

# Official Journal

## of the European Communities

L 303

Volume 40

6 November 1997

English edition

## Legislation

Contents

### I Acts whose publication is obligatory

- \* **Council Regulation (EC) No 2199/97 of 30 October 1997 amending Regulation (EC) No 2201/96 on the common organization of the markets in processed fruit and vegetable products** ..... 1
- \* **Council Regulation (EC) No 2200/97 of 30 October 1997 on the improvement of the Community production of apples, pears, peaches and nectarines** 3
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2201/97 of 5 November 1997 fixing the representative prices and the additional import duties for molasses in the sugar sector..... 5
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2202/97 of 5 November 1997 fixing the export refunds on white sugar and raw sugar exported in its unaltered state ..... 7
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2203/97 of 5 November 1997 fixing the maximum export refund for white sugar for the 14th partial invitation to tender issued within the framework of the standing invitation to tender provided for in Regulation (EC) No 1408/97 ..... 9
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2204/97 of 5 November 1997 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables 10

II Acts whose publication is not obligatory

Commission

97/747/EC:

- \* Commission Decision of 27 October 1997 fixing the levels and frequencies of sampling provided for by Council Directive 96/23/EC for the monitoring of certain substances and residues thereof in certain animal products<sup>(1)</sup> 12

97/748/EC:

- \* Commission Decision of 27 October 1997 on the carrying out of Community comparative trials and tests on propagating and planting material of certain species of fruit plants under Article 20 (2) of Council Directive 92/34/EEC ..... 16

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA

EFTA Surveillance Authority

- \* Recommendation of the EFTA Surveillance Authority No 166/97/COL of 17 June 1997 concerning a co-ordinated programme for the official control of foodstuffs for 1997 ..... 17
- \* Recommendation of the EFTA Surveillance Authority No 167/97/COL of 17 June 1997 concerning a co-ordinated programme of inspections in 1997 to ensure compliance with maximum levels of pesticide residues in and on certain products of plant origin, including fruit and vegetables..... 26

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Text with EEA relevance

## I

*(Acts whose publication is obligatory)*

**COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 2199/97**  
**of 30 October 1997**  
**amending Regulation (EC) No 2201/96 on the common organization of the**  
**markets in processed fruit and vegetable products**

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 43 thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission <sup>(1)</sup>,

Having regard to the opinion of the European Parliament <sup>(2)</sup>,

Having regard to the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee <sup>(3)</sup>,

Whereas Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 2201/96 <sup>(4)</sup> allocates fresh tomatoes by Member State and product group for the 1997/98 and 1998/99 marketing years; whereas, in the case of France, to adjust its quota of tinned whole peeled tomatoes and its quota of other products to the needs of its processing industry, the quota for tinned whole peeled tomatoes should be reduced by 15 000 tonnes and the quota for other products should be increased by the same amount; whereas the total quantities for these two product groups as set out in Article 6 (2) of the Regulation should also be adjusted as a result,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

Regulation (EC) No 2201/96 is hereby amended as follows:

1. The second and third indents of the second subparagraph of Article 6 (2) shall be replaced by:

‘ — tinned whole peeled tomatoes:

1 321 119 tonnes

— other products:

929 890 tonnes.’

2. Annex III shall be replaced by the following:

*ANNEX III*

**Allocation of fresh tomatoes by Member State and by product group for the 1997/1998 and 1998/1999 marketing years**

*(tonnes)*

Member State	Tomato concentrate	Tinned whole peeled tomatoes	Other products	Total
France	278 691	36 113	54 804	369 608
Greece	999 415	17 355	32 161	1 048 931
Italy	1 758 499	1 090 462	622 824	3 471 785
Spain	664 056	166 609	175 799	1 006 464
Portugal	884 592	10 580	44 302	939 474
Total	4 585 253	1 321 119	929 890	6 836 262'

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 266, 3. 9. 1997, p. 17.

<sup>(2)</sup> Opinion delivered on 22 October 1997 (not yet published in the Official Journal).

<sup>(3)</sup> Opinion delivered on 29 October 1997 (not yet published in the Official Journal).

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 297, 21. 11. 1996, p. 29.

*Article 2*

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

It shall apply from 15 June 1997.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Luxembourg, 30 October 1997.

*For the Council*

*The President*

F. BODEN

---

**COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 2200/97**  
**of 30 October 1997**  
**on the improvement of the Community production of apples, pears, peaches and nectarines**

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 43 thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission <sup>(1)</sup>,

Having regard to the opinion of the European Parliament <sup>(2)</sup>,

Whereas a feature of the Community market for apples, pears, peaches and nectarines is a certain mismatch between supply and demand; whereas this situation justifies the re-introduction and extension to pears of the measures to improve Community production introduced for the 1990/91 to 1994/95 marketing years as regards apples and for the 1995 marketing year as regards peaches and nectarines;

Whereas the areas benefiting from this operation should be limited and the least productive orchards should be excluded from it; whereas these areas should be apportioned between the Member States on the basis of the orchard area, production and withdrawals of each Member State; whereas it should be possible to amend this apportionment to optimize the area grubbed up; whereas it is also necessary to allow the Member States to decide on the regions and conditions under which this operation shall apply so that its introduction does not disturb the economic and ecological balance of certain regions;

Whereas the premium, to be paid once only, must be established by taking account of both the cost of grubbing-up and the producer's loss of income;

Whereas the aim of the grubbing-up premium is to achieve the objectives laid down in Article 39 of the Treaty; whereas provision should be made for the measure to be financed by the Guarantee Section of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF),

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

1. Apple, pear, peach and nectarine producers in the Community shall qualify, on application and under the conditions laid down in this Regulation, for a premium for the 1997/1998 marketing year, to be paid once only for the grubbing-up for apple trees other than cider apple

trees, pear trees other than perry pear trees, peach trees and nectarine trees.

2. The premium shall be granted for the grubbing-up of a maximum surface area of 10 000 hectares for each group of products, apples and pears on the one hand, peaches and nectarines on the other hand, divided as follows.

Member States	Apples and pears (ha)	Peaches and nectarines (ha)
Belgium	435	p.m.
Denmark	30	—
Germany	1 100	10
Greece	640	3 770
Spain	1 305	1 640
France	2 820	1 100
Ireland	10	—
Italy	2 275	3 260
Luxembourg	10	—
Netherlands	545	p.m.
Austria	150	20
Portugal	325	200
Finland	10	—
Sweden	40	—
United Kingdom	305	—

The above allocation may be amended by the Commission in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 6 to optimize the area qualifying for a grubbing-up premium, within the maximum surface area limit laid down in the first subparagraph above.

3. The Member States:

- shall designate the regions in which the grubbing-up premium is to be granted on the basis of economic and ecological criteria,
- shall lay down conditions ensuring in particular the economic and ecological balance of the regions concerned,
- may designate priority producer categories on the basis of objective criteria drawn up in agreement with the Commission.

They shall notify these regions, conditions and, where appropriate, categories to the Commission once adopted or designated.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 124, 21. 4. 1997, p. 26.

<sup>(2)</sup> Opinion delivered on 24 October 1997 (not yet published in the Official Journal).

A Member State need not designate a region. In such case, it shall inform the Commission thereof within one month of the entry into force of this Regulation.

#### Article 2

1. The premium shall be granted subject to a written undertaking by the recipient:

- (a) to grub-up or have grubbed-up, at one time, before a date laid down in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 6, all or part of his apple, pear, peach or nectarine orchard, the grubbed-up area being at least 0,5 of a hectare for apple and pear trees and at least 0,4 of a hectare for peach and nectarine trees;
- (b) to refrain from planting apple, pear, peach or nectarine trees, in accordance with the provisions laid down by the procedure referred to in Article 6.

2. For the purposes of this Regulation, and for each of the two product groups referred to in Article 1 (2), 'orchard' means all planted parcels on the holding with a density of 300 trees per hectare or more. However, this minimum density shall be reduced to 150 trees per hectare for parcels planted with apple trees of the Annurca variety.

#### Article 3

The grubbing-up premium shall be fixed taking account in particular of the grubbing-up costs and the loss of income to producers carrying out grubbing-up operations.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Luxembourg, 30 October 1997.

#### Article 4

The Member States shall check whether recipients of the grubbing-up premium have fulfilled the undertakings laid down in Article 2. They shall take any further measures in particular to ensure compliance with the provisions of this scheme. They shall inform the Commission of the measures taken.

#### Article 5

The measures provided for in this Regulation shall be deemed intervention intended to stabilize the agricultural markets within the meaning of Article 3 of Regulation (EEC) No 729/70 of the Council of 21 April 1970 on the financing of the common agricultural policy<sup>(1)</sup>. They shall be financed by the EAGGF Guarantee Section.

#### Article 6

The grubbing-up premium shall be determined and the detailed rules for the application of this Regulation shall be adopted in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 46 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2200/96 of 28 October 1996 on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables<sup>(2)</sup>.

#### Article 7

This Regulation shall enter into force on the third day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

*For the Council*

*The President*

F. BODEN

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 94, 28. 4. 1970, p. 13. Regulation as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1287/95 (OJ L 125, 8. 6. 1995, p. 1).

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 297, 21. 11. 1996, p. 1.

## COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2201/97

of 5 November 1997

## fixing the representative prices and the additional import duties for molasses in the sugar sector

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 of 30 June 1981 on the common organization of the market in sugar<sup>(1)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1599/96<sup>(2)</sup>,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1422/95 of 23 June 1995 laying down detailed rules of application for imports of molasses in the sugar sector and amending Regulation (EEC) No 785/68<sup>(3)</sup>, and in particular Articles 1 (2) and 3 (1) thereof,

Whereas Regulation (EC) No 1422/95 stipulates that the cif import price for molasses, hereinafter referred to as the 'representative price', should be set in accordance with Commission Regulation (EEC) No 785/68<sup>(4)</sup>; whereas that price should be fixed for the standard quality defined in Article 1 of the above Regulation;

Whereas the representative price for molasses is calculated at the frontier crossing point into the Community, in this case Amsterdam; whereas that price must be based on the most favourable purchasing opportunities on the world market established on the basis of the quotations or prices on that market adjusted for any deviations from the standard quality; whereas the standard quality for molasses is defined in Regulation (EEC) No 785/68;

Whereas, when the most favourable purchasing opportunities on the world market are being established, account must be taken of all available information on offers on the world market, on the prices recorded on important third-country markets and on sales concluded in international trade of which the Commission is aware, either directly or through the Member States; whereas, under Article 7 of Regulation (EEC) No 785/68, the Commission may for this purpose take an average of several prices as a basis, provided that this average is representative of actual market trends;

Whereas the information must be disregarded if the goods concerned are not of sound and fair marketable quality or if the price quoted in the offer relates only to a small quantity that is not representative of the market; whereas offer prices which can be regarded as not rep-

resentative of actual market trends must also be disregarded;

Whereas, if information on molasses of the standard quality is to be comparable, prices must, depending on the quality of the molasses offered, be increased or reduced in the light of the results achieved by applying Article 6 of Regulation (EEC) No 785/68;

Whereas a representative price may be left unchanged by way of exception for a limited period if the offer price which served as a basis for the previous calculation of the representative price is not available to the Commission and if the offer prices which are available and which appear not to be sufficiently representative of actual market trends would entail sudden and considerable changes in the representative price;

Whereas where there is a difference between the trigger price for the product in question and the representative price, additional import duties should be fixed under the conditions set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1422/95; whereas should the import duties be suspended pursuant to Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1422/95, specific amounts for these duties should be fixed;

Whereas application of these provisions will have the effect of fixing the representative prices and the additional import duties for the products in question as set out in the Annex to this Regulation;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Sugar,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

The representative prices and the additional duties applying to imports of the products referred to in Article 1 of Regulation (EC) No 1422/95 are fixed in the Annex hereto.

*Article 2*

This Regulation shall enter into force on 6 November 1997.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 177, 1. 7. 1981, p. 4.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 206, 16. 8. 1996, p. 43.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 141, 24. 6. 1995, p. 12.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 145, 27. 6. 1968, p. 12.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 5 November 1997.

*For the Commission*  
 Franz FISCHLER  
*Member of the Commission*

ANNEX

**fixing the representative prices and additional import duties applying to imports of molasses in the sugar sector**

CN code	Amount of the representative price in ECU per 100 kg net of the product in question	Amount of the additional duty in ECU per 100 kg net of the product in question	Amount of the duty to be applied to imports in ECU per 100 kg net of the product in question because of suspension as referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1422/95 <sup>(2)</sup>
1703 10 00 <sup>(1)</sup>	7,99	—	0,22
1703 90 00 <sup>(1)</sup>	11,07	—	0,00

<sup>(1)</sup> For the standard quality as defined in Article 1 of amended Regulation (EEC) No 785/68.

<sup>(2)</sup> This amount replaces, in accordance with Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1422/95, the rate of the Common Customs Tariff duty fixed for these products.



## COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2202/97

of 5 November 1997

## fixing the export refunds on white sugar and raw sugar exported in its unaltered state

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 of 1 June 1981 on the common organization of the markets in the sugar sector<sup>(1)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1599/96<sup>(2)</sup>, and in particular point (a) of the first subparagraph of Article 19<sup>(4)</sup> thereof,

Whereas Article 19 of Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 provides that the difference between quotations or prices on the world market for the products listed in Article 1 (1) (a) of that Regulation and prices for those products within the Community may be covered by an export refund;

Whereas Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 provides that when refunds on white and raw sugar, undenatured and exported in its unaltered state, are being fixed account must be taken of the situation on the Community and world markets in sugar and in particular of the price and cost factors set out in Article 17a of that Regulation; whereas the same Article provides that the economic aspect of the proposed exports should also be taken into account;

Whereas the refund on raw sugar must be fixed in respect of the standard quality; whereas the latter is defined in Article 1 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 431/68 of 9 April 1968 determining the standard quality for raw sugar and fixing the Community frontier crossing point for calculating cif prices for sugar<sup>(3)</sup>, as amended by Regulation (EC) No 3290/94<sup>(4)</sup>; whereas, furthermore, this refund should be fixed in accordance with Article 17a (4) of Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81; whereas candy sugar is defined in Commission Regulation (EC) No 2135/95 of 7 September 1995 laying down detailed rules of application for the grant of export refunds in the sugar sector<sup>(5)</sup>; whereas the refund thus calculated for sugar containing added flavouring or colouring matter must apply to their sucrose content and, accordingly, be fixed per 1 % of the said content;

Whereas the world market situation or the specific requirements of certain markets may make it necessary to vary the refund for sugar according to destination;

Whereas, in special cases, the amount of the refund may be fixed by other legal instruments;

Whereas the representative market rates defined in Article 1 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 3813/92<sup>(6)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 150/95<sup>(7)</sup>, are used to convert amounts expressed in third country currencies and are used as the basis for determining the agricultural conversion rates of the Member States' currencies; whereas detailed rules on the application and determination of these conversions were set by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1068/93<sup>(8)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1482/96<sup>(9)</sup>;

Whereas the refund must be fixed every two weeks; whereas it may be altered in the intervening period;

Whereas it follows from applying the rules set out above to the present situation on the market in sugar and in particular to quotations or prices for sugar within the Community and on the world market that the refund should be as set out in the Annex hereto;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Sugar,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

The export refunds on the products listed in Article 1 (1) (a) of Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81, undenatured and exported in the natural state, are hereby fixed to the amounts shown in the Annex hereto.

*Article 2*

This Regulation shall enter into force on 6 November 1997.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 177, 1. 7. 1981, p. 4.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 206, 16. 8. 1996, p. 43.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 89, 10. 4. 1968, p. 3.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 349, 31. 12. 1994, p. 105.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ L 214, 8. 9. 1995, p. 16.

<sup>(6)</sup> OJ L 387, 31. 12. 1992, p. 1.

<sup>(7)</sup> OJ L 22, 31. 1. 1995, p. 1.

<sup>(8)</sup> OJ L 108, 1. 5. 1993, p. 106.

<sup>(9)</sup> OJ L 188, 27. 7. 1996, p. 22.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 5 November 1997.

*For the Commission*  
Fraiz FISCHLER  
*Member of the Commission*

ANNEX

**to the Commission Regulation of 5 November 1997 fixing the export refunds on white sugar and raw sugar exported in its unaltered state**

Product code	Amount of refund
	— ECU/100 kg —
1701 11 90 9100	37,31 <sup>(1)</sup>
1701 11 90 9910	33,04 <sup>(1)</sup>
1701 11 90 9950	— <sup>(2)</sup>
1701 12 90 9100	37,31 <sup>(1)</sup>
1701 12 90 9910	33,04 <sup>(1)</sup>
1701 12 90 9950	— <sup>(2)</sup>
	— ECU/1 % of sucrose × 100 kg —
1701 91 00 9000	0,4056
	— ECU/100 kg —
1701 99 10 9100	40,56
1701 99 10 9910	39,52
1701 99 10 9950	39,52
	— ECU/1 % of sucrose × 100 kg —
1701 99 90 9100	0,4056

<sup>(1)</sup> Applicable to raw sugar with a yield of 92 %; if the yield is other than 92 %, the refund applicable is calculated in accordance with the provisions of Article 17a (4) of Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81.

<sup>(2)</sup> Fixing suspended by Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2689/85 (OJ L 255, 26. 9. 1985, p. 12), as amended by Regulation (EEC) No 3251/85 (OJ L 309, 21. 11. 1985, p. 14).

COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2203/97  
of 5 November 1997

fixing the maximum export refund for white sugar for the 14th partial invitation to tender issued within the framework of the standing invitation to tender provided for in Regulation (EC) No 1408/97

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,  
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 1785/81 of 30 June 1981 on the common organization of the markets in the sugar sector <sup>(1)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1599/96 <sup>(2)</sup>, and in particular the second subparagraph of Article 17 (5) (b) thereof,

Whereas Commission Regulation (EC) No 1408/97 of 22 July 1997 on a standing invitation to tender to determine levies and/or refunds on exports of white sugar <sup>(3)</sup>, requires partial invitations to tender to be issued for the export of this sugar;

Whereas, pursuant to Article 9 (1) of Regulation (EC) No 1408/97 a maximum export refund shall be fixed, as the case may be, account being taken in particular of the state and foreseeable development of the Community and world markets in sugar, for the partial invitation to tender in question;

Whereas, following an examination of the tenders submitted in response to the 14th partial invitation to

tender, the provisions set out in Article 1 should be adopted;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Management Committee for Sugar,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

For the 14th partial invitation to tender for white sugar issued pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1408/97 the maximum amount of the export refund is fixed at ECU 42,827 per 100 kilograms.

*Article 2*

This Regulation shall enter into force on 6 November 1997.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 5 November 1997.

*For the Commission*

Franz FISCHLER

*Member of the Commission*

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 177, 1. 7. 1981, p. 4.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 206, 16. 8. 1996, p. 43.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 194, 23. 7. 1997, p. 16.

**COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 2204/97**  
**of 5 November 1997**  
**establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of**  
**certain fruit and vegetables**

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,  
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Commission Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 of 21 December 1994 on detailed rules for the application of the import arrangements for fruit and vegetables<sup>(1)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 2375/96<sup>(2)</sup>, and in particular Article 4 (1) thereof,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No 3813/92 of 28 December 1992 on the unit of account and the conversion rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy<sup>(3)</sup>, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 150/95<sup>(4)</sup>, and in particular Article 3 (3) thereof,

Whereas Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 lays down, pursuant to the outcome of the Uruguay Round multilateral trade negotiations, the criteria whereby the Commission fixes the standard values for imports from third

countries, in respect of the products and periods stipulated in the Annex thereto;

Whereas, in compliance with the above criteria, the standard import values must be fixed at the levels set out in the Annex to this Regulation,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

*Article 1*

The standard import values referred to in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 3223/94 shall be fixed as indicated in the Annex hereto.

*Article 2*

This Regulation shall enter into force on 6 November 1997.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 5 November 1997.

*For the Commission*

Franz FISCHLER

*Member of the Commission*

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 337, 24. 12. 1994, p. 66.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 325, 14. 12. 1996, p. 5.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 387, 31. 12. 1992, p. 1.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 22, 31. 1. 1995, p. 1.

## ANNEX

to the Commission Regulation of 5 November 1997 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables

(FCU/100 kg)

CN code	Third country code <sup>(1)</sup>	Standard import value
0702 00 45	064	57,0
	204	50,6
	999	53,8
0709 90 79	052	69,2
	999	69,2
0805 20 31	204	75,6
	999	75,6
0805 20 33, 0805 20 35, 0805 20 37, 0805 20 39	052	64,6
	999	64,6
0805 30 40	052	86,5
	388	53,7
	524	67,8
	528	49,4
	999	64,4
0806 10 50	052	102,4
	064	62,8
	400	226,7
	999	130,6
0808 10 92, 0808 10 94, 0808 10 98	060	44,7
	064	44,6
	400	88,1
	404	86,7
	528	52,4
	999	63,3
0808 20 67	052	101,1
	064	77,7
	400	98,0
	999	92,3

(<sup>1</sup>) Country nomenclature as fixed by Commission Regulation (EC) No 68/96 (OJ L 14, 19. 1. 1996, p. 6). Code '999' stands for 'of other origin'.

## II

(Acts whose publication is not obligatory)

## COMMISSION

## COMMISSION DECISION

of 27 October 1997

fixing the levels and frequencies of sampling provided for by Council Directive 96/23/EC for the monitoring of certain substances and residues thereof in certain animal products

(Text with EEA relevance)

(97/747/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,  
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances and residues thereof in live animals and animal products and repealing Directives 85/358/EEC and 86/469/EEC and Decisions 89/187/EEC and 91/664/EEC<sup>(1)</sup>, and in particular Article 6 (2) thereof,

Whereas Annex IV to Directive 96/23/EC fixes sampling levels and frequencies for live animals and certain products listed in Annex II and entrusts the Commission with the task of determining them for certain other animal products;

Whereas Council Directive 85/73/EEC of 29 January 1985 on the financing of veterinary inspections and controls covered by Directives 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC, 90/675/EEC and 91/496/EEC<sup>(2)</sup>, as last amended by Directive 96/43/EC<sup>(3)</sup>, has fixed in Annex B the fees intended to ensure that the controls on live animals and products of animal origin provided for in Directive 96/23/EC are carried out;

Whereas, in the light of the experience gained through the existing national measures and the information forwarded to the Commission under existing Community rules, sampling levels and frequencies should be fixed for the animal products not already mentioned in Annex IV to Directive 96/23/EC;

Whereas the sampling levels and frequencies provided for in this Decision must be integrated into the residue monitoring plans not later than the update scheduled for

1999, to be submitted by the Member States before 31 March 1999;

Whereas the measures provided for in this Decision are in accordance with the opinion of the Standing Veterinary Committee,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

*Article 1*

The sampling levels and frequencies for the monitoring of certain substances and residues thereof in milk, eggs, rabbit meat and the meat of wild game and farmed game and honey are set out in the Annex to this Decision, which supplements the sampling levels and frequencies set out in Annex IV to Directive 96/23/EC.

*Article 2*

The levels and frequencies referred to in Article 1 must be complied with in the updated residue monitoring plans submitted by the Member States for 1999.

*Article 3*

This Decision is addressed to the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 27 October 1997.

*For the Commission*

Franz FISCHLER

*Member of the Commission*

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 125, 23. 5. 1996, p. 10.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 32, 5. 2. 1985, p. 14.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 162, 1. 7. 1996, p. 1.

## ANNEX

## CHAPTER 1

## MILK

## 1. Bovine milk

A. *Sampling requirements*

- Each official sample must be taken by the official competent authorities in such way that it is always possible to trace it back to the farm of origin of the milk.
- The samples, according to the choice of the Member States, can be taken:
  - (a) either at farm level from the collection tank,
  - (b) or at the level of the dairy industry before the bulk tanker has discharged.
- Derogation from the above principle of traceability to the farm of origin can be accepted for the substances or residues designated in Annex I group B 3 (a), (b) and (c) of Council Directive 96/23/EC.
- Samples must be taken only from raw milk.

The sample size will depend on the analytical methods used.

B. *Sampling level and frequency*

The annual number of samples is 1 per 15 000 tonnes of the annual production of milk, with a minimum of 300 samples.

The following breakdown must be respected:

- (a) 70 % of the samples must be examined for the presence of residues of veterinary drugs. In this case, each sample has to be tested for at least four different compounds from at least three groups among groups A 6, B 1, B 2 (a) and B 2 (e) of Annex I to the Directive.
- (b) 15 % of the samples must be tested for the presence of residues designated in group B 3 of Annex I to Directive 96/23/EC.
- (c) The balance (15 %) must be allocated according to the situation of the Member State.

## 2. Milk from other species (ovine, caprine, equine)

The number of samples for these species must be determined by each Member State according to the level of production and the problems identified. The milk from these species must be included in the sampling plan as additional samples to those taken for bovine milk.

## CHAPTER 2

## EGGS

## 1. Hen eggs

A. *Sampling requirements*

- Each official sample must be taken by official competent authorities in such way that it is always possible to trace it back to the farm of origin of the eggs.
- The samples, according to the choice of the Member States, can be taken:
  - (a) either at farm level;
  - (b) or at the level of the packing centre.
- The sample size is at least 12 eggs or more, according to the analytical methods used.

B. *Sampling level and frequency*

The number of samples to be taken each year must be at least equal to 1 per 1 000 tonnes of the annual production of consumption eggs, with a minimum of 200 samples. The breakdown of samples may be decided by each Member State according to the structure of its industry, particularly as regards levels of integration within it.

At least 30 % of samples must be collected from packing centres which represent the most significant proportion of eggs supplied for human consumption.

The following breakdown must be respected:

- 70 % of the samples must be tested for at least one compound from each following group: groups A 6, B 1 and B 2 (b) mentioned in Annex II to Directive 96/23/EC.
- 30 % of the samples must be allocated according to the situation in the individual Member State, but must include some analyses for substances in Group B 3 (a) of Annex I.

## 2. Eggs from other species of poultry

The number of samples for these species is to be determined by each Member State according to the level of production and the problems identified. The eggs from these species must be included in the sampling plan as additional samples to those taken for hen eggs.

## CHAPTER 3

### RABBIT MEAT AND THE MEAT OF WILD GAME AND FARMED GAME

#### 1. Rabbit meat

##### A. *Sampling requirements*

One sample consists of one or more animals from the same producer, according to the requirements of the analytical methods.

- Each official sample must be taken by official competent authorities in such way that it is always possible to trace it back to the farm of origin of the rabbits.
- The samples, according to the structure of the rabbit production in each Member State, can be taken:
  - (a) either at farm level,
  - (b) or at the level of the registered slaughterhouses (within the meaning of Council Directive 91/495/EEC<sup>(1)</sup>).

Without prejudice to the provisions of Directive 96/23/EC, some additional samples of drinking water and feedingstuffs may be taken at farm level, for the control of illegal substances.

##### B. *Sampling level and frequency*

The number of samples to be taken each year must be equal to 10 per 300 tonnes of the annual production (dead weight) for the first 3 000 tonnes of production, and 1 sample for each additional 300 tonnes.

The following breakdown must be respected: (reference to Annex I to Directive 96/23/EC):

- Group A: 30 % of the total number of samples,
  - 70 % must be checked for Group A 6 substances,
  - 30 % must be checked for substances of other sub-groups of Group A.
- Group B: 70 % of the total number of samples
  - 30 % must be checked for Group B 1 substances
  - 30 % must be checked for Group B 2 substances
  - 10 % must be checked for Group B 3 substances

The balance must be allocated according to the situation of the Member State.

These figures will be reviewed within two years after the adoption of this Decision.

#### 2. Farmed game

##### A. *Sampling requirements*

The sample size will depend on the analytical method used.

The samples must be taken at the processing unit level. It must be possible to trace the animals or their meat back to the farm of origin.

Without prejudice to the provisions of Directive 96/23/EC, some additional samples of drinking water and feedingstuffs may be taken at farm level, for the control of illegal substances.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 268, 24. 9. 1991, p. 41.



**B. *Sampling level and frequency***

The number of samples to be taken each year must at least be equal to 100 samples.

The following breakdown must be respected:

— Group A: 20 % of the total number of samples,

The majority of the samples must be analysed for compounds of group A 5 and group A 6.

— Group B: 70 % of the total number of samples.

The breakdown must be:

30 % must be checked for Group B 1 substances,

30 % must be checked for Group B 2 (a) and (b) substances,

10 % must be checked for Group B 2 (c) and (e) substances,

30 % must be checked for Group B 3 substances.

The balance (10 %) will be allocated according to the experience of the Member States.

Member States shall provide to the Commission the figures corresponding to their national production of farmed game meat destined for human consumption. In the light of this information, the above figures will be reviewed within one year after the adoption of this Decision.

### 3. Wild game

**A. *Sampling requirements***

The sample size will depend on the analytical method used.

The samples must be taken at the processing unit level or at the hunting place.

It must be possible to trace the animals back to the region where they were hunted.

**B. *Sampling level and frequency***

The number of samples to be taken each year must at least be equal to 100 samples.

These samples must be taken to analyse residues of chemical elements.

Member States will provide to the Commission the figures corresponding to their annual national production of wild game destined for human consumption. In the light of this information, the above figures will be reviewed within one year after the adoption of this Decision.

## CHAPTER 4

### HONEY

**A. *Sampling requirements***

The sample size will depend on the analytical method used.

The samples can be taken at any point in the production chain, provided that it is possible to trace the honey back to the original producer.

**B. *Sampling level and frequency***

The number of samples to be taken each year must at least equal to 10 per 300 tonnes of the annual production for the first 3 000 tonnes of production and one sample for each additional 300 tonnes.

The following breakdown must be respected:

— Group B 1 and Group B 2 (c): 50 % of the total number of samples,

— Group B 3 (a), (b) and (c): 40 % of the total number of samples.

The balance (10 %) must be allocated according to the experience of the Member States. In particular, consideration could be given to mycotoxins.

## COMMISSION DECISION

of 27 October 1997

on the carrying out of Community comparative trials and tests on propagating and planting material of certain species of fruit plants under Article 20 (2) of Council Directive 92/34/EEC

(97/748/EC)

THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to Council Directive 92/34/EEC of 28 April 1992 on the marketing of fruit plant propagating material and fruit plants intended for fruit production<sup>(1)</sup>, as last extended by Decision 97/110/EC<sup>(2)</sup> and in particular Article 20 (2) thereof,

Whereas under this Directive comparative trials and tests shall be carried out in the Member States on samples to check that propagating material or fruit plants of genera and species listed therein comply with the requirements and conditions of the said Directive;

Whereas to this end, it is essential, in particular in the early stages of the Directive's implementation, to ensure adequate representation of the samples participating in the trials and tests for the different origins of production in the entire Community, at least for certain selected crops;

Whereas it is therefore necessary to carry out Community comparative trials and tests in 1997/98 on propagating, and planting material of strawberries (*Fragaria*);

Whereas it is necessary for all Member States to participate in the Community comparative trials and tests, in so far as propagating and planting material of strawberries are usually propagated or marketed in their territories, in order to ensure that proper conclusions may be drawn therefrom;

Whereas these Community comparative trials and tests will be used to harmonize, in the first instance, the technical methods of examination of propagating and planting material of these species;

Whereas the measures provided for in this decision are in accordance with the opinion of the Standing Committee on Propagating Material and Plants of Fruit Genera and Species,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

*Article 1*

1. Community comparative trials and tests shall be carried out during 1997/98 on propagating and planting material of strawberries (*Fragaria*).

2. All Member States shall participate in the Community comparative trials and tests, in so far as propagating and planting material of strawberries are usually propagated or marketed in their territories.

*Article 2*

The detailed arrangements for carrying out the Community comparative trials and tests and the assessment of the results thereof shall be made within the Standing Committee on Propagating Material and Plants of Fruit Genera and Species.

*Article 3*

This Decision is addressed to the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 27 October 1997.

*For the Commission*

Franz FISCHLER

*Member of the Commission*

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 157, 10. 6. 1992, p. 10.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 39, 8. 2. 1997, p. 22.

## EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA

## EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY

## RECOMMENDATION OF THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY

No 166/97/COL

of 17 June 1997

concerning a co-ordinated programme for the official control of foodstuffs for  
1997

THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY,

Having regard to the European Economic Area Agreement, and in particular Article 109 and Protocol 1 thereof,

Having regard to the Agreement relating to the establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice, and in particular Article 5 (2) (b) and Protocol 1 thereof,

Having regard to the Act referred to in point 50 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement on the official control of foodstuffs (Council Directive 89/397/EEC), as adapted by way of Protocol 1 to the EEA Agreement, and in particular Article 14 (3) thereof,

After consulting the EFTA Foodstuffs Committee assisting the EFTA Surveillance Authority,

Whereas it is necessary with a view to the sound operation of the European Economic Area, to arrange for co-ordinated food inspection programmes within the EEA;

Whereas such programmes place emphasis on compliance with the foodstuffs legislation in force under the EEA Agreement, the protection of public health, consumer interests and fair trade practices;

Whereas simultaneous implementation of national programmes and co-ordinated programmes can provide information and experience on which to base future control activities;

Whereas Liechtenstein shall comply with the provisions of the acts referred to in Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement by 1 January 2000; whereas Liechtenstein was to do its utmost to comply with the provisions of the acts referred to in that Chapter by 1 January 1997; whereas therefore Liechtenstein is included in this Recommendation for 1997;

Whereas the European Commission, in its Recommendation of 8 January 1997 concerning a co-ordinated programme for the official control of foodstuffs for 1997, has recommended the Member States of the European Union to apply a corresponding programme,

HAS ADOPTED THIS RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that during 1997 Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway should take samples and undertake laboratory analysis for:

- (a) Aflatoxins in spices;
- (b) Contamination of food products for persons suffering from food allergy or hypersensitivity;

1. Although sampling rates have not been set, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway should ensure that the number of samples taken is sufficient to provide an overview of the subject under consideration in each EFTA State. Suggestions will be made for the methods of analysis.
2. Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway should provide the information as requested following the format of the record sheets provided in the Annex to help enhance the comparability of results.

### 3. Aflatoxins in spices

Spices, in particular pepper, chilli products, nutmeg and paprika powder, may contain aflatoxins in excessive amounts owing to different processing and storage conditions. Article 2 of the Act referred to in point 54f of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement laying down Community procedures for contaminants in food (Council Regulation (EEC) No 315/93) prohibits the selling of foodstuffs with excessive amounts of contaminants from the public health viewpoint and in particular at a toxicological level. All EFTA States have specific regulations for the aflatoxin content of this kind of product.

The aim of this element of the programme is to study the extent to which the levels of aflatoxins in these products exceed national limits. This study will also identify the legal basis for rejection in Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. Analytic methods should be capable of determining aflatoxin levels in the samples at least down to 1 µg/kg.

### 4. Contamination of foodstuffs for persons suffering from food allergy or hypersensitivity

Food products labelled or otherwise marketed with claims implying absence of certain protein ingredients and so forth constitute a potential health risk to people suffering from food allergy or hypersensitivity, if they are contaminated with that particular ingredient. Even minute amounts may be fatal. Article 2 of the Act referred to in point 18 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling presentation and advertising of foodstuffs (Council Directive 79/112/EEC) provides that the labelling and the advertising must not be such as could mislead the purchaser to a material degree, particularly as to the composition of the foodstuff. The aim of this element of the programme is to survey the enforcement actions taken by Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway when contaminated food products are found on the market.

#### *Scope*

Any type of food with claims implying absence of a particular ingredient: in view of the types of such food most commonly offered for sale in EFTA States, sampling should be restricted to products not containing milk/milk proteins, lactose, egg, or gluten.

*Project report: record sheet*

The EFTA States should ensure that the number of contaminated food products and of producers/importers involved, together with information about enforcement action taken, are reported to the EFTA Surveillance Authority. If the kind of action taken is related to the amount of the contaminant found, action levels should also be reported.

5. This Recommendation is addressed to Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.

Done at Brussels, 17 June 1997.

*For the EFTA Surveillance Authority*

*The President*

Knut ALMESTAD

---

## ANNEX

## 1. AFLATOXINS IN SPICES

Table 1.1

## Pepper

Member State: .....

Total number of samples analysed:

Total number of samples rejected:

Aflatoxin	Not detected	Number of samples				Average value of positive samples (µg/kg)	Median value of positive samples (µg/kg)	Maximum value (µg/kg)	Limit or guide value for rejection (µg/kg)
		< 2 µg/kg	2 - < 10 µg/kg	10 - 50 µg/kg	> 50 µg/kg				
B1									
B2									
G1									
G2									

Legal basis for rejection:

Method of analysis used (reference: literature, written standard, etc.; keyword description of the procedure; limits of detection and determination) (if different from the proposed method):

Other details, indications, difficulties encountered:

Origin of rejected samples, if known:

Table 1.2

**Chilli and chilli powder**

Member State: .....

Total number of samples analysed:

Total number of samples rejected:

	Not detected	Number of samples				Average value of positive samples (µg/kg)	Median value of positive samples (µg/kg)	Maximum value (µg/kg)	Limit or guide value for rejection (µg/kg)
		< 2 µg/kg	2 - < 10 µg/kg	10 - 50 µg/kg	> 50 µg/kg				
Aflatoxin									
B1									
B2									
G1									
G2									

Legal basis for rejection:

Method of analysis used (reference: literature, written standard, etc.; keyword description of the procedure; limits of detection and determination) (if different from the proposed method):

Other details, indications, difficulties encountered:

Origin of rejected samples, if known:

Table 1.3

**Nutmeg**

Member State: .....

Total number of samples analysed:

Total number of samples rejected:

	Not detected	Number of samples				Average value of positive samples ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Median value of positive samples ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Maximum value ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Limit or guide value for rejection ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )
		< 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	2 - < 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	10 - 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	> 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$				
Alitoxin									
B1									
B2									
G1									
G2									

*Legal basis for rejection:**Method of analysis used (reference: literature, written standard, etc.; keyword description of the procedure; limits of detection and determination) (if different from the proposed method):**Other details, indications, difficulties encountered:**Origin of rejected samples, if known:*



Table 1.4

**Paprika powder**

Member State: .....

Total number of samples analysed:

Total number of samples rejected:

	Not detected	Number of samples				Average value of positive samples ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Median value of positive samples ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Maximum value ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	Limit or guide value for rejection ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )
		< 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	2 - < 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	10 - 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$	> 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$				
Aflatoxin									
B1									
B2									
G1									
G2									

*Legal basis for rejection:**Method of analysis used (reference: literature, written standard, etc.; keyword description of the procedure; limits of detection and determination) (if different from the proposed method):**Other details, indications, difficulties encountered:**Origin of rejected samples, if known:*

**2. CONTAMINATION OF FOODSTUFFS FOR PERSONS SUFFERING FROM FOOD ALLERGY OR HYPERSENSITIVITY**

Table 2.1

**Investigation of products with claims implying absence of one or more of the following ingredients: milk/milk proteins, lactose, egg, or gluten**

Member State: .....

Total number of products tested: .....

Total number of producers/importers involved: .....

Total number of products in which the abovementioned ingredients were found: .....

Total number of producers/importers of products in which the abovementioned ingredients were found: .....

**Enforcement action taken when the abovementioned ingredients were found**

Claims	Number of products		Number of producers/importers		Actions taken (*) Number							
	tested	contaminated	monitored	with contaminated products	none (1)	verbal warning (2)	written warning (3)	improved inhouse control required (4)	sales prohibition (5)	administrative penalty (6)	court action (7)	other (8)
milk/milk protein-free												
lactose-free												
egg-free												
gluten-free												

(\*) Comments on action taken and indication of action level (mg/kg) if the type of action taken is related to the amount of the contaminant found.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8)

Table 2.2

Member State: .....

**Analytical methods used**

Milk/milk proteins	
Lactose	
Egg	
Gluten	

Further comments:

\_\_\_\_\_

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY****No 167/97/COL****of 17 June 1997**

**concerning a co-ordinated programme of inspections in 1997 to ensure compliance with maximum levels of pesticide residues in and on certain products of plant origin, including fruit and vegetables**

THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY,

Having regard to the European Economic Area Agreement, and in particular Article 109 and Protocol 1 thereof,

Having regard to the Agreement relating to the establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice, and in particular Article 5 (2) (b) and Protocol 1 thereof,

Having regard to the Act referred to in point 54 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement on the fixing of maximum levels for pesticide in and on certain products of plant origin, including fruit and vegetables (Council Directive 90/642/EEC as amended), as adapted by way of Protocol 1 to the EEA Agreement (below referred to as the Act), and in particular Article 4 (3) thereof,

After consulting the EFTA Foodstuffs Committee assisting the EFTA Surveillance Authority,

Whereas it follows from Article 4 (2) of the Act, that the EFTA States are required to send to the EFTA Surveillance Authority by 1 August 1996, all necessary information on the implementation during 1995 of their national programmes of inspection to ensure compliance with maximum levels of pesticide residues as set in Annex II to the said Directive; whereas the Authority has received certain information in accordance with this requirement;

Whereas Article 4 (1) of the Act requires the EFTA States to draw up forward programmes laying down the nature and frequency of the inspections to be carried out to ensure compliance with the established list of maximum levels of pesticide residues;

Whereas the amount of information made available to the EFTA Surveillance Authority has not been sufficient to permit a complete overview of the EFTA States' pesticide residues monitoring activities during 1995 or to allow a comprehensive evaluation of the EFTA States' monitoring intentions for 1997; whereas, nevertheless, sufficient information is available to coordinate a programme of monitoring of specific pesticides/product combinations at EEA level; whereas this is the third such specific co-ordinated programme to be recommended and indications as to the products to be included in future annual specific co-ordinated programmes are important for the planning of the competent authorities of the EFTA States; whereas products will not normally be repeated in specific co-ordinated programmes within an interval of three years;

Whereas Annex II of the Act, as amended, contains lists of harmonized maximum residue levels for certain pesticides, which should be subject to the national and co-ordinated programmes of inspections in 1997;

Whereas it remains necessary to recommend general basic arrangements for the inspections for pesticide residues to be carried out by the EFTA States during 1997 in order to ensure compliance with the mandatory maximum levels of pesticides residues and to contribute to the good functioning of the European Economic Area;

Whereas it is important that information on current national quality assurance measures applied to sampling and analyses of pesticide residue levels is made available by the EFTA States as a basis for further discussion;

Whereas it would also be helpful for the establishment of future recommendations for the EFTA Surveillance Authority to be informed in advance of the EFTA States' forward programmes for 1998 for the monitoring of maximum levels of pesticide residues provided for by the Act;

Whereas the inspections and check sampling by EFTA States to ensure compliance with the maximum levels of pesticide residues set out in the list referred to in Article 1 (1) of Commission Directive 90/642/EEC should be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Act referred to in point 20 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement establishing Community methods of sampling for the official control of pesticide residues in and on fruit and vegetables (Commission Directive 79/700/EEC), the Act referred to in point 37 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement concerning the introduction of Community methods of sampling and analysis for the monitoring of foodstuffs intended for human consumption (Council Directive 85/591/EEC), the Act referred to in point 50 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement on the official control of foodstuffs (Council Directive 89/397/EEC) and the Act referred to in point 54n of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement on the subject of additional measures concerning the official control of foodstuffs (Council Directive 93/99/EEC);

Whereas Liechtenstein shall comply with the provisions of the acts referred to in Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement by 1 January 2000; whereas Liechtenstein was to do its utmost to comply with the provisions of the acts referred to in that Chapter by 1 January 1997; whereas therefore Liechtenstein is included in this recommendation for 1997;

Whereas the European Commission, in its Recommendation of 2 December 1996 concerning a co-ordinated programme of inspections in 1997 to ensure compliance with maximum levels of pesticide residues in an on certain products of plant origin, including fruit and vegetables, has recommended the Member States of the European Union to apply a corresponding programme,

HAS ADOPTED THIS RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway:

1. as a specific exercise for 1997, sample and analyse for the product/pesticide residue combinations set out in the Annex, on the basis of a target number of 50 samples of each product, reflecting as appropriate national, EEA and third-country shares of the EFTA States' market and report the results, including analytical methods used, reporting levels achieved and quality assurance measures, at the latest by 1 August 1998;
2. by 1 August 1997, send to the EFTA Surveillance Authority all the information as required by Article 4 (2) of the Act concerning the 1996 monitoring exercise to ensure, at least by check sampling, compliance with maximum pesticide residue levels and, in particular:
  - 2.1. the results of the specific exercise for 1996, as set out in point 5 of Recommendation of EFTA Surveillance Authority No 85/96/COL concerning a co-ordinated programme of inspections in 1996 to ensure compliance with maximum levels of pesticide residues in and on certain products of plant origin, including fruit and vegetables;
  - 2.2 the results of their national programmes concerning pesticides listed in Annex II of Directive 90/642/EEC, in relation to harmonized levels and, where these have not yet been fixed at EEA level, in relation to the national levels in force;

- 2.3. the criteria applied when drawing up their national programmes concerning the numbers of samples taken and the analyses carried out;
  - 2.4. the criteria applied when defining and fixing reporting levels;
  - 2.5. the quality assurance measures applied to sampling of products or changes in those measures reported in previous years;
  - 2.6. details of accreditation, in accordance with the provisions of Article 3 of Directive 93/99/EC, of the laboratories carrying out the analyses and, where such accreditation has not yet been accorded, the criteria applied in establishing quality assurance measures in those laboratories;
3. by 1 July 1997, send to the EFTA Surveillance Authority their intended national programme for monitoring maximum pesticide residue levels fixed by Directive 90/642/EEC for the year 1998 and, as far as possible, for following years.
  4. This Recommendation is addressed to Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.

Done at Brussels, 17 June 1997.

*For the EFTA Surveillance Authority*

*The President*

Knut ALMESTAD

---

## ANNEX

**Maximum Residue Levels (MRLs) to be monitored in the specific exercise for 1997 set out in point 1 of the Recommendation**

(mg/kg)

Pesticide residue to be analysed	Products to which MRLs apply				
	1. Mandarins	2. Pears	3. Bananas	4. Beans (fresh including frozen)	5. Potatoes
Carbendazim (*)	5	2	1	—	—
Thiabendazole	6	5	3	—	5
Acephate	1	—	0,02 (*)	—	0,02 (*)
Chlorothalonil	0,01 (*)	—	0,01 (*)	—	0,01 (*)
Chlorpyrifos	0,3	0,5	—	—	0,05 (*)
DDT	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)
Diazinon	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	—
Endosulfan	1	1	0,05 (*)	1	—
Iprodione	0,02 (*)	10	—	—	0,02 (*)
Metalaxyl	—	1	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)	0,05 (*)
Methamidophos	0,2	—	0,01 (*)	—	0,01 (*)
Methidathion	2	0,3	0,02 (*)	0,02 (*)	0,02 (*)
Triazophos	—	—	0,02 (*)	—	—

(\*) Benomyl, Carbendazim, Thiophanate-Methyl (sum of residues expressed as Carbendazim).

(\*) Indicates lower limit of analytical determination.