

**Public consultation - Update for units of measurement directive**

**Subject :** Units of Measurement Directive

Regarding the consultation question:

7. Should the use of supplementary indications in Article 3 in Directive 80/181/EEC be able to continue?

Living in the UK I have to deal with the continued use of two systems of measurement, SI and Imperial, of which I have only been educated in the former. This is used by retailers to confuse the general public over pricing and the move to a single system of measurement would improve transparency.

Sadly the UK authorities do not enforce the Units of Measurement Directive as is the intent of this Directive, with the result that you will find, for example, cartons of milk, one labelled 1 litre and another 2 pints side by side (the litre size can be hidden on the rear of the packaging and illegally omitted from the shelf, as with Organic milk in Sainsbury's supermarkets). The packaging can be a different shape, distorting the actual volume size of the container, and in this way the smaller unit can be made to look better value when it is actually more expensive per litre.

As long as milk packaging can use the supplementary label in pints, they will be able to take advantage of consumer confusion between SI and imperial sized packages. Such is the effect of 'supplementary indications' in the UK.

When shops are compelled to describe their produce as '1.136 litres' without a 2 pint indication, there would naturally be a move to litre sizes. This would benefit the consumer, who would be able to make a fair comparison between brands and shops.

I therefore wish to strongly oppose this amendment. If the issue is trade with the US, then only packaging from or destined for the US should be permitted to display non-SI units. Any relaxation on domestic products would permit retailers and producers to continue to take advantage of consumers in the UK.

Anthony Wilson  
London