

## **Economic Commission for Europe**

### **Committee on Trade**

### **Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards**

#### **Specialized Section on Standardization of Dry and Dried Produce**

#### **Sixty-first session**

Geneva, 29 June -3 July 2015

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda

#### **Review of UNECE Recommendations**

## **Revised Recommendation for Dried Figs**

### **Comments by the delegation of Germany**

The following comments were submitted by the delegation of Germany (referring to document ECE/TRADE/C/WP.7/GE.2/2015/4):

**Moisture content:** The term “soft fruit/high moisture” was approved for the standards on dried mangoes (2013) and dried pineapples (2014). The denomination should not be changed by produce as in principle we are dealing with the same type of produce. This is why Germany proposes to also discuss this in context with the revision of the Standard Layout.

**Sizing – A – by number:** If at all, there should be only one minimum size for all classes. Moreover, the sizing table in A. is confusing. When applying a 10 g size range, it is allowed to indicate size code 3, 4, 5, or 6. The same problem is linked to the other size ranges. Thus, Germany prefers to separate the provisions for sizing by number from the sizing by weight ranges (i.e. keep the table as in the existing standard and delete the column on size weight ranges).

- In paragraph B., the words “when sized by diameter” should be deleted (they are duplicating). A general rule defining a maximum size range is missing.

**Quality tolerances:** In case of damage caused by pests, Germany is still in favour of 3, 8 and 10 percent for the respective classes. We must take into account that we are dealing with food and that the edibility must not be affected by to high tolerances for damages caused by pests. For Germany it is essential, that the tolerances are reduced in Classes Extra and I. As a compromise we could discuss higher tolerances for Class II.

In case of tolerances for sunscald, split or torn, excessively dried figs, the tolerances for Class II should be reduced to 20 %. Consequently the total tolerances for produce not satisfying the minimum requirements could be reduced from 30 to 25 % in Class II.

**Tolerances for other defects:**

- The last paragraph referring to white and black figs should be re-phrased with respect to the Standard Layout and the tolerances for varieties:
- “Dried figs belonging to varieties or dried figs other than that indicated or dried figs that are distinctly different in colour 10 10 10”

**Uniformity:** The colour scheme mentioned by the US should be optional and anyway be part of an explanatory brochure.

**Marking - commercial specifications:** Why is the “commercial type” mentioned in the specifications on marking. This term is not used in any other part of the standard. Which denominations are expected to be indicated? Why do we require the indication of a size range while the provisions on sizing do not require uniformity in size when sized by diameter?

---