

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>what you expect manufacturers and retailers to spend.</p> <p>Such cost analysis should be compared with a more thorough benefit analysis and an assessment of whether or not the Agency feels an investment of many hundreds of millions of pounds will have any direct or indirect impacts on obesity levels in this country (currently the Government's public health priority). We assume your research will provide insights as to whether or not the existing labelling schemes are widely used and are driving any tangible changes in consumer behaviours. However, you should reference the existing EUFIC research which highlights that only 25% of UK shoppers use the schemes in market. Our analysis of the research suggests that the key priority now is not to make further labelling changes but to educate the other 75% of UK consumers to use the information that is already there.</p> <p>Should a UK specific labelling agreement be implemented, UK specific products would have to be developed which would result in a dramatic increase in cost as many Nestlé products are generic across Europe.</p> <p>Industry benefits FDF believes that the main benefit to industry is that consumers are better informed about products they purchase. There is also a suggestion that front-of-pack labelling has helped focus the reformulation and new product development efforts of manufacturers and retailers.</p> <p>Nestle believes that the main benefit of FoP nutrition labelling to industry is that consumers are better informed about products they purchase</p> <p>Consumer benefits It is crucial that this section includes clear reference to the importance of education in encouraging the use of on-pack information, within the context of lifestyle changes, which is totally different to the importance of awareness of the schemes in market. Research suggests that C2DE mums (one of the key targets for public health campaigns) are difficult to reach and do not already instinctively use the labelling schemes now in market.</p> <p>Education of consumers across all socio economic groups via methods appropriately targeted is key to enable consumers to benefit from any FoP labelling scheme. This will enable consumers to make informed choices at the point of purchase.</p>	<p>Nestle</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestle</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestle</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>Nestlé notes that industry take up of the voluntary GDA FoP labelling scheme in the UK is vast with over 80% of retail food packs now supplying detailed nutrition information on the back of pack on a voluntary basis and that most of this is expressed in a GDA format.</p>	
	Yes	<p>Another cost which has not been considered is the possibility of criteria being reviewed. This can be the case of the GDA values if EFSA comes up with European values which are different to the ones that industry is currently using or if the criteria establishing what is high (red), medium (amber) and low (green) changes (refer to your comment on paragraph 43 a)).</p> <p>Paragraph 29 on products analysis makes no reference to the typical cost for group 2 nutritional information including saturated fat and sugar. This information is easily attainable; we believe it is around £100 per sample mark. Reference should also be made to the fact that analytical data must be representative and therefore more than one set of analysis is required to verify the result, significantly increasing the cost.</p> <p>In addition to the costs acknowledged in the Framework document, there are inevitable costs associated with the time and analysis which will need to undertaken to re-evaluate company Policies and Brand Standards, if MTL colour coding were to be mandatory. This work would also include re-developing our computer systems to ensure product compliance.</p> <p>Costs that have not been accounted for in this document include the costs of administration throughout the supply chain as a result of a change in line code.</p> <p>Retailers have invested considerably in communicating the benefits of individual schemes to their audience. Any changes to existing schemes must take account of consumer education and information, the necessity for new marketing materials, update of websites and countering alternate schemes as appropriate.</p> <p>The role of consumer groups and NGOs to raise awareness of the recommended approach is included under Consumer Benefits (paragraph 33). However, no reference to associated Consumer Information Costs to NGOs is included.</p> <p>The cost/ benefit section does not consider the risks of consumers taking wrong signals from traffic lights, for example the high proportion in EUFIC's FoP labelling research (73%) who thought red indicated avoidance, with potentially significant</p>	<p>British Retail Consortium</p> <p>Morrisons</p> <p>Nestle</p> <p>Waitrose</p> <p>National Heart Forum, Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Kraft</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>consequences for micronutrient consumption.</p> <p>Neither does it consider the potential impact of traffic lights where companies lose the incentive to reformulate foods if a change in colour band is not achievable.</p> <p>There needs to be a clearer analysis of the investment made to date by both the public and private sectors. We estimate that many tens of millions of pounds has been spent already and that similar sums will be needed to re-educate consumers about any future changes to the labelling they see on food and drink packaging. Nowhere in your draft do you address the question of how the Agency and Department of Health will fund such an education campaign. In our experience you cannot make labelling changes without educating consumers and, for the reasons articulated above, we already think that more work needs to be done to educate the majority of consumers to start using the detailed front and back-of-pack information they already have. This point needs to be clearly spelt out in your draft. Going forwards, industry would be concerned if there was no clear commitment from Government to fund future consumer education campaigns.</p> <p>A vast amount of resource has already been utilised in educating UK consumers regarding GDA FoP labelling schemes. In particular industry has worked in partnership with the FDF.</p> <p>Further work is required for education of consumers and funding for these needs to be agreed once ALL relevant research has been undertaken and a European position has been agreed so that the education can align to the needs of consumers identified in any research.</p> <p>The consumer benefit is in our view wider than you suggest at the start of para 32, in that providing simple clear information to consumers on the front of pack helps to improve their overall food literacy and confidence in terms of food as well as the specific benefit of influencing individual choices to be healthier.</p>	<p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestle</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
Range of Foods			
<p><i>Should FoP labelling be restricted to the current recommended food categories or should any additional categories be added? If so which ones and why?</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>This one is difficult to answer without the results of the FSA front of pack labelling evaluation, as it may be that consumers would like front of pack labelling on a wider range of foods. As a general principle it makes sense for the labelling to be applied on 'processed'/added value foods which would include soups, vegetable accomps etc.</p> <p>To be successful, a voluntary labelling scheme must be designed so that it can be used in all product categories by companies that wish to introduce clearer labelling. If that is not the case, then the scheme is flawed, is not suitable for use as a voluntary universal labelling system, and the consultation should make that clear. Introducing a quasi-regulatory approach, such as an exceptions list, will not make that flawed scheme work any better and in fact implies that adoption of the scheme is effectively mandatory.</p> <p>In our view, it would have been sensible to restrict FoP labelling to the recommended FSA food categories until the independent research had been conducted. This would have enabled any research to be clearly focused on specific categories such as everyday food choices and gain detail on associated difficulties and/or benefits. Outcomes could then look at extension to other categories and the relative complexity or ease in extending the scheme.</p>	<p>M&S</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Waitrose</p>
	<p>Should be restricted to current recommended food categories</p>	<p>Our customer research has suggested that customers do not see the benefit of adding this labelling to products that they consider as treats which would include cakes and confectionery. One of the reasons that they gave for this is that they knew it was a treat and didn't want to be made feel guilty for indulging.</p> <p>It would also be difficult to include this labelling across all products due to size of packaging e.g. chocolate, small desserts therefore we may need to consider a minimum requirement for front of pack nutrients to be labelled e.g. calories if labelling was to be applied across these products.</p> <p>We believe that it is sufficient that FoP labelling should be restricted to the current recommended food categories as these are typically products that may be high in fat, saturated fat, sugar and salt without the consumer necessarily realising this. However if the proposed FIR will encompass additional categories for FoP labelling, then the UK</p>	<p>M&S</p> <p>Provision Trade Federation</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>recommendations should be in line with those, when they are agreed.</p> <p>We do not believe that it would be helpful to change the list of products covered by the scheme, at the moment, given that it may need to be changed again in the next few years in line with the proposed FIR. In the current climate, where costs are an increasing priority, for reasons of economy there should be a limit on changes to labels.</p>	
	<p>Should not be restricted to current recommended food categories</p>	<p>We believe FoP labelling should not be restricted to specified food categories, we believe it should be made available to all products which make a significant contribution to the diet.</p> <p>100% of all Morrisons relevant products now display %GDA s on the FOP. Relevant products do not include single component products to be used as part of recipe such as salt, spices, vinegar. This is because either the single ingredient foods cannot be reformulated to reduce key nutrients or that other foods provide only negligible dietary nutrition.</p> <p>No. I think the following categories should be added,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snack/Confectionery Products. i.e chocolate, crisps, cereal bars and similar products. Due to these types of products being consumed throughout the day, normally in between meals as snacks and possibly making a large impact on a persons daily nutrient intake but due to size of the product the nutrient content may not be taken into account. Introducing FoP labelling for these types of products will significantly highlight the nutrient content. 2. Fruit Juices/Fruit Drinks/Fruit Smoothies. Due to the confusing messages surrounding how healthy these types of products are in relation to their contribution to 'five a day' but possibly not highlighting their sugar content. Introducing FoP labelling for these types of products will significantly highlight the nutrient content. <p>Experience from companies already using FOP labelling widely suggests there is no practical reason why it should not be extended to <u>all</u> food categories.</p> <p>We recommend that there should be a presumption to provide labelling on all products.</p> <p>If a staged implementation is undertaken, priority categories would include cakes, desserts, biscuits, snack foods, confectionery and soft drinks with added sugar in view</p>	<p>Co-op</p> <p>Morrisons</p> <p>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>of the acknowledged contribution made by these categories to excess consumption of salt, fat, saturates and sugar and the desire expressed by consumers in FSA research for signposting on 'treat foods'. In view of the current crisis in children's diets and dietary health, we believe that products specifically aimed at children should also be a priority for signposting.</p> <p>The Agency should also encourage retailers to develop shelf labelling to provide customers with information for products sold loose such as bakery, confectionery and fruit & vegetables.</p> <p>The BDA would recommend that FoP labelling is implemented on those composite foods that consumers have identified as being difficult to assess the nutritional content. The list of foods already identified by the FSA covers most of these groups but we would recommend that the groups are extended to include 'fancy' bread products, cakes and desserts as well as snack food items such as crisps, cereal bars and confectionary. We would not like to see FoP labeling on basic single food items such as fresh fruit and vegetables</p> <p>GDA is applicable to all food categories and we support its use for a wide range of products with very limited exceptions, such as certain gifting products which are not consumed as part of the normal diet.</p> <p>A FoP labelling scheme should be able to be applied across all food categories and not lend itself to exceptions.</p>	<p>British Dietetic Association</p> <p>Kraft</p> <p>Nestle</p>
<p><i>Should an alternative approach in which a broader range of foods is</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>The types of Morrisons own-brand "convenience foods" described here already display FOP %GDAs.</p>	<p>Morrisons</p>

¹ This would cover pre-packed foods which are ready to eat or require no preparation other than re-hydration, defrosting, heating or cooking by the consumer before consumption. Such foods include (but are not restricted to) sandwiches, prepared or ready meals, burgers, sausages, pies, pasties and quiches, breaded or coated or formed meat, meat alternative, poultry, fish and similar products including those in sauces, pizzas and breakfast cereals

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
<i>covered be considered (eg 'processed convenience foods'¹)?</i>		<p>If the categories are to be extended, a review of the criteria will be needed to ensure that they are appropriate for any new categories. For example, the definitions for 'high fat' and 'medium fat' for cheese contained in the Codex Alimentarius standard for cheese conflict with the definitions in the FSA FOP scheme.</p> <p>This is a moot point as the national FSA scheme has already been permitted for use by a range of adopters whose products sit outside the recommended categories.</p>	<p>Provision Trade Federation</p> <p>Waitrose</p>
<i>Alternatively should we list categories of foods for exemption from FoP labelling? If so what foods would an exemption cover?</i>	General comments	<p>Exemptions would only be relevant if a scheme is mandatory and this is a voluntary scheme.</p> <p>From a public health point of view, care should be exercised in agreeing any exemptions to a universal labeling scheme because consumers may be confused about the status of unlabelled foods, especially under a voluntary scheme. Unprocessed, single ingredient products on the one hand are likely to be easier for consumers to evaluate. But we do not know what the effect will be on consumer perceptions of these products being unlabelled in an environment where most other products are labelled.</p> <p>Colour-coded systems are not widely applicable as thresholds cannot be set in a way that is relevant to all categories. In our view, this demonstrates that colour coding is inherently flawed. Setting lists of categories to be included, or excepted, for traffic lights does not overcome these flaws and creates a quasi-regulatory approach that is not consistent with a voluntary system.</p>	<p>Waitrose</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Kraft</p>
	Yes	<p>Including lists of foods for exemption may produce difficulties in classification. The BDA would recommend that foods that we are trying to encourage consumers to eat as the basic staples of their diet should not have FoP labeling eg Fruit, veg, rice, pasta, potatoes, milk, most dairy, regular bread.</p> <p>This does highlight the need for additional nutritional education to help consumers identify which food groups a food belongs to, alert consumers to the value of each of the four food groups and to appropriate portion size</p> <p>Agree that the FSA need to define foods that are exempt. These should include basic vegetables, meat, fish, poultry etc. (products that are 'unprocessed' or would be used as ingredients within a meal).</p>	<p>BDA</p> <p>M&S</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>Yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Foods in packages with a small surface area. 2. Foods that do not fall within the current definition of Pre Packed. 	Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
	No	<p>Given that front-of-pack labelling is voluntary, FDF sees no reason why exceptions should be necessary. Companies should be free to decide whether or not they use front-of-pack labelling and should not be pressurised into a decision either way.</p> <p>Consulting on such a section would, we feel, send a strong message to industry that you intend to make labelling a quasi-regulatory initiative which will be enforced as if it has the power of law which it clearly does not as it is an EU competence. We think this is a very worrying development.</p> <p>In the context of the current economic climate and given the fact that Government ministers have publicly pledged that industry will not suffer further unnecessary regulatory burdens, it is particularly worrying that industry would be requested to engage in two separate and costly labelling changes.</p>	Food & Drink Federation

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
<p><i>Do you think that the foods listed in Annex IV of the FIR (see Annex 2 to [the framework document]) should also be used as a basis to exempt foods from FoP labelling in the UK?</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>It is difficult to answer this question because the scope of Annex IV of the FIR has not been clarified, particularly with respect to the first two items on the list (unprocessed and lightly processed products). As mentioned in our submission to the FSA on the FIR we believe that the second exemption should encompass products such as cheese, bacon and ham. These products will have many of the characteristics of unprocessed products, such as variability in nutrient composition, which would justify an exemption to nutrition labelling.</p> <p>It is worth noting that in common with most other UK retailers, the majority of Waitrose branded food products carry a nutrition declaration, even in those instances where the FIR might allow exemptions.</p> <p>It could be construed as misleading to provide FOP nutrition labelling if the full nutrition declaration were not also made. We believe that the absence of back of pack nutrition declaration should prohibit any FOP declaration.</p> <p>We note that the underpinning arguments for the exemptions in Annex IV are largely based on practical considerations (cost, packaging etc), not public health.</p>	<p>Provision Trade Federation</p> <p>Waitrose</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p>
	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, we are aware of the proposed list of exempt food items given in Annex IV of the EC proposal for a food information regulation which broadly matches the products which we do not consider suitable for FOP labelling.</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Morrisons</p> <p>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
	Good starting point	<p>The foods listed in Annex IV of the FIR would be a good basis on determining a list of exempted products though unprocessed products and processed products which have been subjected to smoking or maturing and comprise of a single ingredient or category of ingredient should not be included within this list as these products may make a significant contribution to the diet. However where products are presented in a variety pack i.e. selection box of biscuits, it would be impractical to display the traffic light labelling of all the varieties within the product and therefore any FoP labelling should be on a voluntary basis.</p> <p>Agree in principle that this list would be a good start with additional understanding on consumer expectations of labelling on products such as cakes and confectionery. However, as mentioned in response to question (a), there may have to be an additional agreed position for small products where there is no room on the label for full front of pack labelling.</p> <p>With the experience of the existing limited scheme for FoP labelling, the consultation should consider comprehensive labelling with only few exemptions. The exemptions in Annex 2 offer a basis but there seems no basis from a consumer perspective to exclude the categories in the first two bullet points. Also some vinegars are sweetened with sugar and so there is a case for not exempting these.</p>	<p>Co-op</p> <p>M&S</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p>
Calories			
<i>Should calories be a required part of FoP recommended approach?</i>	Yes	<p>The BDA recommend that calories are a required part of the FoP. The evidence in consumer research shows this is the main thing consumers understand and is consistent with putting only calories on menus labeling</p> <p>Within the design of FoP labelling, calorie information should be included per average adult.</p> <p>Absolutely – it is essential that consumers understand calories to help them manage energy intake which in the longer-term is the only element of diet that will impact on obesity risk.</p>	<p>British Dietetic Association</p> <p>Co-op</p> <p>M&S</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>Yes. It is well established that consumers often use calorie information as a proxy nutritional indicator in making food choices. Given the current focus on saturated fat and energy, FOP information concerning energy (calories) and the 4 key nutrient (including saturated fat) with respect to portion size would be of value to drive both consumer choice and industry portion/pack sizes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Certainly calories are the recognised measure of energy intake that consumers use to make appropriate choices. However, the EU FIR proposal suggests that calories per 100g/ml and possibly per serving would become a mandatory FOP labelling requirement, and as such, this would result in unnecessary duplication of information.</p> <p>Yes. Consumers find this information helpful and it gives a signal for energy-density in foods. For clarity energy should be expressed as calories per portion.</p> <p>Providing calorie information per portion is central to FoP labelling as it meets consumer needs and directly addresses the overriding public health priority of obesity. We note that this forms the basis of the FSA's recent recommendations for nutrition labelling in restaurants and the wider 'out of home' sector.</p> <p>It makes sense to provide consumers with information that they seek. In addition energy density (calories per unit weight or volume) is an important determinant of unintentional weight gain. Therefore foods high in energy density (about 225 kcal/100g) and where a serving or typical daily intake provides a substantial proportion (e.g. 10% or more) of daily energy requirements (i.e. about 200 Kcal) then it would be sensible to highlight this on FoP labelling.</p> <p>FDF strongly believes that FSA's research will follow the strong indications of the EUFIC research that calorie per portion information is important. The Agency's own research carried out ahead of the discussions with the catering sector also highlighted the same point. Given the strong focus of the Department of Health on tackling obesity, and the Agency's new menu labelling scheme for caterers, it is clear that calorie per portion information is important. FDF believes that calories are key to any voluntary approach to front-of-pack labelling – which is why they have been at the heart of the GDA scheme from the start.</p> <p>Energy/ calories are an essential part of a GDA scheme. Nestlé supports the European</p>	<p>Morrisons</p> <p>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council</p> <p>Waitrose</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Kraft</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestlé</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		legislation in the area on having a calorie icon FoP per portion. Nestlé does not support MTLs.	
<i>If a traffic light based approach is recommended in what ways should information be provided? Does it need to be colour coded or are numbers sufficient?</i>	General comments	<p>If traffic light colours are seen by consumers as the most helpful means of understanding/interpreting nutrition information, then calories should also be colour coded.</p> <p>Whether it can be incorporated into an already complicated traffic light colour coded scheme needs assessment.</p>	M&S Royal College of Physicians
	Traffic lights should be included	<p>The BDA supports the use of colour coding on FoP labeling and would want to see a consistent approach with all manufacturers/retailers. Until there is agreement on portion sizes the BDA would support a colour coding system based on 100g portions as this helps in comparison between products.</p> <p>Colours and numbers would be beneficial.</p> <p>Publicly available research shows that colour-coding is essential to provide consumers with information about key nutrients at-a-glance. When information is presented only as percentage GDAs (without colour-coding), this has been shown to be a barrier to consumers' ability to use FOP nutritional labelling. Numbers-based traffic lights have not to our knowledge been tested.</p> <p>The essential simplicity of traffic-light labelling lies in its colour-coding. Numbers have been shown to be a barrier to at-a-glance interpretation by most consumers – except for calories. A social marketing type of public education programme will be needed to help consumers interpret the FOP scheme adopted.</p>	British Dietetic Association Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health
	<p>Traffic lights should not be included</p> <p>Traffic lights should not be included</p>	No. At present, colour coding corresponding to the Agency's designated "high, medium and low" ranges applies on a per 100g basis. As such, the colour coding of foods does not acknowledge the way in which foods are eaten e.g those starchy foods which make large contributions to the diet or those which are generally consumed in portion sizes of less than 100g. We believe translating nutritional content, including energy (calories) into % of GDAs can better inform consumers of their nutrient/energy intakes in terms of actual food portion sizes over the course of the day.	Morrisons

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>Calorie information should appear as per serving, see current Waitrose packs for approach. This approach has been in existence for 3 years and is very successful and well received by consumers. Colour coding is not necessary on calories because individual requirements are all different.</p> <p>Calories should not be colour coded as currently there are no industry wide approach and guidelines in determining the calorie information in relation to adults intake and colour coding them.</p>	<p>Waitrose</p> <p>Co-op</p>
GDA for Sugar			
<p><i>What is the appropriate GDA figure for sugar that should be used on FoP labels? Please explain your answer.</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>This is very tricky as there is a real labelling issue with the potential for confusing consumers on fruit and milk sugars –NMES is a calculated figure and can not be measured. The BDA would support further research into how ‘added sugar’(ie sugar added to a food in processing and excluding sugars naturally occurring in fruit, vegetables, potatoes and dairy. So for example yoghurts would show total carbohydrate & total sugars on the nutrition panel on the back in line with food labelling law and a value for any added sugar on FoP label. This is complicated, but so is the current scheme when you can exceed GDA for sugar by eating fresh fruit, veg and milk.</p> <p>Currently grams of sugar per portion of food as given as %GDA represent the absolute amount of sugars that includes both NMES and naturally occurring fruit and milk sugars. Likewise, it is recognised that the MTL scheme does not distinguish between these sugar types. We also appreciate that this area is complex and open to debate given that both types of sugars are thought to have similar nutritional effects in the body.</p> <p>Extra information will need to be provided for children.</p> <p>It should be made clear that there is no recommendation from WHO for labelling of non-milk extrinsic sugars (NMES) or so-called ‘free sugars’. The terminology proposed for labelling is total sugars (2007).</p> <p>We don’t believe that these questions are best addressed in this consultation as it relates to labelling systems, not dietary guidelines.</p>	<p>British Dietetic Association</p> <p>Morrisons</p> <p>Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Kraft</p>
	<p>60g</p>	<p>Pending further discussion, we would wish to continue using the use of FSA recommended value of a maximum 60g for sugar on front of pack for traffic light</p>	<p>Co-op</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
	60g NMES	<p>calculation.</p> <p>The declaration for sugars should be for non-milk extrinsic sugars (NME), not total sugars, to ensure that nutrition labeling is consistent with and supportive of the recommendations of nationalⁱ and WHOⁱⁱ scientific reports that NME sugars should not exceed 60g per day or 10% of total dietary energy. The GDA figure for FOP labeling purposes should be calculated on this basis.</p> <p>Many if not most processed foods (e.g. confectionery, sugary drinks, dressings, many canned foods) will contain most if not all their sugar content as added sugars and these would be the same as Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy (COMA's) NME sugars. There seems no rational basis for not using the COMA DRV for NMES as a basis for this labelling. Exemptions might be considered for the less usual situation where there is a substantial component of sugars naturally incorporated into the food matrix.</p>	<p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p>
	90g total sugar	<p>Ideally the GDA should be based on 'added sugar' as from a public health perspective it is added sugar that the UK population need to decrease in their diet. However this causes problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement – it is total sugars that are analysed and labelled therefore difficult for enforcement officers to check the accuracy of colour coding • Calculation – suppliers need to calculate added sugar which is time consuming <p>Therefore, we need to base the GDA for sugar on the agreed recommended intake of total sugars i.e. currently 90g. If we can't reach agreement on a GDA for total sugars then this should be given to SACN for comment or alternatively we should drop sugar from the front of pack label and explore other ways of highlighting to consumers products which contain high amounts of added sugar e.g. using the ingredients list.</p> <p>It would seem sensible to use the GDAs already established by the industry. Front of pack and back of pack declarations should reflect each other.</p> <p>Nestlé supports the GDA values which are used and are included in the Commission proposal Annex XI as reference intakes for energy and selected nutrients (adults):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy 2000kcal • Total fat 70g 	<p>M&S</p> <p>Waitrose</p> <p>Nestle</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturates 20g • Sugars 90g • Salt 6g <p>In addition and if relevant, reference values can be used for children. These have been developed and are awaiting CIAA endorsement.</p>	
<p><i>Should the EFSA advice on GDAs for nutritional labelling be used, when available?</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>We would like to comment on this advice when it is made available for examination and consultation.</p> <p>The EFSA advice should be considered when available. Should the EFSA advice fail to refer to NME sugars, this should not be a barrier to FSA using a GDA for NME sugars for UK labelling purposes.</p> <p>A consultation on the presentational aspects of labelling would seem an inappropriate opportunity to debate detailed technical points that are already being discussed elsewhere. In that respect, FDF believes that the EFSA opinion should be awaited.</p>	<p>Morrison's</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p>
	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The BDA recognizes that there is a need for consistency across Europe for food labeling. For clarity and to reduce confusion EFSA advice should be used possibly with the exception of sugars</p> <p>We would want to ensure that ongoing work related to the development of the sugars GDA is also taken into account when any changes to the high threshold for sugars are considered</p> <p>Yes, it is important that we standardise figures across Europe as many companies retail products in a number of countries</p> <p>EFSA should be the relevant authority to establish GDAs for key nutrients, to ensure a consistent approach across Europe.</p>	<p>BDA</p> <p>British Nutrition Foundation</p> <p>M&S</p> <p>Kraft</p>
<p>Salt Threshold</p>			
<p><i>In reviewing the red (high) threshold for salt, should proposals be developed which take account of ongoing work on NHCR, Nutrient Profiling and salt</i></p>	<p>General comments</p>	<p>It is both confusing and inconsistent for industry to have FSA 2010 voluntary targets and those which may be different and feature in the proposed NHCR Nutrient Profiles. Crucially, it is not in the consumers interest to have items labelled as "high salt" (under the NHDR) when they may meet the FSA 2010 targets after much time and cost has been devoted to achieving this. We understand the principle of the FSA voluntary salt target 2010 is about whole- industry collaboration and adjustment in salt sensitivity</p>	<p>Morrison's</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
<i>targets?</i>		<p>over time. Morrisons is currently on target to achieve FSA 2010 salt targets by September 2009¹. We would appreciate being involved in consultation to determine future salt targets.</p> <p>We believe the GDA approach should be applied to salt</p> <p>We feel a GDA approach should be applied to salt as to all other nutrients, as is currently the case even in the traffic light scheme</p>	<p>Kraft</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p>
	Yes	<p>Yes. Again there is a need for continuity across EU</p> <p>The salt thresholds should relate to maximum levels for the salt targets for specific product categories.</p> <p>We agree that the 'high' threshold for salt should be increased to bring it more into line with the EU NPM and the FSA salt targets. Without this amendment there could be conflicting declarations on the label. However the task will be quite complex owing to the different EU NPM thresholds and FSA salt targets.</p> <p>This would be helpful although the salt threshold is not the only consideration for NHCR or nutrient profiling, other nutrient thresholds are under consideration.</p> <p>As UK sodium intakes decline and consumer preferences change, so it should be possible to reduce the sodium content of processed foods further. It makes sense to take this into account in developing the scheme into the future.</p>	<p>British Dietetic Association</p> <p>M&S</p> <p>Provision Trade Federation</p> <p>Waitrose</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
	Definitions	<p>Products sold i.e. single serve packs or generally eaten in quantities less than 100g.</p> <p>Snack, confectionary products, single portion foods less than 100g.</p> <p>Single serve, single eat.</p>	<p>M&S</p> <p>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council</p> <p>Waitrose</p>
<p><i>Do you think specific criteria for smaller portions eg less than 25g would be helpful to consumers? Please explain your answer.</i></p>	General comments	<p>FoP needs to reflect realistic portion size. Where normal portion size is small eg spreads and salad dressings (where only eat 10-20g) a front of pack labeling based on 100g is unable to help the consumer identify lower fat, saturated fat alternatives. The BDA would support agreement on portion sizes and prevent the current confusion where unrealistically small portions</p> <p>This scope of this question is not clear. We presume that the Agency is referring to setting specific colour-coded “high, medium, low” ranges for food sold in smaller portions. If so, it is anticipated the application of such a criteria would not be “simple system”, and may lead to both industry and consumer confusion over the types of foods this applies to, as well as the contribution of the food’s nutrients to a balanced diet. %GDAs based on portion sizes already present a simple and cumulative way with which to gauge and manage one’s intake over the course of a day.</p> <p>The per 100g approach used for traffic lights does not relate to the way people consume food and setting specific criteria for small portions does not overcome this problem - what about portions between 25g and 100g?</p> <p>Providing information per portion is central to improving consumers' food literacy and their ability to make informed choices and the consultation should incorporate this subject for discussion.</p> <p>Nestlé supports GDA labelling regardless of portion size. However, a small portion size may result in a small pack size and this would preclude the use of GDA FoP labelling.</p>	<p>British Dietetic Association</p> <p>Morrisons</p> <p>Kraft</p> <p>Nestle</p>
	Yes	<p>We requested this for consideration at the onset because of products like breakfast cereals (approx 30g), crisps (25-30g), cheese portions (30g).</p> <p>The BDA would support specific criteria for smaller portions for the reasons identified above. This would also then cover smaller 100calorie equivalent portions of</p>	<p>Waitrose</p> <p>British Dietetic Association</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>confectionery/snack foods and may encourage manufacturers to make and retailers to sell smaller portion size products</p> <p>Yes. We are being encouraged to offer consumers a range of portion sizes, especially on products that would be considered snacks or energy dense. With the current nutrition criteria for colour coding a 100g packet of crisps would be colour coded similarly to a 25g packet of crisps. Whilst there is sensible rationale for this, the colour coding at present would not help the customer choose the smaller portion size. However, this may be overcome by incorporating colour coding for calories.</p> <p>We agree that specific criteria should be set for products consumed in small portions, such as butter, because this would provide the consumer with nutrition information about the amounts actually ingested. Alternatively, we suggest that this category should be exempt from FOP labelling.</p> <p>Yes as smaller products (under 25g) are likely to include snack/confectionary products.</p>	<p>M&S</p> <p>Provision Trade Federation</p> <p>Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council</p>
	No	<p>We believe introducing further criteria for foods consumed in smaller portions would make the system for calculating traffic lights as a whole too confusing and would incur costs to businesses who have already invested in technology within existing I.T systems to calculate traffic light coding for on-pack label approval.</p> <p>No. We do not believe that there are sufficiently persuasive issues relating to smaller portions that would require different criteria. The FSA should aim for a consistent approach which is clearly communicated to consumers.</p> <p>While in some circumstances the impact of small portions on total daily intake may be negligible, it is possible for them to make a meaningful contribution e.g. to sodium intake. In addition, certain products might be eaten frequently though in small portions, and it is the total intake that matters. It could be confusing to have different criteria for small portions (especially as they might sometimes be identical products to those sold in larger portions). It might be possible to have a case by case list of exemptions from any FoP labelling (rather than different criteria) where it can be shown that a typical daily intake will have negligible impact on overall intake, but this should not be the default.</p>	<p>Co-op</p> <p>National Heart Forum Faculty of Public Health</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p>
Other comments			

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
	General comments	<p>We would like to see a specific question on how other stakeholders perceive the impact that front of pack labelling criteria has had on the reformulation of products and driving new product development, along with their views on the potential benefits to health that this might have had.</p> <p>We also suggest that the use of hybrid schemes is considered – some retailers and manufacturers have opted to use a colour-coded GDA scheme on Front of Pack and it would be interesting to collect comments on the clarity of information and any evidence of consumer behaviour change. Also, as they have been included in the on-going research, it is an option that needs to be further explored.</p> <p>We use FoP GDA (Guideline Daily Amounts) signposting in our European markets and believe that it is important to have a consistent approach across Europe to help build consumer understanding and to enable the free movement of goods within the single market.</p> <p>The consultation should also address the incompatibility between per portion GDA and per 100g traffic lights and the anomalies created when the two approaches are combined in a single label.</p> <p>The consultation should consider the need for the FSA FoP scheme to made compulsory, and for Guideline Daily Amounts (GDA) schemes to be phased out. There are considerable benefits to a single scheme, and the graphic simplicity of the FSA scheme compared to the GDA schemes would probably benefit those in the lowest income groups who are a particular focus for this activity.</p> <p>As a key principle, FDF notes that the document is written from the standpoint of a single preferred labeling scheme and of traffic light colours being the <i>de facto</i> scheme. Whilst we recognize that there may be political considerations at play, it cannot in our view be assumed that the evidence from the PMP will support the conclusion that there is a single ‘best’ or preferable scheme available. In addition this approach will potentially create a disconnect with the majority of industry respondents who, as you know, are using a GDA-based scheme.</p> <p>Energy/ calories are an essential part of a GDA scheme. Nestlé supports a future European regulatory environment that endorses the GDA scheme with 1 GDA Front of Pack (FoP) for Energy/Calories per portion, monochrome, and Back of Pack (BoP)</p>	<p>British Nutrition Foundation</p> <p>Kraft</p> <p>Royal College of Physicians</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestlé</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>Regarding the European Commission's proposed Food Information Regulation, we would expect to see recognition that nutrition labelling is an EU competency and that the UK government's ability to recommend a 'national scheme' is conditional on such schemes being acceptable under the regulation, when it is adopted.</p> <p>In addition, we would reinstate our concern that according to article 2(1) of the NHCR 1924/2006 the use of pictorial, graphic or symbolic representations implying a food has a particular characteristic is defined as a claim. Our view is that this can be interpreted as including colour coding which would mean products are subject to fulfilling the nutrient profile and thereby prohibits its use in certain circumstances. This would mean that the effective use of traffic lights would not be possible. It is also worthy of note that none of three working groups voting on the proposed FIR (including the binding one) are in favour of allowing national schemes (such as the FSA traffic lights) on the basis that they would distort the internal market.</p>	Waitrose
	EU/UK timeline	<p>One of the things that the Agency agreed to do at the stakeholders' workshop was to provide a timeline comparing the decision making process for the UK FOP labelling scheme and the Proposed Regulation on consumer information, with the aim to coordinate the two as far as possible. We have not yet seen this.</p> <p>Furthermore we believe that when proposing any labelling changes there should be a general understanding of the different labelling provisions that industry has to implement in the next few years, e.g. declaration of flavourings in the ingredients list, allergens in products containing wine and wine sold as such, new definition of fibre, new energy conversion factors and RDAs for some vitamins and minerals. The timeline project should comprehensively cover all these required changes.</p>	British Retail Consortium
	Different tools for different purposes	<p>While we understand that different tools maybe developed for slightly different purposes, e.g. OFCOM model to restrict advertising to children, European nutrient profile model to control the use of claims, traffic light labelling to further explain to a customer whether a products is high, medium or low on an specific nutrient; the overall reason for developing these tools is reducing obesity rates. We therefore believe that further consideration should be given to how all these tools work together in practice to try to avoid any discrepancy that will ultimately confuse consumers. Furthermore for industry the complexity of having to use a myriad of targets whilst developing products is proving difficult and has a cost associated with it which will only increase if more targets or tools are introduced.</p>	British Retail Consortium M&S

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
	GDAs	The labelling of GDA information should remain voluntary, due to the basis of how the information is determined and to who it applies i.e. average man/women.	Co-op
	Transition periods	Any change to GDA's or threshold limits should be made to coincide with other FoP labelling requirements or a lengthy transitional period should be given to enable businesses to comply with the requirements without incurring significant cost of relabelling.	Co-op
	Health context	<p>This section should refer to obesity as the Governments overriding priority in the area of dietary health.</p> <p>An additional point to note in this section is that since 2004 the Government's health priority has changed and is now focusing very much on obesity. The Public Service Agreement in this area relates to childhood obesity. While we would completely agree that all the factors highlighted in the health context are important, this change in emphasis needs to be considered when designing a programme that should now presumably target obesity as a priority.</p> <p>Nestlé agrees with the targeting of obesity as a key Public Health issue in the UK and welcomes any science-based initiatives that will help address this issue. All of the health issues mentioned are important. A reduction in the rates of overweight and obesity will contribute to a reduction in Cardiovascular Disease, arthritis, some cancers as well as type II diabetes independently of other improvements in diet and lifestyle.</p> <p>Nestlé would like to note the current thinking that Energy (in)balance is key in the development of obesity and should be a key priority for any public health campaigns.</p> <p>FoP labelling that provides portion calorie information will enable consumers to understand the calorie contribution of foods and drinks that they consume. Research shows that GDAs can be used by a large number of consumers across different socioeconomic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Kraft</p> <p>Food & Drink Federation</p> <p>Nestle</p>
	Front of pack labelling context	It appears that the framework document is based on an assumption that there should be a single scheme and that it will incorporate traffic light colour coding. If so, we would question both assumptions:	Kraft

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		<p>- industry's engagement in the FSA research was explicitly conditional on an understanding that it would test the effectiveness of systems in the market and would not necessarily recommend a single scheme. The Department of Health's preference for a single scheme was subsequently announced in the <i>Healthy Food Code of Practice</i>, without industry agreement or consultation. The paper should recognise these points in paragraphs 8 and 12-15.</p> <p>- the majority of companies using FoP labelling are using monochrome GDAs and an assumption that Multiple Traffic Lights (MTLs) will be recommended would appear to pre-judge the FSA research.</p> <p>The document should recognise the very widespread adoption of voluntary FoP labelling and the presence of monochrome GDAs on the majority of food manufacturers' and retailers' packs (around 80 companies, according to FDF tracking).</p> <p>The document should also acknowledge the full range of the FSA's own nutrition labelling work, in particular the calorie information per portion system currently being recommended for the 'out of home' sector.</p> <p>We suggest there is an acknowledgement of the Agency's work to introduce a new labelling scheme for catering, which focuses on calorie information per portion.</p> <p>Your document does not set the context for these discussions by highlighting the prevalence of voluntary front-of-pack schemes in the UK. Schemes based on monochrome GDAs are supported by the majority of retailers and manufacturers (about 80 companies to date). It should also be recognised more clearly that back-of-pack information on retail products is well established – with more than 80% of retail food packs now supplying detailed nutrition information on the back of pack on a voluntary basis and that most of this is expressed in a GDA format. Such information is vital if we are to fully understand the cost implications of any premature changes to the existing labelling landscape before the EU regulatory framework is agreed.</p> <p>It should be made clear that the Food Information Regulation (FIR) bases its calls for mandatory information on a scheme that is equivalent to GDA labelling in the UK. There should be further discussion on possible scenarios, based on the timeline for the European negotiations. This scenario planning should include analysis as to whether changes in the UK would be considered in addition to those required by the EU Regulation – in other words would industry be forced to make two changes in a short</p>	<p>Food & Drink Federation</p>

Question/Issue	View	Comment	Respondent
		Regulation already has a provision for ensuring common per portion information is provided across all 27 Member States – so this work will be happening in the near future.	
	Reformulation	On a global level, Nestlé supports reductions in public health sensitive nutrients in its food and beverage products. Nestlé has global policies pertaining to reductions in saturated and trans fats, salt and sugar. The policies are mandatory and stipulate levels where products are required to undergo reductions in these nutrients. In addition, the policies stipulate that during renovation or innovation, the levels in products should not increase.	Nestle

ⁱ Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy. 1991. Dietary Reference Values for Food Energy and Nutrients for the United Kingdom. Report on Health and Social Subjects 41. Department of Health.

ⁱⁱ World Health Organization. 2003. Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. Report of a Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation. Technical Report Series No 916. Geneva: WHO.