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Avocados - Proposal by the delegation from Germany

**Note**: The following proposal is based on UNECE Standard FFV-42 for Avocados.

This proposal addresses the marking provisions on sizing.

The existing provisions (2016/2017) are as follows:

**D. Commercial specifications**

* Class
* Size expressed as minimum and maximum weights or by count
* Code number of the size scale and number of fruits when it is different from code number or, optionally, code number of the size scale and the net weight of the package.

1. The two indents concerning the size indication are equivalent. This means on each package the provisions of both indents have to be respected.

This could be corrected with a new indentation, e.g.

* Size expressed as
* Minimum and maximum weights or
* Count or
* Code number of the size scale and number of fruits when it is different from code number or, optionally, code number of the size scale and the net weight of the package.

1. The count as such, does not provide any information on the size if the size of the box is not known. Thus, this indication is not clear and should either be deleted or completed by the size range or the net weight.
2. However, the last indent on code number refers to the sizing provisions in section III. In an example given: we have a package containing avocados of size code 28. These avocados are packed in sales packages (pre-package) of 6 fruits per sales packages. On these sales packages the size could be labelled as 28/6 (size code 28, count 6) which does not mean anything to the consumer. Alternatively, the size could be indicated as 28/500g – the 28 would not mean anything to the consumer. For consumers, the net weight of the sales package is of importance or – where the produce is sold by number – the number of units (if not visible from the outside).
3. The final proposal for a clear provision on labelling the size is as follows:

* Size expressed as
* Minimum and maximum weights or
* **Count or**
* Code number of the size scale and number of fruits when it is different from code number or
* Code number of the size scale and the net weight of the package or
* **In case of sales packages (pre-packages): net weight. However, in the case of products sold by number, the requirement to indicate the net weight shall not apply if the number of items may be clearly seen and easily counted from the outside or, if the number is indicated on the label.**