problems with immature fruit occur also for fruit bigger than size "D". It was also mentioned that bad seasons could lead to smaller size fruit. The working group proposed to maintain size "D" in the standard.
- The working group agreed that colour was not a reliable maturity indicator because there was too much variation between different varieties and even the same variety can show differences depending on the growing region.
- Modern non-destructive quality tests exist but are still too expensive to apply on a big scale.
- Existing tests like squeezing, pinching or a penetrometer test depend very much on the individual tester. Good training is needed to ensure uniformity of assessment by different inspectors.
- The indicators of dry matter content or sugar acid ratio could be explored but no technical data exists.
- It was mentioned that the EC marketing standards allows optional labelling of firmness and brix value for consumer information.
- The delegation of France will provide the interprofessional agreement on penetrometer testing and brix value for peaches and nectarines which is used in France to the Secretariat.

74. The delegation of the European Community said that several Member States had experienced problems with immature fruit of size D and he would not have any problem with deleting this category.

75. The delegation of the United Kingdom said that the brix level was already used in the industry and their experiences could be valuable.

76. The delegation of Chile said that the brix value was not a reliable maturity indicator. He offered to provide more information on the concept of "well matured fruit" which was researched in the United States.

77. It was decided that the working group should continue to work on the following items:

- size "D"
- maturity indicators
- information from the United Kingdom on the use of the brix level
- the proposal made by the Ukraine at the last session (contained in TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2000/14).
- any other proposals.

78. The delegate of France offered to serve as rapporteur for this group.

**Item 3 (j): Peas**

Standard in force: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.5*

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/12 (European Community)

79. The European Community proposed several changes to the UNECE Standard for Peas. The amendments concerned the following areas:

- resolving a possible conflict between the minimum requirement "intact" and the fact that "sugar snap peas" very often have their ends removed;
- to better distinguish in the standard between provisions for pods and seeds and "mange tout", "sugar snap peas" and other peas.

80. The proposal was agreed with minor editorial changes. The complete text of the proposed revision will be published in Addendum 6 to this report. The text will be transmitted to the Working Party for adoption as the revised UNECE Standard for Peas.

**Item 3 (k): Peppers**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/13 (European Community)

81. The European Community proposed several changes to the UNECE Standard for Sweet Peppers. The amendments concerned two main areas:

- to allow the trading of elongated sweet peppers pointed by lowering the minimum width from 30mm to 20mm (as a consequence peperoncini type sweet peppers fall in this class and do not have to be treated separately);
- to allow mixed packaging of different colored sweet peppers with different numbers for each color;

82. The proposal was agreed with minor editorial changes. A mistake in the French version of the text was pointed out.

83. The Specialized Section agreed to the proposal. The amendments will be reproduced in Addendum 3 to this report and transmitted to the Working Party for adoption and inclusion in the UNECE Standard for Beans.

**Item 3(I) Table Grapes (maturity requirements, bunch weight)**

Standard in force: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.6*

Documents for this session: *TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/14* ( South Africa)  
*TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/14/Add.1* (European Community)

*Bunch weight*

84. The revised UNECE Standard for Table Grapes was adopted at the last session of the Working Party. At the last session of the Specialized Section a working group (Chile, Greece, South Africa) was formed to prepare a proposal on brix values and varieties. The present documents have been received from South Africa on bunch weight and maturity requirements and from the European Community on brix values and varieties.

85. The delegation of South Africa introduced their document concerning bunch weight for late harvest grapes (e.g. of the varieties Barlinka, La Rochelle and Dauphine) which fulfill all requirements for Class I except for the bunch weight where they only reach 100g instead of the required 150g for large berry varieties. He said that other varieties might be concerned as well.

86. The Specialized Section agreed to the proposal in an amended form. It will be reproduced in Addendum 3 to this report and transmitted to the Working Party for adoption as a recommendation for a two-year trial period.

*Maturity requirements*

87. The delegation of the European Community introduced their proposal to include a brix value of 12 or 13 depending on the variety in the standard. He felt that it would be useful to put a brix value into the standard to test it and to develop it further.

88. The delegation of South Africa said that in his view the inclusion of brix values only made sense if it was done by variety or groups of varieties because a brix value of 13° could mean for certain varieties an acceptable marketing quality whereas for others it was unacceptable. Including this value in the standard might lead to the marketing of immature grapes which nevertheless fulfilled the criteria of the standard.

89. This view was supported by the delegations of Greece and Belgium.

90. The delegation of Chile said that the brix level is not a good indicator for many grapes. He proposed including both minimum brix level and sugar/acid ratio as indicators and set them according to different groups of grape varieties. He proposed further that as a starting point three levels of brix could be adopted as follows: 12, 13 according to the proposal of the European Community and 15 for seedless grapes.

91. The Specialized Section agreed to the proposal in an amended form. It will be reproduced in Addendum 3 to this report and transmitted to the Working Party for adoption as a recommendation for a two-year trial period.

92. Some delegations saw a problem in adding a requirement concerning a measurable index without giving any figures but could agree on trying out these provisions as a recommendation while the working group would prepare a more comprehensive proposal.

93. The mandate for the working group is as follows:

- Defining satisfactory brix and sugar/acid ratio levels depending on the variety with the goal of identifying groups of varieties for which the same levels could be acceptable.
- Reviewing methods for sampling and measurement for the above indexes.

94. The delegation of South Africa offered to serve as rapporteur for this group. He invited delegations to send any comments or proposals to South Africa by 31 January 2002.

**Item 3 (m) Strawberries**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.1 and Rev.1(Germany)

95. The delegation of Germany proposed amendments to the UNECE Standard for Strawberries. The need for these had arisen during discussion of the OECD Explanatory Brochure which will be finalized shortly.

96. During the discussion of the proposals several nordic countries raised the problem of strawberries grown in their countries which lose their calyx easily. They are not traded internationally because they are soft and keep only for some days after harvest. It was mentioned that consumers were interested in buying strawberries without calyx.

97. At present the standard allows the absence of the calyx for wood strawberries. It was suggested a list be established of soft strawberry varieties and treat them in the same way. This was considered impractical because there are many changes in the varieties produced every year.

98. It was finally decided to mention them in the minimum requirements next to wood strawberries as “varieties which easily lose their calyx at harvest”.

99. The delegation of Germany also proposed to define in the standard the provision “presence of a small white patch” (contained in the classification for Class I) by stating that the patch should not exceed more than one tenth of the surface area of the fruit.

100. Several delegations were of the opinion that 10% was difficult to reach especially at the beginning of the season and were in favour of a higher figure.

101. Other delegations felt that because strawberries did not ripen after harvest 10% was sufficient for Class I and Strawberries which did not fulfil this criteria should be placed in Class II where 20% is allowed.

102. It was also proposed to allow “slight traces of soil” in Class I. Some delegations felt that this should not be allowed because in production, efforts were made to avoid contact of strawberries with the soil.

103. The Specialized Section provisionally agreed to a number of amendments to the UNECE Standard for Strawberries (see Addendum 3 to this report). As three producing countries (Israel, Italy and Spain) were not present at the session it was decided to give countries until 30 September 2001 to comment on these

amendments. They will only be proposed to the Working Party for adoption and inclusion in the standard if no objections are received by the Secretariat by this date.

**Item 4 Proposal for a draft UN/ECE Standard for Pineapples**

Document at the last session: *TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2000/20 (COLEACP)*

Documents for this session: *TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/15 (South Africa)*  
*TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/15/Add.1 (COLEACP)*  
*TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/15/Add.2 (COLEACP)*

104. Comments on the document distributed at the last session have been collected by COLEACP in document -2001/15/Add.1 which includes the comments made by South Africa. A revised draft of the standard was prepared by COLEACP in document -2001/15/Add.2.

105. The delegation of COLEACP introduced their documents and mentioned a number of corrections to clarify that the proposed standard did not intend to allow the trading of pineapples without the crown. The classification by external colouring had been made optional.

106. The delegation of the Ivory Coast said that 64% of world trade in fresh pineapple were between Africa and Europe and 55% of the pineapples were produced in the Ivory Coast. He said that the aspect of the crown was important to the consumer and that the crown protected the fruit against infections, rotting and mechanical damage. Pineapples without the crown were only traded for processing.

107. The delegation of South Africa said that the UNECE Standard should be aligned with the Codex standard to allow trade of pineapples without the crown. They also felt that provisions for a Class II should be included in the standard.

108. The delegate of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme said that the existing Codex Standard for Pineapples had been revised following a request from COLEACP. During the revision the question of the crown had been discussed extensively. In order to be flexible to reflect world trade it had been decided to allow Pineapples to be traded with or without the crown. Countries wishing to propose changes to the Codex Standard could do so in the CCFFV. The draft UNECE Standard for Pineapples should be harmonized with the Codex standard.

109. Several delegations felt that in order for UNECE standards to be truly international they would have to take all world trade into account. The delegations of New Zealand and the United States stated that in their countries pineapples without the crown were marketed for direct consumption.

110. The delegation of Germany asked the working group to consider whether special provisions for pineapples marketed without the crown could be included in the standard.

111. The delegation of the European Community said that there were no European rules on the trade of pineapples without the crown but that in fact the market did not ask for this product. He felt that more data on trade without the crown was needed.

112. This view was supported by the delegation of Chile. He said that the Specialized Section is a technical group and should discuss on the basis of data. He said that it would be interesting to have some data on shelf-life of pineapples with or without the crown to decide if the differences were as big as for e.g. cherries.

113. The delegation of the United States agreed to do some research to find data on this matter.

114. A member of the Secretariat said that the terms of reference of the working group states that each change they proposed to the existing Codex standard should be identified and justified.

115. The delegation of the European Community supported this view and said that the proposed standard should be redrafted to reflect this. He said that it contained interesting provisions including those concerning classification of external colouring which should be discussed further. He said that before discussing the standard in the CCFFV again good reasons should be given for any changes proposed.

116. To achieve more clarity and make it easier to compare the Codex and UNECE standards it was agreed that the working group would with the assistance of the Secretariat:

- (1) take the existing Codex standard and adapt it to the UNECE standard layout;
- (2) make changes to this text and highlight them;
- (3) add justifications for the changes made.

**Item 5 Proposal to create an internationally recognized list of trade descriptions and classification codes for fruits and vegetables.**

Documents for this session: *TRADE/WP.7/2000/11, paras. 71-76*

117. The agenda item and the speaker (Mr. Miodrag Mitic from EAN International) were introduced by the Deputy Director of the Trade Division and Chief of the Trade Facilitation Section, Mr. Hans Hansell. He gave a short introduction to the work that is being done in UN/CEFACT on electronic data interchange and electronic commerce. The best known standard of this organization is the UN/EDIFACT standard on data interchange. It was approved in 1987 and has now over 500,000 world-wide users in different fields.

118. In electronic commerce UNECE cooperates closely with EAN International. EAN International is a non-profit organization operating world-wide in the area of electronic commerce (supply chain management, article numbering, bar codes, modeling) and is also very active in the UNECE Specialized Section on Standardization of Meat. Electronic data interchange combined with the coding system offered by EAN can not only speed up trade procedures but open new ways of managing supply chains e.g. Just in time techniques.

119. The Deputy Director said that he was very pleased with the cooperation between the Specialized Section and EAN. He hoped that the synergy between experts from different fields working together would lead to results showing new ways of facilitating trade of fresh fruit and vegetables.

120. The delegation of EAN International gave a presentation on the work of EAN and the use of its standards to manage supply chains in different fields of trade. He also reported on recent developments in labelling technology which now made it now possible to label individual fruit with bar codes.

121. The delegation of EAN International then proposed establishing a coding system to enable bar coding of UNECE trade descriptions for fresh produce and through this facilitate efficient international electronic trading.



122. The delegation of Chile said that he was concerned about the cost of implementing such a system. He also said that they were happy with the PLU number (4 digit number to identify fresh produce) which has been in use for a number of years.

123. The delegation of EAN International replied that to use the EAN standards only a membership fee of around 150US\$ plus the cost of the technical equipment were needed. He said further that once implemented on a world wide consensus the bar code system would offer many more possibilities to the users than the PLU number e.g. in the area of traceability.

124. The Chairman asked the Specialized Section how they would like to proceed with this matter.

125. Several delegations said that they were very interested in continuing discussions on this matter. The possibility of implementing traceability and moving towards a universal system were mentioned as reasons.

126. It was decided to form a working group (Chile, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Slovakia, United Kingdom, United States, European Community) which would meet for the first time from 15-16 November in Geneva. The agenda and terms of reference would be worked out by the secretariat in cooperation with EAN and the working group members. All information concerning this group will be posted on the Internet.

#### **Item 6 Issues concerning trade marks and names of varieties**

Documents for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/17  
TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/INF.5

127. The Secretariat reported on the history of this issue which had first been discussed by the Specialized Section in 1993. At the last session it was decided to seek advice from the Legal Counsel on this matter. Document -/2001/17 sums up the information provided to the Senior Legal Advisor and the preliminary reply received. In his reply the legal advisor indicated that more information from Sun World was needed.

128. Since then there has been an exchange of letters between UNECE and the United States Patent and Trademark office because Sun World has announced that they would seek legal action against the United Nations, should the trade names Superior Seedless and Early Superior Seedless not be removed from the standard.

129. Keeping in mind the discussions held at the last session the Secretariat has again had discussions with the legal service in New York and Geneva explaining the position of the Specialized Section and basically asked the following questions:

- What is the best legal way to mention trade mark names in United Nations Standards?
- Can a trademark holder prevent all mention of the trademark in regulations and standards?  
If so, then how is it possible to regulate?
- Do the names have to be deleted from the standard because Sun World is threatening legal action?

130. The preliminary answer (see -/2001/INF.5) from the legal services includes a brief summary on trademarks extracted from the web site of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) (paras. 11-12). The legal services of United Nations state that more time is needed to examine all aspects of the issue (para. 13). They say that for an acceptable solution to this issue the following options appear open to UNECE (in para. 20 of their memorandum):

- To either amend the UNECE Standard for Table Grapes clarifying the status of the trade marks better than at present i.e. avoiding all possibility that they can be confused with synonyms and ensuring that the trademark holders rights are protected; or
- to remove the reference to the trade names from the standard on a temporary basis pending further review.

131. In the discussion (para. 21) of these options the legal services state that the second option will not solve UNECE's problems i.e. to make reference to trade marks for identification purpose in the standards set and could lead to a series of requests by owners of other trademarks to have these removed from the standards. This is why at present the legal services do not recommend the second option.

132. Concerning the risk of legal action against the UN they note (para. 22) that the United Nations enjoy privileges and immunities from any legal proceedings that Sun World may seek to commence in connection with this matter. They also state the commitment of the United Nations to provide alternative modalities for resolving conflicts of a private law nature that may arise with the United Nations, such as arbitration, where appropriate.

133. The delegation of the United States explained to the Specialized Section why Sun World was so concerned about the mention of its trademarks in the UNECE standard. According to United States trademark law a trademark may lose its protection if it becomes generic. It is the trademark holders obligation to ensure that it does not become generic ("policing"). He cited the case of the company Bayer who did not properly "police" the trademark "aspirin" which then became generic. He said further that in his opinion the best solution would be to remove the trade names from the standard. In any case he suggested that advice should also be sought from WIPO.

134. The delegation of Chile said that in a letter sent by Sun World to one of their clients in the United Kingdom, Sun World states that they own personal and intellectual property rights to the "sugraone" grapevine. This letter created confusion because the "sugraone" variety is traded by Chile.

135. It was decided to follow the recommendation given by the legal services i.e. not to change the standard at present but to await the conclusive advice from the lawyers. It is clear to the group that the rights of Sun World and other companies holding trademarks that are mentioned in UNECE Standards need to be protected by making the mention in the correct way. It was decided to place the issue on the agenda of the Working Party where the appropriate changes could be decided.

#### **Item 7 Establishment of a list of countries using code marks**

Documents for this session: TRADE/WP.7/2000/11, paras.84-85  
TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.22

136. The issue was discussed at the last session of the Working Party. South Africa proposed the preparation of a list of countries not accepting code marks and requiring the full name and address of the packer or dispatcher.

137. The Working Party accepted this proposal. It requested the secretariat to prepare a small questionnaire which was published as TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.22 to request this information from all countries and to publish the results on the home page.

138. The secretariat reported that only a few answers had been received and that the questionnaire would be sent again. It is available on the Internet and was also distributed at the session and delegations were invited to send replies as soon as possible.

**Item 8 Exchange of information on non-conformity cases**

Documents for this session: TRADE/WP.7/2000/11, paras.77-81  
TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.21

139. At its last session the Working Party adopted the relevant OECD document. It was published as TRADE/WP.7/2000/11/Add.21. It was mentioned that a list of contact points for quality control would be useful for the application of this document. The Working Party decided to request the specialized sections GE.1 and GE.2 to establish such lists.

140. Delegations were invited to supply the relevant information to the secretariat for publication on the Internet.

**Item 9 Review of the Guide on Implementation of Quality Control**

Documents for this session: TRADE/WP.7/2000/11, paras. 82-83  
AGRI/WP.1/R.190

141. The OECD Guide on Implementation of Quality Control was adopted in 1990. At the last session of the Working Party it was proposed to publish the Guide on Implementation of Quality Control on the home page. As many delegations were not familiar with this document, it was decided to request the GE.1 Specialized Section to review it and make recommendations to the Working Party as to its use.

142. The delegate of the OECD Scheme informed the meeting that the document was applied by member countries of the scheme and worked well. At present there were no proposals to change it. She offered to provide the actual version of the document in English and French to the UNECE secretariat.

143. The delegation of Chile proposed the deletion of “size” from the definition of a “lot” because in commercial practice 3 to 4 different sizes were used in a lot of 15 to 20 pallets. In his view the separation of lots by size was artificial.

144. The delegation of the European Community said that the document was being reviewed by the Commission including the problem raised by Chile but that it was too early to make any formal proposal.

145. The Representative of the Codex Secretariat informed the Specialized Section that the CCFFV was also considering issues related to the quality inspection and certification of fresh fruits and vegetables. In this regard, she informed the meeting that the last CCFFV decided to discontinue the consideration of the main body of the Draft Code of Practice for the Quality Inspection and Certification of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables since it was already covered by other texts elaborated by the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems. However, the Committee recognized that the Annexes to the Code were specific to the quality inspection and certification of fresh produce and therefore, it agreed to redraft them as the *Proposed Draft Guide for the Quality Control of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*.

146. The delegation of the European Community expressed the hope that there would be no duplication of work on this matter between the three organizations involved.

147. It was decided that the Secretariat would make the actual version of the document available on the Internet. Delegations were invited to send proposals for the next session.

#### **Item 10 E-mail and web site addresses in UN/ECE Standards**

148. South Africa proposed discussing the question of e-mail and web site addresses in UNECE standards. Since the advent of the Internet and e-mail more and more companies are making use of web sites to promote themselves and e-mail to correspond with others and to do business. By visiting the web site of producers/exporters a wealth of information can be accessed directly and instantly, including postal and physical addresses. Therefore South Africa proposes that web site and e-mail addresses also be officially recognized in addition to conventional addresses.

149. Several delegations said that while they could understand the proposal from South Africa they did not feel that at present e-mail and web site addresses offered the same amount of traceability as conventional addresses.

150. It was decided to allow as an option the additional labelling of email and web site addresses and to collect more information on this subject.

#### **Item 11 Participation to the Specialized Section**

151. At the last session it was agreed that the Chairman, assisted by the secretariat, would write a letter encouraging participation especially to international associations of large distributors. The Chairman said that this had not yet been done.

152. The delegation of the European Community said that during discussions with candidate countries these had been informed about the work on agricultural standards at UNECE.

#### **Item 12 Acceptances**

Document for this session: TRADE/WP.7/GE.1/2001/18

153. The secretariat prepared a consolidated document listing by standard the acceptances of countries. This information can also be found on the web site of the agricultural standards unit at: [www.unece.org/trade/agr](http://www.unece.org/trade/agr) under the menu item GENERAL. Delegations were invited to study this document carefully and to transmit comments or corrections to the Secretariat.

#### **Item 13 Matters of interest arising from the work of**

##### **(a) Codex Alimentarius Commission**

154. The last session of the CCFFV advanced the draft Codex standards for *Tannia, Papaya* (revised), *Cape Gooseberry, Asparagus* and the provision on *Minimum Juice Content (42%)* in the *Codex Standard for Limes* to the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for final adoption. The Minimum Juice Content was in line with the one set out in the UNECE Standard for Citrus Fruits. The Draft Codex Standard for Asparagus was harmonized with the corresponding UN/ECE Standard.

155. The *Proposed Draft Codex Standard for Cassava* was forwarded to the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for primary adoption as Draft Standard. Specific comments and data on international trade of bitter varieties of cassavas were being requested in order to ensure that they did not pose any health risk with a view to its inclusion in the Draft. The *Draft Codex Standard for Yellow Pitahaya* was being redrafted to include varieties of different colour traded internationally.

156. In regard to outstanding provisions on sizing in the Codex Standards for Limes, Pummelos and Grapefruits, a Drafting Group lead by the United States and assisted by the European Community was revising the sizing provisions in these standards including those for oranges. The Draft Standard for Oranges was returned for redrafting. A Drafting Group on Maturity Requirements applying to oranges and their green varieties was set up. Both groups had to report back to the Codex Secretariat by 1 July 2001. The outcome of the discussions of the two Drafting Groups together with the changes agreed at the last CCFFV would be incorporated in the Draft Standard and circulated for comments with a view to its finalization by the next session of the Committee.

157. The Proposed Draft Codex Standards for Apples, Table Grapes and Tomatoes were being redrafted by specific Drafting Groups lead by the United States, Chile and Mexico respectively. Once they finalized the revision of the proposed draft standards, the Codex Secretariat would circulate them for comments and consideration by the next Committee session.

**(b) European Union**

158. The delegation of the European Community mentioned that several EC Standards have been amended as a consequence of the decisions taken at last year's session of the Specialized Section: beans, peas, table grapes, tomatoes and miniature produce (cauliflower, aubergines, courgettes, headed cabbage, sweet peppers). Amendments to the EC standards for melons, apples and pears and citrus fruit are about to be adopted.

159. He said further that following the adoption of the revised UNECE Standard for Cultivated Mushrooms the European Community had decided to elaborate in the close future an EC standard for cultivated mushrooms.

160. The EC nearly finalized its review of the inspection regulation and a new regulation replacing 2251/92 should soon be adopted.

**(c) OECD Scheme**

161. The delegate of the OECD Scheme informed that the most recent publications of the scheme were interpretative brochures for the standards for Broccoli and Asparagus. The next Meeting of Heads of National Control Services will take place from 4 to 6 June 2001 at the invitation of the Slovakian authorities. The next Plenary Meeting of the Scheme will take place from 23 to 25 October 2001 in Paris. The Produce Working Groups will meet on 22 October 2001.

**Item 14 Operational activities**

162. The delegation of the United Kingdom reported on training courses held in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic concerning formation of quality inspection services. He then invited delegations to the UK international training course taking place in Guildford from 18 to 20 July 2001. The following products will be

covered: Strawberries, Lettuce, Cherries, Cauliflowers, Garlic, Apples, Apricots, Carrots and Nuts. Also covered will be Commission Regulation 2251/92 laying down conformity inspection procedures. There will be a technical visit to a wholesale market.

163. The delegation of Slovakia informed that the Slovak international training course would be held from 10 to 14 September 2001.

164. The delegation of the Czech Republic said that three workshops for importers and producers had been held with the assistance of Ireland.

#### **Item 15 Other business**

165. The Specialized Section agreed to propose to the Working Party to change its name to "Specialized Section on Standardization of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables.

166. The delegation of Austria informed that they had withdrawn their reservation on sizing in the UNECE standard for Strawberries.

167. The Secretariat proposed to change the numbering system used in UNECE standards to a legal numbering system (1, 1.2, 1.2.1, etc.) in order to make the standards easier to read and allow numbering of all paragraphs if necessary instead of having to use indentation which might easily get lost in one of the language versions and lead to confusion.

168. The proposal was welcomed by several delegations and it was decided that the secretariat would prepare a proposal to the Working Party based on the existing standard layout.

#### **Item 16 Preparation of the next session**

##### **(a) Future work**

169. Future work will include:

- Annonas
- Draft UNECE Standard for Apples
- Draft UNECE Standard for Pears
- List of varieties for the existing UNECE Standard for Apples and Pears
- Avocados
- Citrus Fruit
- Kiwifruit
- Peaches and Nectarines
- Table Grapes
- Pineapples
- Trade descriptions and classification codes
- Trademarks
- Use of Code Marks
- Electronic exchange of non-conformity information
- Participation to the Specialized Section

- Guide of implementation of quality control
- Standard layout (numbering, optional inclusion of email addresses and web sites)
- Lambs lettuce (proposal to create a new standard)
- Strawberries;
- Leeks

**(b) Date and place of the next session**

170. The next session of the Specialized Section is provisionally planned from 23-26 April 2002.

**(c) Preparation of the 57th session of the Working Party on Standardization of Perishable Produce and Quality Development**

171. The following items will be brought to the attention of the Working Party:

- A proposal to change the numbering system for the standards;
- any information received from the legal services concerning the trademark issue;
- Amendments to the UNECE Standard for Beans, Lettuce, Onions, Peas, Sweet Peppers (adoption as a revised UNECE Standard)
- Amendments to the UNECE Standard for Strawberries (if no objections received by 30 September 2001)
- Amendments to the UNECE Standard for Table Grapes (adoption as a UNECE Recommendation for a two year trial period)
- Amendments to the UNECE Standard for Avocados (inclusion in the UNECE Recommendation for the remaining one year trial period)
- A proposal to change the name of the Specialized Section

**Item 17 Election of officers**

172. The Specialized Section re-elected Mr. D. Priester (United States) as its Chairperson and Ms. U. Bickelmann (Germany) as its Vice-Chairperson.

**Item 18 Adoption of the report**

173. The Working Party adopted the report of its forty-seventh session on the basis of a draft prepared by the secretariat.

**Note by the secretariat:**

The following addenda will be published separately to this report:

- Addendum 1: Revised draft UNECE Standard for Apples;
- Addendum 2: Revised draft UNECE Standard for Pears;
- Addendum 3: Amendments to the UNECE Standards for Beans, Table Grapes, Avocados, Sweet Peppers and Strawberries.
- Addendum 4: Revised UNECE Standard for Lettuce;
- Addendum 5: Revised UNECE Standard for Onions;
- Addendum 6: Revised UNECE Standard for Peas;

**Task list**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Latest Date</b>
Publish the Guide on implementation of quality control on the web site	Secretariat	ASAP
Adapt existing Codex Standard for Pineapples to UNECE Standard layout (to COLEACP)	Secretariat	ASAP
Write a letter to encourage participation of large distributor organisations and consumer organisations	Chairman and Secretariat	ASAP
Comment on amendments to the UNECE Standard for Strawberries	All delegations	30 September 2001
Publish addenda to the report (to transmit to the Working Party)	Secretariat	3 September 2001
Prepare a proposal to revise the standard layout	Secretariat	3 September 2001
Comments on weight sizing for apples (to New Zealand)	All delegations	31 January 2002
Proposals on Table Grapes maturity requirements and sampling (to South Africa)	All delegations	31 January 2002
Comments on list of varieties for apples and pears (to Germany)	All delegations	31 January 2002
Revised proposal for Annonas	Spain	11 February 2002
Proposal on weight sizing for Apples	New Zealand	11 February 2002
Proposal on weight sizing for pears	Chile	11 February 2002
Proposal on the lists of varieties for Apples and Pears	Germany	11 February 2002
Report of WG on Kiwifruit	New Zealand	11 February 2002
Report of WG on Peaches and Nectarines	France	11 February 2002
Report of WG on Table Grapes	South Africa	11 February 2002
Transmit a new proposal on pineapples with justifications	COLEACP	11 February 2002
Report of the Working Group on Trade Descriptions and Classification Codes	Secretariat	11 February 2002
Report on results of research on maturity requirements for oranges	Spain	11 February 2002
Report on developments concerning trade marks	Secretariat	11 February 2002
Provide information on acceptance of code marks	All delegations	11 February 2002



Provide information on contact points for quality control	All delegations	11 February 2002
Transmit comments on acceptances to the secretariat	All delegations	ongoing
Prepare a draft UNECE Standard for Lambs Lettuce	France	11 February 2002
Prepare revisions to the UNECE Standards for Leeks and Strawberries	EC	11 February 2002